

# Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Agenda

September 20, 2001 • 1:00 pm - 2:30 pm  
Student Union Bldg. • Salmon River Suite  
Idaho State University • Pocatello, Idaho

---

Page

## Consent Agenda Items

1. Approval of Committee Minutes ..... 2
  - a. **Exhibit 1a** Minutes of CAAP May 31, 2001 Meeting..... 3
  - b. **Exhibit 1b** Minutes of CAAP July 26, 2001 Conference Call Meeting..... 8
2. New Program Requests ..... 11
  - **Exhibit 2** New Postsecondary Notice of Intent Request-Summary ..... 12  
Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Science-**Boise State University**
3. Programs Changes Approved by Executive Director ..... 13
  - **Exhibit 3** ..... 14
4. Intellectual Property Policy Update ..... 16

## Agenda Items

5. Accelerated Learning: Statewide Committee Nominations ..... 17
  - **Exhibit 5** Statewide Committee Nominations ..... 18
6. University of Washington School of Medicine Admission Committee ..... 19
  - **Exhibit 6** University of Washington School of Medicine Letter of Nominations..... 20
7. Professional Programs/Differential Fees Statements from Institutions ..... 21
  - **Exhibit 7a** BSU Statement/Response ..... 22
  - **Exhibit 7b** UI Statement/Response ..... 25
  - **Exhibit 7c** LCSC Statement Response ..... 36
  - **Exhibit 7d** ISU Statement Response ..... 38
  - **Exhibit 7e** EITC Statement Response ..... 39
  - **Exhibit 7f** Professional Program Analysis..... 40

## **Subject**

### **1. Approval of Committee Minutes**

## **Motion**

To approve the following standing committees' minutes as written as consent agenda items:

- Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Committee May 31, 2001 meeting (*Exhibit 1a.*)
- Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Committee July 26, 2001 conference call meeting (*Exhibit 1b.*)

Moved by\_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by\_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

## **Exhibit 1a.**

### **Approved Minutes**

## **Council on Academic Affairs and Programs**

May 31, 2001 • 9:30 am – 3:30 pm  
Conference Room 302 • Boise, Idaho

<b>Present:</b>	Jerry Beck, CSI	Brian Pitcher, UI	Mike Falconer, SDPTE
	Daryl Jones, BSU	Rita Rice Morris, LCSC	Bob West, SDOE
	Jonathan Lawson, ISU	Dan Petersen, SDPTE	Robin Dodson, OSBE
			Patty Sanchez, OSBE

<b>Absent:</b>	Jerry Gee, NIC	<b>Guests:</b>	Dr. Douglas Johnstone, WGU
	Mary Ann Carlson, EITC		Dr. Sam Smith, WGU

### **1. WGU Presentation - Dr. Doug Johnstone and Dr. Sam Smith**

Robin Dodson introduced Dr. Douglas "Chip" Johnstone and Dr. Sam Smith of the Western Governors University (WGU) who were in attendance to discuss further with CAAP WGU's request to have the Idaho State Board of Education's support and approval of their Master of Arts in Learning and Technology program (MLT).

Dr. Johnstone provided CAAP with a packet of information, which included a letter to Robin that addressed some of CAAP's concerns in detail. Additionally, a visual presentation regarding the program was shown to CAAP. The MLT was launched in 1999 and awarded candidacy for accreditation by the Interregional Accrediting Committee (IRAC) in November 2000. The states of Utah, Washington, and Wyoming have officially approved the program for teacher salary increases and professional advancement statewide. Currently, WGU's MLT has 150 students enrolled in the program from 23 states. The program graduated its first student last November and a second will graduate summer 2001. Dr. Johnstone shared with CAAP the competency domains in the MLT and how students are assessed. He also shared with CAAP other degrees and certificates offered at WGU. In essence, WGU would like the opportunity to offer this MLT to Idaho and fundamentally, request the support and approval of the SBOE.

A discussion ensued regarding the faculty and the courses that make up the MLT program. Essentially, CAAP agreed to forward a letter to Dr. Johnstone with the intention to support the approval of the MLT program with the condition that WGU provide a list of faculty and their qualifications and a list of courses that relate to the MLT program.

### **2. Minutes of March 29, 2001 CAAP Meeting**

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the March 29, 2001 meeting.

### **3. Minutes of April 11, 2001 CAAP Meeting**

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the April 11, 2001 meeting

#### **4. Notices of Intent:**

- a. Doctorate in Physical Therapy--ISU
- b. Masters in Science, Clinical Laboratory Sciences--ISU
- c. Changing Specializations in Civil, Electrical, & Mechanical Engineering to Bachelor of Science, Degrees--ISU **(Information Only)**
- d. Associate of Applied Science and Technical Certificate, Computer/Business Equipment Technician--ISU
- e. Advanced Certificate, Computer Software Engineering Technology/Computer Programming/Analyst--ISU
- f. Post-secondary Technical Certificate, Electromechanical Drafting--ISU
- g. Associate of Applied Science and Advanced Technology Certificate, Electromechanical Design Drafting Technology--ISU
- h. Associate of Applied Sciences and Advanced Technical Certificate, Machining Technology--ISU

Robin Dodson informed CAAP that NOIs from ISU were only just received by the Division of Professional-Technical Education. The Division, having not had the opportunity to review these NOIs, requested that these NOIs be pulled from the agenda and moved onto June's CAAP meeting.

Dr. Lawson briefly discussed ISU's intent to offer a Doctorate in Physical Therapy and a Masters of Science in Clinical Laboratory Sciences and intends to prepare and forward full proposals to the Board for consideration at their June meeting in Moscow.

**It was agreed by consensus to recommend to forward the NOIs to the Board for their consideration at the its June 21-22, 2001 meeting in Moscow.**

#### **5. Recommendations on "Collaborative Centers"**

Robin Dodson summarized the charge given to the Chief Academic Officers of the public 4-year institutions to develop a definition of what constitutes a "collaborative center" for the Board to use for the distribution of the \$1.0 million appropriation. He added that a conference call was held on May 24, 2001 among the Chief Academic Officers of the seven institutions to identify what constitutes a collaborative center and to formalize a list of recommendations for the distribution of the \$1 million. Robin directed the Council to the *Recommendations on Collaborative Centers document* and briefly outlined the recommendations that was formulated as a result of the conference call. CAAP reworked some of the language and ultimately agreed to accept these recommendations as outlined and forward to the Board at their June Board meeting.

#### **6. IRSA Committee Charges**

Robin briefly summarized the Board's actions regarding CAAP's recommendations of the Standing Committees. Jerry Beck expressed concerns regarding the discontinuance of the Statewide Medical Advisory Committee and the recommendation to assign its function and charge to the Board's Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee (HPWS). He also had concerns that there was no representation to this HPWS committee from Professional-Technical Education (PTE) and from the community colleges. Robin explained that the Health Professions Workforce Studies Committee (HPWS) was formulated in December of 2000 with the Board charge to provide workforce projection

needs of the state for health professions. He added that the Board charged the Idaho Commission of Nursing and Nursing Education (ICNNE) in 1995 to look at nursing education programs across the state and to address issues Jerry mentioned such as the technical 2-year nursing programs. Ms. Sandy Evans is the ICNNE representative and serves on the HPWS committee. An HPWS membership committee list was shared with CAAP. Considerable discussion occurred regarding the function of the HPWS committee and additional concerns were shared regarding the lack of representation from Professional-Technical Education and from the community colleges. CAAP felt that there should be someone representing the PTE and community colleges. Robin was not opposed to having that representation on the HPWS committee and agreed to follow up and seek representation.

## **7. SBOE "Committee of the Whole"**

Robin briefly shared with CAAP the organizational structure that the Board temporarily plans to adopt for next month's meeting and explained how non-board action items would be presented on agendas.

## **8. Accelerated Learning Policy --Final Draft**

Robin directed CAAP to the *Accelerated Learning Policy draft* and outlined changes that the Board reviewed at the May Board Retreat. CAAP discussed and recommended changes to better clarify Item 3 dealing with definitions and charging of a fee, Item 4 regarding eligibility and admission requirements, and Item 5 dealing with adjunct faculty qualifications. CAAP recommended that additional language to Item 4 be added to note that general information about accelerated learning opportunities should be released by March 1 of each year to all 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade students.

Additional discussion ensued regarding adjunct faculty qualifications. It was suggested to rework the language on item 5a. to note that a Master's Degree or equivalent in the subject area will be expected and that faculty will be considered temporary or special exempt employees of the State Board of Education.

## **9. Memorandum of Understanding**

Robin directed the Committee to the *Memorandum of Understanding Draft* and outlined additional changes made. Robin noted that CAAP needs to review and comment as soon as possible before forwarding to IRSA at its June Board Meeting. A discussion ensued regarding the *125% of the costs offered by the out-of-state institution* addition and felt that there should be additional discussion with the Board as to what the impact of the cost would mean to students. Ultimately, CAAP agreed to forward their recommendation of the MOU to IRSA for their review and consideration.

Robin shared with CAAP the *Accelerated Learning Policy Potential Addition Draft* and explained the benefits of creating a statewide committee much like one in Utah and suggested that this be brought forward to the Board for their consideration. CAAP was supportive of this endeavor.

