

**Tuition & Fee Proposal Committee**  
**November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007 Meeting Minutes**  
**Location: BSE 2.102**  
**Time: 8:00am**

**In attendance:**

**Student Members:** Christina Gomez, Tommy Thompson, Nicole White, Sara Hohne, Yelena Nevel, John Schieferle Uhlenbrock

**Faculty Members:** Dr. Arturo Ayon, Dr. Victoria Jones, Dr. Keith Fairchild

**Ex-Officios:** Janet Parker, Candie Sagehorn, Sam Gonzales, Terry Wilson, David Gabler

**Executives:** Kerry Kennedy

**Guests:** Jackie Hobson, Lynn Bishop, Gerry Dizinno, George Norton, Rosanne Gorny, Candy Schlueter

**Absent Student Members:** Robert Allums, Matthew Deleon, Ashleigh Ervin, Corey Green, Joseph Hopkins, David Matiella, Briana Rogler-Brown, Paula Salas, Shannon Simmons, Raheel Veerani, Ayeza Zafar

\*\*\*\*\*

**Janet Parker** opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda and then introducing the topic of graduation rates and admissions standards. Gerry Dizinno (Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Research) and George Norton (Assistant Vice President for Admissions) were introduced.

**George Norton** began the Graduation Rates & Admissions Standards presentation with the outline of questions asked and the challenges faced.

I. **Gerry Dizinno** identified the Fall cohort as it relates to retention and graduation rates and referenced the handout chart on page 1.

- Year 1 retention rates have increased from 58.3 % to 66.1%
- 4 year graduation rates have increased from 6.4% to 8.7%
- 6 year graduation rates have increased from 27.1% to 31.3% (a 1% increase per year is very respectable)
- What leads to good graduation rates? The quality of students and the support given to the students.

II. **George Norton** discussed the CAP Program. Note the number for UTSA is 1,221. CAP retention rate is 32%.

- Impact of new admission standards (implemented for Fall 2008). The major difference in the standards is automatic admission of the top 25% of high school

- class (current criteria is top 10% of class). Gerry added that high school ranking is a better indicator of retention and graduation rates than ACT and SAT scores.
- Fall 2007 Freshman Admission Pipeline. UTSA over offers on the ADP program. The JUMP program works with community colleges (the offers are soft denials)
  - Implications of new admission criteria. 33% of all applicants will enroll. We expect that in the future, our institution will be seen as a more attractive campus given these standards and will result in a larger applicant pool to mitigate the initial loss of revenue due to higher standards and fewer qualified applicants.
  - The Bottom Line. Initially we expect to see a small dip in enrollment which will then (hopefully) pick up.

**Question from Sam Gonzales:** Does THECB provide projections on high school enrollment? Gerry answered “yes”. However their projections are typically low.

**Another question from Sam:** Does THECB provide state-wide projections? Gerry answered “yes”.

**Question from Dr. Victoria Jones:** Do you have information about the impacts on the number of African-American students? How will the new standards impact the diversity of our student body who are African-American? Gerry indicated we’ve experienced enrollment increases in the number of African-American students, despite a decrease last year. He also indicated that the new standards should make no statistically significant difference on this protected group because the n is so low.

Janet asked for a brief introduction by each attendee and then reviewed the handouts with a brief explanation of the University Center updated document.

**Candie Sagehorn** (Senior Director, Budget Planning & Development) presented an overview of UTSA’s Operating Budget.

Janet continued the presentation:

New State Appropriations in FY 07-09: \$15M State Appropriation increment, but only \$4M is discretionary

Budgeted Tuition Revenue Increases FY 2007-2008: \$6.4M increment

Internal Reallocations: \$2M over 2 years

UTSA’s Budget Increments for the 2008-2009 Biennium

FY 2008 (Current Year) Incremental Allocations:

- Strategy 1: Preserving the Quality of our Workforce, \$6M, 26%
- Strategy 2: Preserving the Quality of our Mission and Student Success, \$4.8M, 20.5%
- Strategy 3: Division Strategic Initiative Funding , \$1.8M, 7.9%
- Strategy 4: Enhancing and Protecting our Infrastructure, \$7.555M, 32.2%

**Question from Student John Schieferle Uhlenbrock:** Will any of the Off Campus space be located at UH or near the new FBI Bldg? Janet responded that we are looking at space near 1604 and we are issuing an RFP.