## **10. Intellectual Property Policy--First Reading**

Robin directed CAAP to the *Intellectual Property Policy* drafted for first reading. He reminded the Committee that the Board elected not to take action to approve the Intellectual Property Policy

drafted. He added that the Board did approve language from the original Intellectual Property rule as Board policy temporarily. He informed CAAP that Marianne Clarke of Battelle may be contacted to possibly conduct a review of the intellectual property issue and policy.

## **11. Math and Science Goals--Matrix, Initiatives, and Function**

Trudy Anderson directed the Council to the Math and Science Initiatives that she drafted for CAAP's review and introduced the discussion. There seemed to be a consensus among the group that Idaho has a vision and overall it wants to raise the bar across the board. Trudy offered to rework the draft and email it to CAAP for comment in preparation for a final draft to the Board in June. It was recommended to design the matrix of current efforts and then to come up with goals that change vision to goals and goals to objectives. Robin offered to meet with Rod Lewis to get his input before the Board meeting.

## **12. Health Professions Workforce Committee**

- a. Robin briefly discussed the history of ISU's involvement with medical education, proposals, UUSM and WWAMI. He added that ISU was charged by the Board to prepare a 5-10 year projection of costs and needs for the west. ISU has presented that data to the Health Professions Workforce Committee (HPWS). As a result, Utah would be interested in having discussions with ISU about the possibility of having course work taken at ISU in the 1<sup>st</sup> year of medical school. However, ISU and Utah cannot begin these discussions unless the Board gives the permission to do so. The HPWS committee recommended to take this to CAAP and then to IRSA for their support.

Robin also noted that Utah and WWAMI are working collaboratively to make arrangements to share clerkships and also working on the possibility of exploring clerkships for Idaho students in Utah and Seattle for Magic Valley, Blackfoot, and Idaho Falls.

There were concerns that CAAP was not invited to have university representation or involvement with this and recommended that in future CAAP be kept informed of the issues brought forward by the HPWS committee. Robin offered to forward draft minutes of the Health Professions meetings to CAAP as they meet and to share with CAAP the data that is collected.

- b. Robin informed the Council that a subcommittee comprised of Karen McGee, Jim Girvan, Jonathan Lawson, Julia Robinson, and the Board's Chief Academic Officer has been formulated to study and report on the various national models that focus upon intercollegiate nursing and health profession centers. He informed CAAP that they will be visiting the Washington State University's Intercollegiate College of Nursing in Spokane on June 15, 2001.
- c. Robin shared with CAAP the letter that was sent to Mr. Karl Kurtz of the Department of Health and Welfare regarding the support of social worker training. The Board at its April 19-20, 2001 meeting formally adopted the concept of Idaho's institutions working with the Department to provide part or all necessary services presently under the Agreement. He noted that this would also be shared with IRSA.

### **13. Other--Division of Professional Technical Education--Compressed Video Coordinator Position**

Robin asked Cliff Green of the Division of Professional-Technical Education to discuss with CAAP the proposal for the Distance Learning Coordinator Position. Mr. Green provided background information. Essentially, it was first created and funded solely by the Division of Professional-Technical Education. The Division committed to fund the position for three years. After three years, the position would be evaluated for relevancy. Technical Deans voted that the position was needed and due to deadlines for institutions to include items in their FY01 budgets, the Division offered to fund the position at the current level for an additional year while arrangements for role redefinition and shared fiduciary responsibility were discussed.

A memorandum was generated by the Division of Professional-Technical Education proposing an equitable funding solution for FY03. It was proposed that the Department of Administration supply \$10,000, the Division \$39,702, leaving each of the institutions to contribute \$2000 of the cost. There was considerable discussion regarding this proposal. CAAP was concerned that this was not communicated to them by anyone and came as a surprise to be asked to contribute \$2000 for a position they had no or little knowledge about. Cliff Green offered to keep CAAP informed of issues regarding the DLN system and the coordinator position.

### **14. Other--Grow Your Own**

Daryl Jones referred to a memo that was generated by Lynn Humphrey, which provides a copy of the letter from the Governor providing the Board office some direction about how the "Grow Your Own" \$450,000 appropriation can be used. A clear majority of the \$450,000 was recommended to be distributed toward scholarships (100 @ \$3,000 for a total of \$300,000). Daryl inquired how the monies would be split among the institutions and asked that this information be shared as soon as possible so that institutions could begin recruitment activities. There was a general consensus that the monies could be split four ways but Robin offered to discuss with Lynn and get back with CAAP.

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.**

## **Exhibit 1b.**

### **Approved Minutes**

#### **Conference Call Council on Academic Affairs and Programs**

July 26, 2001 • 10 am – 11:30 am  
LBJ Building • Boise, Idaho

<b>Present:</b> Jerry Beck, CSI	Rita Rice Morris, LCSC	Greg Fitch, OSBE
Daryl Jones, BSU	Mary Ann Carlson, EITC	Keith Hasselquist, OSBE
Alan Egger, ISU	Bob West, SDOE	Nancy Szofran, OSBE
Jerry Gee, NIC	Tom Farley, SDOE	Patty Sanchez, OSBE
DeVere Burton, NIC	Mike Falconer, SDPTE	Jimmi Sommer, Brd Intern

**Absent:** Brian Pitcher, UI

#### **1. Professional Program/Fee Analysis**

Greg Fitch reminded CAAP that they were charged to provide a more thorough presentation from the relative parties in support of and opposed to differential fees. Greg shared with CAAP the comments he received regarding the professional program analysis and asked if CAAP wanted to proceed with a white paper of CAAP's point of view of this analysis. Daryl Jones felt the Board would like to hear more about the options already addressed by CAAP instead of providing a point of view.

A brief discussion ensued about the position CAAP that would take. Essentially, it was suggested that each institution prepare and submit a position statement that could be assembled into an executive summary to be presented to the Board in September. CAAP agreed to submit their position statement to the Board office by August 17, 2001. Greg offered to prepare an executive summary draft for their review by August 23, 2001. A final will be presented at CAAP's regularly scheduled meeting on August 30, 2001 before forwarding to the Board in September.

#### **Collaborative Centers**

An inquiry was made regarding the finalized distribution of funds for the four regional collaborative programs and the necessary steps in receiving those funds.

Keith Hasselquist, Chief Fiscal Officer for the Office of the Board of Education stated that there is \$250,000 for each of the four centers, but that two are currently on hold. Greg shared with CAAP the exhibit that was presented to the Board in June that outlined CAAP's recommendations to the Board on how those funds should be allocated. He added that the Board approved the recommendations at their June Board meeting. Keith stated that utilizing that exhibit the monies could be distributed now, but would still need to address the reporting process.



Daryl Jones noted that an Oversight Council and Advisory Committee have yet to approve proposed expenditures for Magic and Treasure Valleys (UI, BSU, CSI) and recommended that each institution make recommendations to their Presidents on how to expend the available monies, which would enable them to share the recommendations with the other Presidents at the President's Council Meeting, where a consensus might be reached.

Mary Ann Carlson inquired about funds for Idaho Falls and NICHE. Keith informed her that Idaho Falls is in place but that NICHE needs to submit proposals.

## **2. Accelerated Learning Policy**

Greg reminded CAAP of the Board's action to table the Accelerated Learning Policy and the charge given to staff to begin work on the development of a Statewide Committee for Recommendation and Advice to the State Board of Education on Accelerated Learning Programs. He informed CAAP that the Board office has received multiple nominations from the same area and rather than create an uncomfortable situation of picking and choosing for Board members, he has recommended to Mr. Rod Lewis, IRSA Chair, that a balanced team be set up, e.g. one from each of our institution types and three superintendents or K-12 people and present that list to the Board. CAAP had no concerns.

Due to considerable discussion and concerns surrounding the Accelerated Learning Policy primarily, the adjunct faculty qualifications, at the June Board meeting, CAAP thought it would be best to hold any further revisions/work to the policy and just report to the Board the nominations and operate under the current policy as is.

## **Memorandum of Understanding**

CAAP was informed that Utah will not be pursuing the Memorandum of Understanding. According to Utah Commission staff, there is no reason for the states to have an MOU created for concurrent enrollment provided by the State of Utah in Idaho. Although the Utah Legislature provided a "special appropriation" for concurrent enrollment within the State of Utah nothing was provided for efforts outside the state. Essentially, the representative from Utah said that no Utah institutions would be offering concurrent enrollment options outside of Utah and saw no reason for the MOU.

Greg added that ISU has made every effort to accommodate concurrent enrollment requests. They have received information (requests) for five (5) courses. ISU has granted one (1) and rejected four (4) based upon the instructors' credentials and qualifications. They will continue to work with the school districts as much as possible.

There was some discussion regarding the ADA funding based upon Mr. Hammond's concerns. Present activities (effort) seemed to be working and ADA funding not an issue at this time.

## **3. Math and Science**

Greg informed CAAP that the Governor's Initiatives have been released and briefly outlined key areas of interest, among them being Math/Reading/Science Education. With that in mind, Greg thought it would be best to resume work with the Math and Science Initiative. He informed CAAP that Trudy Anderson, who has been assisting CAAP with this charge, contacted him and asked whether to proceed with another draft.

He reminded CAAP that at the June Board Meeting Mr. Rod Lewis had requested that the Math and Science Initiative be tabled until a future meeting as he was unsure if CAAP was still heading in the right direction and wanted to speak to Robin Dodson more on this issue. Daryl Jones reminded members that Robin had shared with CAAP that Mr. Lewis felt the initial direction CAAP was taking to develop math and science goals on the basis for all students K-16 was not consistent with certain industrial/business stakeholders. Mr. Lewis felt that CAAP should be also examining a different direction/options with the goals and targeting students entering into those fields that require significant math and science preparation. CAAP recommended that Greg get clarification from Mr. Lewis regarding the direction CAAP is taking and then contact Trudy Anderson to generate another draft with those emphases.

#### **4. Intellectual Property Policy**

The Board did not take action to approve the modified language of the Intellectual Property Policy, but rather approved language from the original Intellectual Property rule as temporary Board policy so that there is coverage of IP issues while the new policy is completed and approved by the Board. He added that an outside source, possibly Battelle, will be providing an objective analysis of intellectual property issues and the proposed policy. Greg informed CAAP that a letter has been sent to Mr. Bill Shipp asking him to be a member of the Intellectual Property Policy Committee.

#### **5. Governor's Initiatives**

Greg briefly outlined the Governor's Initiatives that might be recommended above Maintenance if funds become available. Agencies/institutions may be asked to redirect existing funds in addition to or in place of new appropriations. Items are not in priority order are: teacher salaries, technology, math/reading/science education, partnerships with K-12 schools, science and technology, salary equity to name a few.

#### **6. Teacher Standards-Reading-Praxis II**

Bob West briefly discussed the need to use assessment for certification. He added that students should know that certification is not a prerequisite to enter student teaching. He reported that there are certification concerns with technology and reading standards. They are in the process of proposing an interim 3-year provisional certification to provide more time for students to meet Reading, Technology certification requirements.

#### **7. Updates from Nancy Szofran**

Nancy informed CAAP that they are making progress on the streamlining videos and student completion rates. She added that she is working on placing links to the Idaho Electronic Campus that would link to the institution/student newspapers and asked members to provide a URL that would link to their respective institutions. She added that the diversity issue is being addressed and met with Tam Dinh of Boise State University's Multicultural Center. She thought it would be ideal to have a link for any multicultural events occurring on campuses and asked institutions provide a URL if available.

Nancy informed CAAP that she is putting together a symposium of technology grants that have been funded over the years. She thinks it will be very beneficial and should be set up for next summer.

## **Subject**

### **2. New Program Requests**

## **Background and Discussion**

In accordance with Board policy, all new academic and professional-technical programs must have full Board approval prior to implementation or inclusion in the SBOE's fiscal year budget request. The CAAP committee, in concert with its guidelines on program review (i.e., Quality Centrality to role and mission, duplication, demand/need, and resources) has acted on the IRSA charge to evaluate new program requests.

## **Impact**

The institutions requesting these new programs, if Board approved, will implement these requests and will be subject to future monitoring for program compliance.

## **Fiscal Impact**

See Attachments

## **Recommendation**

Both CAAP and Board Staff recommend approval of Boise State University's Notice of Intent for a B.A. in Environmental Studies without the development of a full proposal.

## **Motion**

To approve Boise State University's request to offer a Bachelor of Arts degree in Environmental Studies.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## **Attachments**

*Exhibit 2      New Postsecondary Notice of Intent Request - Summary*

## **Exhibit 2**

### **New Postsecondary Notice of Intent Request - Summary**

Boise State University has submitted a Notice of Intent to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies and CAAP recommends approval without the development of a full proposal.

#### **a. Bachelor of Arts, Environmental Studies by Boise State University (BSU)**

The proposed Environmental Studies Bachelor of Arts degree is a broad-based, interdisciplinary, liberal arts program that gives students the opportunity to draw from a variety of existing courses to gain perspective on the environment and environmental issues. Three new courses will supplement existing offerings. They include an introductory course, an internship option, and a required senior project course.

Environmental Studies Programs are very much in demand by current undergraduate students around the west and at Boise State University. It was discovered in a web-based survey that approximately three-fourths of higher education institutions in the west offered either majors or minors in an environmental area. BSU faculty conducted informal surveys in their classes and found many students interested in this program and the courses and expressed a great interest in knowing more about the environment and complex issues. This program will also provide a solid background for entry to law school, for preparation for graduate school in public policy, the social sciences, and the humanities. Currently, no university or college in Idaho offers a B.A. degree in Environmental Studies. Additional resources are minimal and will be funded through internal reallocation. No new faculty or space is needed.

## **Subject**

### **3. Program Changes Approved by the Executive Director**

## **Background and Discussion**

In accordance with Board policy, postsecondary program components (e.g., majors, minors, emphasis, and options), changes in title or units (e.g., department, schools, colleges, etc.) and routine changes (e.g., addition, discontinuance, semester offerings, catalog changes, etc.) may be approved by the Executive Director of the Board; however, these changes require Board Approval if the fiscal impact is greater than \$150,000 per year. In addition, those actions taken by the Executive Director are reported quarterly to the Board.

## **Impact**

None

## **Fiscal Impact**

None

## **Recommendation**

None

## **Board Action**

None

## **Attachments**

*Exhibit 3      Program Changes Approved by Executive Director*

## Exhibit 3

### Academic Program Changes

Approved by Executive Director  
April 1, 2001 – September 30, 2001

Date	Program Change	Institution
3/4/01	Joint Ph.D. Degree--College of Natural Resources and College of Agriculture--UI And Centro Agronomico Tropical de Investigacion y Enzenanza (CATIE)	UI
4/4/01	Establish a Masters of Health Education Program in ISU Boise Center	ISU
4/24/01	Offer a Graduate Certificate in Business Administration	ISU
5/15/01	Establish TechHelp, Idaho's Manufacturing Extension Program and EDA University Center, as a separate administrative unit	BSU
5/15/01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Establish a Minor in Linguistics within the Anthropology Department</li><li>Discontinue the Physical Education Minor option within the Sport Science, Physical Education, and Dance Department</li></ul>	ISU
	Discontinue the Plant Science Major option from the Department of Plant, Soil, & Entomological Sciences	UI
6/4/01	Extend 3 offerings to ISU's Boise Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>B.S. in Educational Interpretation</li><li>B.S. in Speech Pathology and Audiology</li><li>Dietetic Internship</li></ul>	ISU
6/28/01	Add Audiology Option to current Speech Pathology & Audiology Baccalaureate Program	ISU
6/28/01	Introduce a 27-credit hour Minor in English as a Second Language (ESL)	ISU
7/02/01	Add Minor in Sports Management	ISU
7/9/01	Bachelor of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science -ISU Boise Campus	ISU
7/9/01	Master of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science-plus off campus to ISU Boise	ISU
7/10/01	Offer fast track version of their current Bachelors of Science in Nursing--ISU Boise	ISU
7/30/01	Certificate of Completion and Minor in Geographic Information Analysis (GIS)	BSU
8/2/01	Bachelor of Science Physical Education, Athletic Training Major	UI
8/2/01	Associate of Applied Science (30 Month)--Farm Business Management Program	ISU
8/2/01	Associate of Applied Science (20 Month)--Computer/Business Equipment Technology Program	ISU

## Professional - Technical Program Changes

Approved by Executive Director  
April 1, 2001 – September 30, 2001

Date	Program Change	Institution
3/14/01	Add new Landscape Management Technician Option to the AgriBusiness Technologies Program	EITC
3/14/01	Add new Education Assistant Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Education Technician</li> <li>▪ Associate Teacher</li> <li>▪ Special Needs Para Educator</li> </ul>	CSI
3/14/01	Add new Horticulture Program	CSI
6/28/01	Replace Technical Certificate offered in the Welder-Fitter option of the Welding Program with a 64-credit/18 month Advanced Technical Certificate	ISU
7/05/01	Computer/Business Equipment Technician Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Change the program title to Computer/Business Equipment Technology</li> <li>▪ Drop 11-month Technical Certificate under old program title</li> <li>▪ Add new Computer/Business Equipment Technician Option--offering a 9-month Technical Certificate and a 15-month Advanced Technical Certificate`</li> </ul>	ISU
7/10/01	Delete Multi-Skilled Health Assistant option from Medical Assistant Program	EITC
7/16/01	Add an 18-month Advanced Technical Certificate to the Machine Tool Technology option of the Machining Technology Program	ISU
7/16/01	Add a Level I Reserve Officer option to the Law Enforcement Program	ISU
7/16/01	Delete 10-month Technical Certificates offered in the Diesel Electric Technology and Diesel Technology options of the Diesel/Diesel Electric Technology Program	ISU
7/16/01	Add a new Computer Programmer/Analyst option to the Computer Software Engineering Technology Program--a 20-month Advanced Technical Certificate	ISU
9/6/01	Combined the Administrative Specialist and Business and Computer Applications Specialist options of the Office Technologies program into one Office Professional option--will offer a 20-month AAS Degree.	EITC

## **Subject**

### **4. Intellectual Property Policy Update**

## **Background**

This legislative session, the Board successfully requested that the administrative rules on Intellectual Property be repealed, thus allowing the Board to govern intellectual property issues by policy rather than rule. The rule was repealed and put into policy this summer so that there would be a policy in place by the time the repeal of the rule went into effect on July 1, 2001. A Statewide Intellectual Property Policy Review Committee was formed in January and has been working on a complete revision of the new policy, since the policy has not been updated since the early 1990's, and many changes have occurred in the area of intellectual property since that time.