- Strategy 5: Special Items - Changes to Prior Year, \$2.1M, 9.2%
- Other: New Faculty Reserve for FY 2009, \$979,823, 4.2%

## FY 2009 Budget Planning

- Designated Tuition is the only new discretionary funding source in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the biennium because we have essentially allocated all of the money received from the state in the first year of the biennium.
- Major challenge – modeling the impact of the new admissions criteria on tuition revenue.

**Question from Student Christina Gomez:** When did 15 credit hours become the norm? 12 hours is full time for Pell; in terms of Coordinating Board and System - 15 credit hours is full time. Janet Parker indicated she would provide a breakdown of costs for 12 credit hour students at the next meeting.

Elimination of the Energy Fee – see slide

FY 2009 Revenue Requirements: Proposing rate increase to \$116/SCH

FY 2010 Funding Requirements: Strategic issues and Assumptions

Strategic Issue: UTSA's Reliance on Non Tenure Track Faculty

Instructional Usage of Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty

UTSA SFR and Faculty Counts

FY 2010 Recommended Designated Tuition Increase: Proposing an increase to \$128/SCH; will generate \$8.3M

Review Fee Forecast: Referred to handout "Proposed Mandatory Student Tuition & Fee Schedule"

Referred to handout "Comparison of Tuition & Fees at Texas Institutions of Higher Education"

**Question from Student John Schieferle Uhlenbrock:** Is UTSA looking at Flat Tuition & Fee rate option? Brief discussion of flat rate tuition: Janet indicated it is something to be studied and considered but will not necessarily result in lower tuition and fees. It will simplify the billing. Flat rate tuition does not mean there would be no growth in fee rates. What it does do is make the revenue more fungible versus tied to only one purpose (e.g. what is allowed in the fee justification).

**Comment and Question from Dr. Victoria Jones:** Comment referred to the low UTSA State Appropriation/FTES rate and asked why is the State not supporting our vision to be a premier research campus? Also why we are not even at the middle of the rate scale? Janet responded by pointing to 1) the shrinking pot of funding to distribute and 2) our growth versus other campus's enrollment declines and the hold harmless provision – meaning, campuses who are flat or declining in enrollment and formula funding do not get hit with a budget decrease to fund the growth at UTSA.

**Question by Dr. Jones:** What is formula based on? Janet responded that among other things....weighting discipline, student numbers, number of Tenure Track faculty teaching lower division classes, students repeating classes.

**Question by Dr. Jones:** Who is "lobbying" on our behalf? Answer: although it is technically illegal to lobby, we do have representatives that provide information to the legislature on UTSA's initiatives and who support our vision. We need to involve the community to impress upon them the benefits of our becoming a research intensive institution and how this requires additional funding from the state.

**Question from Dr. Keith Fairchild:** What is the current base rate for Formula Funding? Janet referred to a slide on this subject; e.g. \$55.72 for 12 SCH for Liberal Arts freshman. **Student John Schieferle Uhlenbrock** asked for a copy of the formula funding slide for the next meeting.

**Question from Dr. Jones:** What do we do to make sure we get a bigger piece of State appropriations and how does UTSA determine the allocation to each College? Discussion took place as to involvement of students, parents, general public. Provost and executive group need to address the question of how the dollars are allocated once we receive; this is not a task of this Committee.

**Question from Dr. Arturo Ayon:** expressed concern regarding UTSA’s criteria for Undergraduate and Graduate fees. Janet responded that the fees are set by the legislature and that is because Graduate programs are more expensive. Dr. Ayon responded back that the higher Graduate rate is discouraging Undergraduates from signing up for Graduate level courses and discouraging Graduates from continuing in their programs. **Student Christina Gomez** wanted to know the rankings of UT and TX institutions in *U.S. News & World Report*.

Janet reminded attendees that next week’s Agenda will include:

- Incidental and Course Fees to include requests for increases and new fees
- Tuition and Fee DRAFT Overview
- Q&A Discussion time (including questions remaining from two previous meetings)

### **Action Items from November 6th Committee Meeting**

Action Item	Assigned To	Due Date
Breakdown of tuition and fee costs for various SCH loads per semester	Janet Parker	Nov. 13 <sup>th</sup> meeting
Formula Funding Handout from Presentation	Janet Parker	Nov. 13 <sup>th</sup> meeting
Research Graduate Student Rates – are other institutions charging Graduate Students same rate as their Undergraduate Students?	Budget Office	Prior to Nov. 13 <sup>th</sup> meeting
Add U.S. News and World Report rankings to the Comparison handout.	Janet Parker	Nov. 13 <sup>th</sup> meeting