## **Discussion**

Battelle Institute, the consultant of record for the Governor's Council on Science and Technology, has been hired to provide a study and comparison the intellectual property policies and environment of 10 benchmark institutions in other states (primarily neighboring Western states) as well as a couple of "best practices" models. He will primarily be benchmarking systems that have a governing structure that is similar to the one in Idaho. Mr. David Hochman of Batelle Institute has suggested a four month timeline, with a final report to be delivered in December, barring any unforeseen circumstances. After performing some initial background research, he will be interviewing a staff member of the central governing board who deals with intellectual property issues at the system level and at least one vice president for research or director of technology transfer at each of the ten institutions chosen for the comparison.

## **Impact**

The consulting project will provide information about how institutions formulate and use intellectual property policies in states similar to Idaho. The intent is to use the analysis to develop a policy that balances obligations to the particular institution and to the State of Idaho.

## **Fiscal Impact**

Approximately \$15,000 which will be divided according to the pro-rated formula between Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College and the University of Idaho. Their presidents have given approval for this expenditure to come from institutional funds, which the board approved at the June 2001 meeting.

## **Board Action**

None at this time.

## **Attachments**

None.



## **Subject**

### **5. Accelerated Learning: Statewide Committee Nominations Update**

#### **Background and Discussion**

In June, CAAP forwarded a recommendation to the Board to create a Statewide Committee on Accelerated Learning Programs. The Board supported the recommendation and instructed staff to begin development of a Statewide Committee for Recommendation and Advice to the State Board of Education on Accelerated Learning Programs to be presented to the Board in August.

At the August Board meeting, discussion occurred surrounding the membership of the committee and how multiple nominations for the same areas were being forwarded to the Board Office. It was proposed that a balanced team be set up, e.g. two from our institutions (higher education), two primary and secondary people, three parents with student(s) in accelerated learning programs, one State Department of Education staff member, and one Office of the State Board of Education staff member (Chief Academic Officer). The Board approved this membership structure at their August Board meeting and charged staff to develop a list of nominations for this committee that included those key people.

#### **Impact**

#### **Fiscal Impact**

#### **Recommendation**

Both CAAP and Board Staff recommend approval of the committee nominations by IRSA and the full Board.

#### **Motion**

To approve the nominations to the Statewide Committee on Accelerated Learning Programs as displayed on Exhibit 5.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Attachments**

*Exhibit 5 Nominations to the Statewide Committee on Accelerated Learning Programs*

## **Nominations to the Statewide Committee on Accelerated Learning Programs**

### **COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDAHO**

Dr. Gerald L. Beck, Executive Vice President and Chief Academic Officer

### **IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Dr. Jonathan Lawson, Vice President for Academic Affairs

### **STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Mr. Gary Marx, Gifted/Talented Specialist, Bureau of Special Education

### **IDAHO PARENT/TEACHER ASSOCIATION (PTA)**

Michelle Morrison, Boise

Mary Lou Hobson, Nampa

Kori Bonney, Blackfoot

### **PRIMARY AND SECONDARY**

Ted Popplewell, Twin Falls, Primary Principal

Julie Yamamoto, Caldwell, Secondary Principal

### **IDAHO ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS**

Region 1, David Rawls, Superintendent, Coeur d'Alene District 271

Region 5, Melvin Beutler, Superintendent, West Side Jt. District 202

### **IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Chief Academic Officer

## **Subject**

### **6. University of Washington School of Medicine Admissions Committee**

## **Background and Discussion**

Three Idaho physicians serve on the University of Washington School of Medicine Committee on Admissions for the WWAMI program. Idaho's current representatives are Dr. Rich Paris of Hailey, Dr. Roger Boe of Pocatello, and Dr. Richard McLandress of Coeur d'Alene all serving 3-year terms from September 1998 to September 2001. Drs. Boe and McLandress are willing to be reappointed and Dr. Paris does not wish to be reappointed.

The following individuals have been nominated and agreed to serve on the University of Washington School of Medicine Committee on Admissions for a three-year term.

Dr. James Dardis  
McCall, Idaho

Dr. Roger Boe  
Pocatello, Idaho

Dr. Richard McLandress  
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

## **Recommendation**

All physicians nominated are very well qualified to serve on the University of Washington School of Medicine Admission Committee. The Board staff recommends approval by IRSA and the full Board.

## **Motion**

To approve the nomination of Dr. James Dardis and renominations of Drs. Roger Boe and Richard McLandress to serve three-year terms on the University of Washington School of Medicine Committee on Admission, September 2001 through September 2004.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## **Attachments**

*Exhibit 6      University of Washington School of Medicine Letter of Nominations*

## **Exhibit 6**

### **University of Washington School of Medicine Letter of Nominations**

Please contact Patty Sanchez at (208) 332-1562 or email [psanchez@osbe.state.id.us](mailto:psanchez@osbe.state.id.us) to obtain a hard copy of this item.

## **Subject**

### **7. Professional Programs/Differential Fees Statements from Institutions**

#### **Background and Discussion**

At the April 19, 2001 meeting of IRSA, considerable discussion occurred on the issues of what defines a "professional program," the approval of a "professional fee," and differential fees. In reference to differential matriculation fees, IRSA directed CAAP to provide a more thorough presentation and brief from the relative parties in support of and opposed to differential fees to include examples of universities and states that have implemented differing fees, what the impact has been in those schools and states, an analysis of the relevant issues in Idaho, and the impact if that fee structure were implemented in Idaho.

#### **Impact**

The significance of this issue has wide spread policy implications. Issues of tuition for a professional fee, increasing the matriculation fee, and/or the establishment of differential matriculation fees impacts a wide variety of shareholders and raises constitutional and statutory questions. Other considerations include, what constitutes the "true" cost of education, equity, education program value, and how to meet the need for high quality programs and student access.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

The consequence of Board action on these issues will significantly impact the Board's institutions, students, financial aid, loan debt, and the Board's own policies and strategic plans.

#### **Recommendation**

CAAP has held considerable discussion on this issue at their July and August meetings. As a result, each institution has submitted a position statement in support of and opposed to differential fees and a Professional Program/Fees Analysis was prepared for the Board's review, which includes examples of universities and states that have implemented differing fees, what the impact has been in those schools and states, of the relevant issues in Idaho, and the impact if that fee structure were implemented in Idaho.

#### **Motion**

To accept the institution's statement/responses in support of and opposed to differential fees as presented.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Attachments**

*Exhibit 5a BSU Statement/Response*

*Exhibit 5b UI Statement/Response*

*Exhibit 5c LCSC Statement Response*

*Exhibit 5d ISU Statement Response*

*Exhibit 5e EITC Statement Response*

*Exhibit 5f Professional Program Analysis*

### Boise State University Statement Response to Differential Fees

August 16, 2001

TO:           Members of the Board  
              And  
              Colleagues on IRSA

FROM:       Daryl Jones  
              Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT:   Boise State University Position Paper on Differential Fees

Submitted at the request of the Board, the following synopsis is designed to offer a succinct list of concerns, policy issues, and potential unintended consequences that may ensue in conjunction with any substantial broadening of the definition of “professional fee” or with implementation of differential fees. These observations are offered in a spirit of collegiality and with respect for the principle of institutional autonomy, but also with genuine concern for the system-wide impact of changes in fee policies and practices. I look forward to our continued discussion of these issues.

- 1) It has generally been acknowledged that discussion of modifications to the existing fee policies and mechanisms has been prompted by insufficient levels of funding, not by problems with the fee policies or mechanisms per se. Revenues can be increased simply by raising existing fees; there is no need to change the fundamental mechanisms. Specifically, matriculation fees or technology fees can be raised with Board approval; institutions also have the authority to institute or increase special course fees to offset certain costs. Finally, any effort to increase the level of funding available to higher education cannot rest on student fees alone; a parallel effort must be made to increase State appropriations and to address problems in the existing allocation methods.
- 2) To date, a clear and consistent, defensible rationale for differential fees based on field of study has not been articulated. On occasion, it has been suggested that differential fees should be linked to “ability to pay” (i.e. potential for future income). But is this approach fundamentally fair, or will it be perceived simply as a mechanism whereby those affluent enough to elect certain fields of study will become more affluent in the future? On other occasions, the rationale for differential fees has been tied to the intrinsic costs of instruction in certain disciplines. The point must be made, however, that cost differentials are already addressed in the weighting mechanisms for award of State appropriated funds through the Enrollment Workload Adjustment formula. More importantly, though, any formal link between student fees and the direct costs of instruction in certain fields will invite legal challenges based on the State’s statutory prohibition of charging tuition to resident students.

### BSU Statement Response to Differential Fees

#### Page 2

- 3) As students have noted, differential fees will likely exclude less affluent students from certain fields of study or will, at the least, increase student indebtedness at graduation. It is unlikely that enhanced financial aid will offset this increased financial burden.
- 4) Differential fees are likely to be perceived by students and the general public as fundamentally unfair unless applied consistently across the board. Raising fees in high cost disciplines such as engineering or business may seem palatable, but would not fairness dictate that fees also be raised in equally high cost disciplines such as music, art, or nursing? While no one likes fee increases, increases in the current matriculation fee are at least perceived as fair because they apply to all and they distribute increased costs across large numbers of students, thus reducing the impact on any given subset of students.
- 5) Differential fees will likely provoke “gamesmanship” and other undesirable academic behaviors or inhibit more positive choices and behaviors. For example, will students delay declaration of a major or enrollment in certain courses in order to defer higher fees? What impact would this behavior have on retention and time to graduation? Will differential fees curb or eliminate students’ choice to earn certain double majors or to minor in certain fields? What inhibiting effect would differential fees have on students’ desire to sample certain fields of study or courses of interest?
- 6) Differential fees are inconsistent with the tradition and purposes of public education. Historically, public institutions have subsidized the costs of education overall and also have distributed costs across large numbers of students in order to keep costs manageable for individuals regardless of their field of interest.
- 7) Differential fees will complicate the fee structure, will be perceived as arcane and confusing, and will exacerbate public concern and suspicion about the rising costs of higher education. Differential fees will also be more difficult and costly to administer.
- 8) Differential fees would be inconsistent with other Board initiatives and would, in fact, counteract certain Board policies. For example, the Board has increased caps on the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) program and has increased the number of non-resident fee waivers that may be awarded in order to discount fees and attract students in certain high demand fields such as engineering, computer science, health sciences, etc. These are the very high-tech fields in which substantially higher, differential fees will likely be proposed, thus negating the desired outcomes of the WUE and high-tech discounts.

### BSU Statement Response to Differential Fees

#### Page 3

- 9) Differential fees are inconsistent with, and will in fact negate, the desired effects of the weighting system employed in the Board's enrollment adjustment formula; that is, differential fees will vitiate the formula's function in recognizing differential costs of instruction among disciplines and in encouraging focus on areas of emphasis according to assigned institutional role and mission. For example, it might be argued that a higher, differential fee is warranted in Business as a function of the cost of instruction; however, in the Board's enrollment workload formula, Business is weighted in Group II, the second to lowest group in terms of cost of instruction. Moreover, what if the proposed increase is not consistent with the institution's assigned areas of primary emphasis? Ultimately, differential fees are likely to undermine the effectiveness of the Board's funding formula as a tool for directing certain institutional behaviors.
- 10) Differential fees will likely fuel a greater and largely unhealthy competition among institutions and even between disciplines within institutions. Some institutions or units would adopt the private school model of instituting higher fees as a synonym for "quality." Fees would escalate as a function of each institution's or unit's desire to be perceived as "higher quality" or "more professional" than another unit, and over time more and more funding would be directed toward marketing rather than instruction. Disciplines such as engineering or business, which enjoy the cachet to increase fees in the name of quality, would prosper. But what about sociology? Inevitably, the disparity between the haves and the have nots would increase. The trend would be encouraged by advisory boards, influential friends and booster, etc. and would be politically difficult to resist. Overall, it would become increasingly difficult for institutions to manage escalating fees and to exercise reasonable self-restraint.
- 11) Suggestions that fees be differentiated according to areas of primary emphasis in assigned role and mission are also problematic. Is it fair to charge a student more to major in business at one institution as opposed to another simply because he or she chooses (or has no choice but) to attend one institution rather than another? Further, areas of emphasis are already recognized and funded accordingly in the enrollment workload adjustment formula.

#### Recommendation:

In light of the foregoing issues and concerns, it would seem prudent for the Board to maintain its longstanding practice of adhering to a rather conservative, restrictive approach to approving "professional fees". Moreover it would seem prudent to continue to utilize existing fee policies and mechanisms rather than differential fees. Since the real issue is insufficient levels of funding, not flawed fee mechanisms, continued escalation of the matriculation fee over time, coupled with a concerted effort to increase State appropriations and to address allocation methods, as well as efforts to enhance extramural funding, would appear to be the recommended approach to enhancing institutional resources.

C: Charles Ruch, President



# **Positioning the University of Idaho to Achieve the State's Strategic Objectives**

Brian Pitcher, Provost

University of Idaho

August 17, 2001

## **Introduction**

A strong higher education system is critical to the future for Idaho. The mission of the Idaho System of Higher Education is to provide quality, access, and relevance in a broad range of programs to enhance quality of life, and to prepare good citizens and a competitive high-tech work force. The public is looking for higher education to service more students, keep the “best” in Idaho, retain and graduate students on-time, graduate more skilled job-ready workers, and attract and retain high quality teachers and researchers. On the other hand, current levels of state support coupled with low student matriculation fees seriously challenge access and quality. Taxpayer funding at 1/3 of cost, plus low matriculation fees, do not cover the cost of education. In the past 10 years, costs for equipment, space, curriculum, and competitive faculty have increased exponentially. Accreditation requirements have required institutions to increase expenditures significantly, in many cases without new funding. While this funding challenge is not unique to Idaho, the state should be commended for permitting institutions significant flexibility in financial planning.

In this context, the University of Idaho has adopted the philosophy that our academic and financial goals can best be accomplished by becoming a more market-oriented, entrepreneurial organization. We are working to be more responsive and flexible, and thus an institution that adapts more rapidly to changing circumstances and is less dependent upon state funding. We are making the internal policy and structural changes needed to foster this cultural change. Some of our initiatives and assumptions are summarized below.

## **Finding Efficiencies and Cost Savings**

We have instituted Responsibility Center Management (RCM) and are reshaping the roles and expectations of the Deans, Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts. We are also moving aggressively to create a flexible, stable, accountable, incentive-based operating environment within the university that is congruent with our expectations of the Deans, Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts. RCM focuses decisions and change at the local level closer to the facts, knowledge base and node for implementation. Through RCM we are focusing on unit performance targets and accountability, and requiring units to study and make difficult decisions about the currency, capacity and viability of their academic offerings. Examples of these changes include the following:

- A single fiscal-year budget for year-round, statewide program delivery
- Attribution of fee revenue to colleges with incentives and penalties for revenue generation
- Predictable treatment of one-time financial savings due to turnover and vacancies
- Financial incentives to increase summer and off-campus enrollments
- Flexible start times for academic year appointments
- More flexible use of 10- and 11-month contracts

### UI Statement Response to Differential Fees

#### Page 2

- Temporary salary adjustments to help address salary competitiveness
- Quarterly performance reviews of Deans, Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts

These changes are providing incentives for programs to redesign and become more effective and efficient in the curriculum. The Polya Math Education Center, Teacher Education redesign, and technology-enhanced education are primary examples. Our focus on alliances/partnerships is another strategy for resource enhancement and efficiency. Effective collaboration with partner higher education institutions, national laboratories, corporate partners, and foundations allowing the UI to broaden programs, exchange services, increase efficiencies, and augment the resource base.

These strategies are essential to creating a more competitive institution positioned for the future.

### Diversifying and Strengthening the Funding Base

**Consistent with our strategy to become more market and quality focused, we are working to grow a variety of funding sources to subsidize educational costs. For example:**

- **Grants, Contracts and Federal Appropriations**

Though our research record is solid, our benchmarking comparisons indicate some peer institutions have more effective strategies for using external funding to support their academic programs. The direct benefit of external funding is the discovery and utilization of new knowledge. In addition, this research also helps pay for graduate assistantships, faculty salaries, research equipment, new construction and renovation, the information infrastructure and advanced professional development.

Our goal is to grow external funding at a rate of 10-15 percent per year. For fiscal year 2001, contract and grant funding topped \$82 million. Through effective allocation of new Governor's Research Initiative funding and focused incentives, we project multiplying this investment and significantly growing our research, graduate and technology transfer programs.

- **Philanthropy**

Philanthropy, traditionally associated with private institutions, has assumed a prominent role in higher education overall as a strategy to augment base funding to enhance student access, faculty support, and excellence in academic programs and facilities. Philanthropy frequently provides the extra support critical for special enhancements to the educational experience – a special enhancement. The goal of the University of Idaho capital campaign is to raise \$100 million in new funding by November 2004. Campaign priorities are to support student scholarships and fellowships, academic programs and services, faculty enhancement, and funding for priority facilities. Through June 2001 the university raised over \$82 million. Annual fund raising at the UI has increased from less than \$10 million per year four years ago to now almost \$30 million per year. The capital campaign includes the goal of increasing the UI's endowment to \$230 million.

### UI Statement Response to Differential Fees Page 3

- **Miscellaneous Revenues**

The financial plan also targets revenue generation through auxiliary programs. Examples include housing, the bookstore, and conferences and events. These programs are expected to generate a profit for institutional benefit.

- **Enrollment Growth**

Full utilization of our human and facility resource base through enrollment growth is high priority. The UI Academic Plan and the Financial Plan assume enrollment growth on-campus at a rate of 2-3 percent per year and off-campus at a rate of greater than 5 percent per year. The 7-10 year plan is to grow the Moscow-based enrollment to approximately 13,000 students, and an additional 5,000 students off-campus. The growth off-campus is targeted to be largely in graduate programs in disciplines where the UI has a statewide mission.

There is significant new demand in the marketplace for lifelong learning through certificate programs, non-credit workshops, continuing professional education, and so forth. These services are to be self-supporting and to add value for both the student and higher education system.

These funding targets and strategies all focus on quality and market opportunity and will help the University of Idaho become less dependent on the state taxpayer.

### **A More Market-Oriented Approach to Mandatory Fees**

As part the strategy for positioning the university for the future, the UI has sought authority to take a more flexible, market-oriented approach to the setting of mandatory fees. The university should learn to recognize and adjust to market sensitivities relating to the relationship of fees with cost and value. Over time, a more market-oriented approach will focus decisions by providers and consumers on need, cost and value. We believe this approach will help position the university to sustain and enhance both quality and access.

The State Board has considerable flexibility within its fee setting authority (see Attachment I) and has taken action to delegate quite broad fee setting authority to the Presidents. This delegation includes the decision to allow flexible pricing of UI courses in summer and off-campus programs. The delegation is facilitating the transition toward a more market-oriented university culture, maintaining access to graduate engineering courses, and helping the university sustain and enhance the quality of its programs. An area where the authority to be more market-oriented has not been delegated is now under discussion in the review of professional fees and/or differential fees.

Possible market opportunities associated with selective flexible pricing include:

1. **Enhance access to quality in high cost programs**

While the UI is making consistent progress in strengthening quality and broadening access, we continue to have very challenging resource deficiencies in some critical areas. In the past, professional fees have been used very effectively in Law, Architecture and Landscape Architecture to

### UI Statement Response to Differential Fees

#### Page 4

add critical services – e.g. technology laboratories. Attachment II summarizes data indicating that the UI is significantly behind peer institutions in infrastructure support for engineering education. Differential fees are a mechanism where students could help pay for a higher level of experience.

2. **Broader curriculum offerings in low enrollment areas**

In some areas or levels of study it is difficult to find large enough enrollment to offer specialized courses. A flexible pricing system might facilitate more electives by pricing small upper division and graduate classes at a little higher level.

3. **Opportunity for more rapid response to workplace needs**

Response time is a significant challenge in implementing new programs. Under current systems the institution must find funds to reallocate, work through a reallocation strategy and/or wait for enrollment workload adjustment funds. With flexible pricing the institution would need to build and evaluate a business model to determine if there is an immediate market for the program and at what price.

4. **Shaping course and program taking behavior and enhancing efficiency**

We are interested in the possibility of efficiency gain through shaping enrollment behavior by time-of-day, day-of-week, campus location, instructional term, and/or delivery mechanism.

According to the recent study by the Idaho State Board staff, a number of western states use differential pricing systems of some kind. It is interesting to note the diverse criteria used in different states. Some fairly common criteria include access, affordability, quality and cost. In our own review of the issue we also find wide variety. Each system seems to have quite a different history – and typically the system is the product of a series of unconnected decisions made incrementally over many years or even decades. While we have discovered a few interesting, consistent and rather comprehensive flexible funding models, we have not discovered a dominant model. We assume we will need to develop our own model to fit the circumstances, market and programs of the University of Idaho.

Some characteristics of the market for the UI are that it is statewide, regional and national in some areas. The Kiplinger study's ranking of the UI in the top 75 U.S. public institutions, evidences that the university is establishing a strong reputation for competitive quality and value. We compete for good students in Idaho, as well as good students in the Northwest. Competing residential campuses frequently include strong research programs at the University of Washington, Oregon State University, the University of Oregon and the University of Montana, and also excellent liberal arts colleges of the Northwest. There is strong evidence these students frequently make their choice based on perceived program quality and life-style amenities. To compete for strong resident and non-resident students, the UI must establish brand recognition by differentiating specific educational programs – such as the new Core Curriculum, the Integrated Business Curriculum, the Lionel Hampton School of Music, the Engineering Senior Design program, the Information Assurance program and others. Quality will be very, very important in the future for maintaining strong enrollments and funding support at residential campuses. For this reason we believe it is particularly important to have flexibility to price programs at market. The UI's competitive position depends on the quality of programs and fee structures in Washington, Oregon and Montana.

### UI Statement Response to Differential Fees Page 5

**Flexible Fee Recommendation:** *To adequately fund access and quality, the University of Idaho recommends that the State Board modify funding mechanisms allowing selective programs to be priced commensurate with cost and market value.*

The policy could be a broader definition of professional program, however this would not likely result in differentiation based on cost and quality. The University of Idaho would be prepared to prepare a proposal with criteria and processes for selecting and implementing differential fees, and then a process for evaluating the impacts of differential fees.

It is important to note a couple of important caveats:

1. When fee increases are considered, either across the board or differentially, some legitimate questions need to be considered concerning fairness and affordability. We encourage the consideration of a balance of cost and program benefit to address fairness. A more flexible approach to the setting of mandatory fees should ensure that students' fees are more directly proportional to the amount of educational service they consume and the cost of providing these services.
2. Since fee increases of any type may negatively affect access for needy students, need based financial aid becomes a critical success factor in the attainment of the public policy objective to fairly and appropriately assess user fees. As mandatory fees increase, federal financial aid automatically increases. In addition, the institutions may leverage private support for need-based scholarships to assist in preserving access. Moreover, the Board can authorize the institutions to waive all or a portion of any mandatory fee on the basis of financial need. The institutions have the ability to review financial need on a case-by-case basis and to act affirmatively to ensure that increased fees do not have a disproportionate impact on students with high levels of financial need. An annual summary of the need-based scholarships and fee waivers would keep the Board apprised of the extent to which the institutions were preserving access.

### Summary

To achieve our strategic objectives with tight resources, the University of Idaho developed and is implementing a specific long-term financial strategy. This strategy focuses on how to build the financial resource to:

- To be a 'Residential Campus of Choice'
- Offer globally competitive graduate, professional and research programs in selected areas
- Expand capacity and delivery of outreach programs and services.

**UI Statement Response to Differential Fees  
Page 6**

The UI financial strategy emphasizes increasing institutional efficiency, and growing non-state support, particularly research/grant funding, private funding, and enrollment growth on and off-campus. Managed enrollment growth in targeted areas, both at the Moscow campus and outreach programs, will be critical to the UI's long-term academic and financial health. Healthy enrollment will depend on quality, service, and competitive approaches to marketing, selling and delivering the UI's educational services.

The university believes that a more flexible approach to setting fees in regular session, on-campus courses will help position the university to sustain access and quality in both the short and long terms. We believe that this approach is both consistent with our role and mission and positions us effectively relative to our peer institutions. We believe, however, that the most prudent public policy would be to permit each institution to pursue its own philosophy and to develop approaches to the setting of mandatory fees that are consistent with their leadership philosophies and their respective roles and missions. We encourage the State Board to adopt more flexibility allowing institutions some discretion to set a moderate differential fee structure in selective areas.

**UI Statement Response to Differential Fees  
Page 7**

**Attachment I**

**TUITION AND FEES IN THE STATE OF IDAHO**

**I. Constitutional Prohibition**

The Idaho Constitution prohibits the University from charging "tuition" to students who are residents of the state of Idaho. The Constitution, however, allows the University to charge residents "tuition" for studies in a "professional department" and for "extra studies." The University may also charge tuition to non-residents. All of this results from the implied incorporation of the Territorial Charter establishing the University of Idaho into Article IX, Section 10, of the state Constitution that perpetuated the University's existence at statehood.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, as matter of state constitutional law, the University may charge "tuition" only to (1) non-residents; (2) residents or non-residents for studies in "professional departments;" and (3) residents or non-residents for "extra studies." The constitution does not address the subject of "fees" that do not constitute "tuition."

**II. Legislative Enactments**

In 1970, the Legislature adopted Idaho Code Section 33-3717. Today, that section provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(1) Any student who shall be a full time regularly enrolled resident student in any degree granting program at a state college or university now or hereafter established shall not be required to pay tuition in said college or university, excepting in a professional college, school, or department, or for extra studies or for part-time enrollment. The state board of education and board of regents for the University of Idaho may prescribe rates of tuition for nonresident students, and shall adopt uniform regulations, including a standard definition of a full time regularly enrolled student, applicable to all said colleges and universities.

This provision essentially follows the Constitutional prohibition, though there are slight differences. Those differences are: (1) tuition may be charged to "part-time" students, whether residents of Idaho or not; and (2) tuition may be charged to full-time students who are not "regularly enrolled in any degree granting program," whether residents of Idaho or not.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See, *Dreps v. Board of Regents of the University of Idaho*, 65 Idaho 88, 139 P2d 467, 470 (1943), in which the Idaho Supreme Court held that the "rights, immunities, franchises, and endowments" clause in Article IX wrote into the Idaho Constitution the provisions of the Territorial Act "as if it had been set out at length in the constitution."

<sup>2</sup> Resident status is determined by reference to Idaho Code Section 33-3717(2) – (4) and IDAPA 08.01.04.

**UI Statement Response to Differential Fees  
Page 8****III. Analysis**

There are number of important questions generated by the aforementioned rules. These include: (A) what constitutes "tuition?" (B) what constitutes "fees?" (C) how can the Board monitor the appropriate expenditure of matriculation fees to ensure that they do not support instructional activities? (D) what is meant by the term "professional departments?" (or "professional colleges or schools")? (E) what is meant by the term "extra studies?" and (F) is there a legal limit as to the amount of tuition or fees.

**A. What constitutes tuition?**

The Legislature has defined tuition in Idaho Code Section 33-3717(1)(a)

(a) Tuition shall be defined as the cost of instruction at the colleges and universities. The cost of instruction shall not include those costs associated with said colleges and universities, such as maintenance and operation of physical plant, student services and institutional support, which are complementary to, but not a part of the instructional program.

The State Board of Education's definition is similar:

Tuition is defined as the fee charged for the cost of instruction at the colleges and universities. The cost of instruction shall not include those costs associated with said colleges and universities, such as maintenance and operation of physical plant, student services and institutional support, which are complementary to, but not part of the instructional program. Tuition may be charged only to nonresident, full-time and part-time students enrolled in any degree granting program and to vocational students enrolled in pre-employment, preparatory programs. SBOE Policies and Procedures Manual V.R.1a(1)

There are several states whose courts have construed the scope of a state constitutional prohibition on charging tuition. The courts have determined that expenses resulting from heating, lighting, construction, and maintenance of non-instructional buildings such as student union buildings and heating and power plants, may be funded through student fees and that such fees are not tuition. Further, it appears that student fees may be assessed to pay for buildings that are primarily for non-instructional purposes but which contain some instructional facilities. An unanswered question is whether a student fee charged to pay for the construction or maintenance of a building containing primarily classroom facilities would constitute tuition and thus generally be impermissible.<sup>3</sup> There is no court interpretation of these issues in Idaho.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Priest v. Regents of the University of Wisconsin, 11 NW 472 (Wisc. 1882) (holding that the prohibition on charging tuition meant that the cost of "teaching" could not be charged and that tuition therefore did not include incidental expenses of heating and lighting.); Rheam v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma, 161 OK 268, 18 P2d 535 (1933) ( holding that charging a student fee to repay bonds for a student union building was not the charging of tuition, which is prohibited in



**UI Statement Response to Differential Fees**  
**Page 9**

**B. What constitutes matriculation fees?**

The Legislature defines the term "matriculation fees" in Idaho Code Section 33-3717(1)(b):

(b) Matriculation fees shall be defined as the fee charged to students for educational costs excluding the cost of instruction. The state board of education and board of regents for the University of Idaho may prescribe matriculation fees for resident students.

The Board's definition is similar:

Matriculation fee is defined as the fee charged for maintenance and operation of physical plant, student services, and institutional support for full-time students enrolled in academic credit courses and vocational pre-employment, preparatory programs. SBOE Policies and Procedures Manual V.R.1a(2)

Essentially, the term "matriculation fees" means the fees charged for "educational costs" which are not "costs of instruction."

The Board also has the legal authority to charge fees for costs that are for neither educational costs nor costs of instruction. In other words, the matriculation fee is not the only category of permissible fees. Fees for other than educational costs or costs of instruction include activity fees and the student health fee.

**C. How can the Board monitor the appropriate expenditure of matriculation fees to ensure that they do not support instructional activities?**

The colleges and universities are subject to annual external independent audits of their financial operations. The audit can be designed to confirm that matriculation fee revenue - is used solely to pay for appropriate non-instructional activities in physical plant, student support, and institutional support.

**D. What is meant by the term "professional departments"?**

This term is undefined in statutory or case law. Currently, the Board defines the "professional fee" as follows: "the additional fee charged for educational costs for students enrolled in specialized degree granting programs such as pharmacy, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, physician assistant, physical therapy, architecture and landscape architecture." SBOE Policies and Procedures Manual V.R.1b(4). It is the University's view that the Board would be afforded great latitude in defining what constitutes a "professional department" and that its judgment would be subject to rejection by the courts only if the definition was arbitrary and capricious. Put another way, as long as there is some rational basis for the Board's definition, it is likely not subject to challenge.

---

Oklahoma) ; State ex rel. Veeder v. State Board of Education et al., 97 Mont. 121, 33 P2d 516 (1934) (following Rheam and Priest).

**UI Statement Response to Differential Fees  
Page 10****E. What is meant by the term "extra studies?"**

This term is also undefined in statutory or case law. Currently, the Board has authorized a "graduate fee," as well as other fees that may be construed as being for "extra studies." It is the University's view that the Board would be afforded great latitude in defining what constitutes "extra studies" and that its judgment would be subject to rejection by the courts only if the definition was arbitrary and capricious. Put another way, as long as there is some rational basis for the Board's definition, it is likely not subject to challenge.

**F. Is there a legal limit as to the amount of tuition or matriculation fees?**

The amount of tuition and matriculation fees is within the discretion of the Board. The Board may adopt policies establishing the amount of tuition and matriculation fees.

**G. May the Board set matriculation fees differentially ?**

The Board has the authority to set the amount of the fee. Inherent in this authority is the ability to create a structure based on reasonable criteria which allows the fee amount to vary. This concept has been discussed as a "differential fee." Like setting tuition, it is the University's view that the Board would be afforded great latitude in defining a differential fee structure and that its judgment would be subject to rejection by the courts only if the fee structure was arbitrary and capricious. Put another way, as long as there is some rational basis for the Board's determination, it is likely not subject to challenge. Among the reasonable factors the Board might consider in creating a differential fee structure are cost, value, fairness, impact on student access, financial condition of the institutions, comparisons with other states, and the general public welfare.

UI Statement Response to Differential Fees  
Page 11

Attachment II

Comparison of Infrastructure support in the UI College of Engineering with Peer Colleges at Oregon State University, New Mexico State University, University of Wyoming, Montana State, Colorado State, University of Nevada-Reno, Washington State University, and the University of Washington. Data is for FY99-00.

No	Description	UI	Mean	UI/Mean
<b>Funding</b>				
1	State support per faculty, k\$/FTE	\$ 112.50	\$ 108.07	104%
2	State support per ugrad, k\$/FTE	\$ 5.69	\$ 4.64	123%
3	State support per grad, k\$/FTE	\$ 5.24	\$ 5.42	97%
4	Research Expend per faculty, k\$/FTE	\$ 65.43	\$ 134.81	49%
<b>Student to Faculty Ratios</b>				
5	Ugrad student to faculty ratio	19.76	23.31	85%
6	MS student to faculty ratio	4.06	3.32	122%
7	PhD student to faculty ratio	0.87	1.03	85%
8	Total student to faculty ratio	24.68	27.66	89%
<b>Infrastructure</b>				
9	Staff to faculty ratio	0.31	0.36	85%
10	GA to faculty ratio	0.29	0.77	38%
<b>Space</b>				
11	Admin space per faculty, sq.ft./FTE	110	146	76%
12	Acad lab space per faculty, sq.ft./FTE	365	491	74%
13	Res lab space per faculty, sq.ft./FTE	218	503	43%
14	Shop space per faculty, sq.ft./FTE	152	164	93%
15	Total space per faculty, sq.ft./FTE	795	1249	64%
16	Acad lab space per ugrad, sq.ft./FTE	18	21	88%
17	Res lab space per grad, sq.ft./FTE	44	116	38%

### **Expected Impact of Professional/Differential Fees For Lewis-Clark State College**

LCSC is pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the current discussion of professional program and/or differential fees for high cost programs by the Idaho State Board of Education. Although the discussion of such fees relates to all Idaho schools the following represents LCSC's response to the discussion and a description of how we would use the opportunity to impose the fees if they are approved.

As a four-year college with several high cost professional programs among both our technical and academic offerings we routinely seek new funding options for these programs. Although the professional fees options under consideration offer the potential to effectively address this challenging problem LCSC does not expect to use such fees if they are approved. We do not expect to utilize such fees because (1) we currently have tools available to us to address a significant portion of the unique costs of high cost programs appropriate to our mission and (2) to impose such fees will have a serious impact upon access to post-secondary education for the regions we serve.

### **Current Cost Recovery Options**

As a public institution in Idaho LCSC develops its matriculation and course fee structures using the following assumptions:

- a. Fees charged to Idaho residents will not recover the full cost of instruction.
- b. No programs are intrinsically more valuable to the student or the citizens of Idaho
- c. Some of the high costs of programs can be recovered through existing mechanisms.
- d. Fee structures must be realistic for the population we serve.

To the extent that we identify extraordinary program costs for our credit-bearing programs that we must recover in order to insure the quality of the program and/or offset the impact of the costs upon core institutional operations we are able to recover at least a portion of the costs using mechanisms available under current policy.

Current tools and funding opportunities that help offset increasing program costs and serve to keep down costs for students include

Course Fees. Unique program equipment and supply and support costs can be passed on to the student in the form of course fees. LCSC assesses such fees to cover "consumables" for students; costs for supervision of internships, co-ops, and practica; and technology delivery costs. Because of the potential impact upon students we consider any increase of such fees to be undesirable.

Enhanced Funding Requests and Initiative Funding. In the past when we sought to enhance or add new programming in a high cost area we sought additional funding through an enhancement decision unit. A second option has been funding for competitive faculty salaries. We have also been able to fund high cost programs through governor's initiatives in the sciences and economic-development related areas. This set of options allows us to directly address high faculty costs in high-demand and high-cost programs.

### LCSC Statement Response to Differential Fees

#### Page 2

Reallocation of Current Funds. A third option currently available for our use addressing high cost programming is internal reallocation of funds. Like other institutions we continually monitor and adapt our program mix to meet regional and state-wide needs and deal with the demands of increasing costs for instruction, equipment, and support services. If we determine it is appropriate to our mission and service area to add or enhance programs we can reallocate our current resources.

### Potential Impact upon Access

The charging of professional/differential fees for high cost programs is not a desirable policy option for LCSC. LCSC is a regional college which has historically sought to first meet the educational needs of Regions I and II. For over 30 years we have been engaged in outreach activities designed to make post-secondary education accessible to those regions. Because of changes in the percentage of state support for LCSC we have passed along to students a portion of the high costs of several of our professional and technical programs and the costs of outreach itself through course and delivery fees. This practice has limited access to our programs for citizens in our region. Our discussions with public school and community leaders seeking to provide access to higher education for their community identify increased cost as the primary barrier to greater participation by both high school students and community members. Although outreach students are able to take both credit and non-credit programs without having to relocate to Lewiston or Coeur d'Alene current fees are still a barrier for many high school students hoping to enroll in dual credit programs or citizens seeking skill-upgrade training and/or a baccalaureate degree.

Because we have not passed along all the instructional costs and operational costs of these high cost programs and we added a Board directed "community college" mission several years ago, the gap between the state funding and programming needs has increased. Our options are to decrease access for our outreach students and/or reduce our program numbers and types. Both options limit student access. However, they are both more desirable than passing on new fees for regional students.

### Policy Considerations

Although we expect the use of professional program fees to be a deterrent for access to LCSC programs fees, as an Idaho post-secondary school we do not oppose the use of such fees for high cost graduate and unique high cost undergraduate programs as are currently assessed under Option 1. We find this option most desirable as it calls for a review of requests in the context of the nature of the professional programs identified of the constitution and the changing nature of professional education and assumes that new fees will be added only for appropriate cause. We do not support approval criteria that define professional programs so broadly as to include professional-technical programs which are specifically developed with access in mind. We hope that an increase in the use of these fees will not lead to a decrease in legislative funding for new programming. Finally, we hope that fee policy will not devalue those programs without such fees for the citizens of Idaho.

### Idaho State University Statement Response to Differential Fees

#### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Dr. Gregory G. Fitch  
Executive Director, State Board of Education

**FROM:** Dr. Jonathan Lawson  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

**DATE:** August 15, 2001

**SUBJECT:** Differential Fees and Professional Fees

Idaho State University has considerable historical experience with professional fees for professional programs. We feel that we can identify those programs and that we understand the purpose of the fees and have no problem with them as currently administered. The issue of differential fees, however is somewhat more complex. As an institution, we have no desire to have or administer differential fees. Should other institutions wish to do so, we have no objection.

Some of us have had experiences with differential fees on other campuses and found them to be highly problematic, leading to inequities, access problems, fragmentation of university programming, divisiveness amongst deans and department chairs, and a general reduction of the sense of university. While the desire to build programs which the market will sustain at a more than average fee level is understandable, it does not address the real problem in Idaho's institutions of higher education. The real problem is that our fee structure is insufficient to support the program array. Were the fee structure adequate, we could manage the institutions without either starving programs or taking on the negative fallout from differential fees.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

JL:pt

c: President Richard L. Bowen  
Deans' Council  
Vice President Ken Prolo

## **Exhibit 7e**

### **Eastern Idaho Technical College Statement Response to Differential Fees**

August 17, 2001

Dr. Greg Fitch, Executive Director  
Office of the State Board of Education  
650 W. State Street  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0037

Dear Dr. Fitch,

After reviewing the proposed definitions for professional programs and professional fees, President Miles LaRowe and I submit the following from our perspective at Eastern Idaho Technical College. Because we represent a technical college perspective, we do not presume that our response relates to those of the four-year college or universities.

As a technical college and two-year sector college that practices open enrollment, the issues of access, affordability, and quality drive the decisions in this student-centered institution. We have demonstrated in the past and continue to demonstrate our diligence to remain affordable by keeping the EITC student fees as low as possible through sound fiscal practices and prudent decision-making in times of scarce resources. On occasions, we have had to shift some costs to the students, but only after thorough analysis of all options and the "Is it reasonable?" test. Additional student financial burden is only approved after significant deliberation.

With regard to the professional program definition, we submit that the integrity of education in the State of Idaho could be jeopardized by a definition, which allows technical programs to be defined as professional, in spite of the name, the Profession Technical Education Division. This would be the case if option 2 criteria were adopted. The historical definition in option 1 retains the appropriate criteria for professional programs and the option we endorse for the future.

Thank you for the opportunity for Eastern Idaho Technical College to present its perspective on these issues.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Carlson

**Professional Program/Fees Analysis**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Fee Structures in Other States.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Graduate v. Undergraduate fee differential.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Special Course Fees.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Special Program Fees.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Extreme Example of Differential Fees.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Decision Making Criteria.....</b>	<b>45</b>



## **Fee Structures in Other States**

The fee structures of institutions in the Western states were analyzed for purposes of this discussion.

Nevada appears to be one of the few states reviewed in this report that does not charge tuition to their residents. Tuition is only charged to nonresidents, similar to Idaho, however all students are charged a per credit fee (\$76.50 undergraduate/\$103.50 graduate) or a yearly full time registration fee (\$2,295 undergraduate 30 credits/\$1,863 graduate eighteen credits) that is similar to the matriculation fee currently assessed to students enrolled at Idaho institutions. The fee is the same for all students, depending on their status as undergraduates or graduate students.

Oregon is in a unique position in that they are able to assess tuition to provide support for the cost of instruction expenditures, but have been prevented by their Legislature from raising tuition for undergraduate students since the 1997-1998 academic year. They do have the ability to raise nonresident undergraduate tuition, and graduate tuition, and also seem to rely on raising fees for certain programs such as Business and Engineering undergraduate and graduate programs.

Montana appointed a Task Force on Student Fees that has been reviewing the fee structure at Montana institutions. The Task Force was appointed in order to gain more control and accountability of course fees, and to ensure consistency in definitions of course fees and their applications. For fiscal year 2002 it was recommended that some course fees be eliminated, some course fees be reduced, and that some course fees be increased if they met certain criteria.

Most of the states analyzed are limited by Board policy when setting tuition. According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the exception to this is the State of Washington, where Legislators may continue a partial grant of authority to institutions to set their own tuition, or grant them complete authority over tuition-setting.

### **Graduate versus undergraduate fee differential**

The most common differential fees at institutions in other states are the differential fees between graduate and undergraduate programs. In some states, the differential fee between those two programs depends upon the classification of the student. If the student is an undergraduate, the student pays the undergraduate prices whether taking undergraduate or graduate courses. If the student is a graduate student, they pay the graduate prices whether they are taking an undergraduate or a graduate course. In other states, the student pays the undergraduate price for undergraduate courses and the graduate price for graduate courses.

Arizona has differential tuition only between its various graduate programs. For the 2001-2002 school year, differential tuition was approved for the following Graduate professional programs: Doctorate in Education, MS Management, Evening MBA, Masters in Public Administration, and the Master of Engineering program.

In Nevada, law and medicine have differential tuition prices at the University of Nevada School of Medicine and Williams S. Boyd Law School. For the upcoming school year, full time resident law school tuition and fees are \$7,000 a year, while the School of Medicine tuition and fees are \$8,417.00.

New Mexico has differential tuition between undergraduate, graduate, medicine, law and Pharmacy programs. Medicine, law, and Pharmacy tuition rates and fees are adjusted annually taking into consideration the different costs of education for these professional programs.

Washington has differential tuition between undergraduate and graduate, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine, and distance degree programs.

The University of Wyoming charges differential rates between undergraduate and graduate programs, and between certain graduate programs, with the Master of Social Work, Law and the Pharmacy programs charging a higher rate than the other graduate programs.

### **Special Course Fees**

Many states have special course or lab fees provided for in policy. Idaho institutions currently have the ability in Board policy to assess a special course fee for a specific course or special activity and is a fee that is assessed only to the students taking the course, not on of all students enrolled at the institution. These fees include penalty assessments, library fines, continuing education fees, parking fines, laboratory fees, breakage fees, fees for video outreach courses, late registration fees, and fees for special courses offered for such purposes as remedial education credit that do not count toward meeting degree requirements are considered special course fees. The chief executive officer of the institution approves these special course fees. In other states and institutions outside Idaho, these course fees are often for courses that are labeled self-support classes, that is, the fees go directly toward supporting the course itself. In the states that have self-support classes, only certain courses are labeled as such, and the other courses are state-supported classes, courses that are paid for with the money received from the Legislature or other sources.

In Arizona, the fees approved for the 2001-2002 school year range from \$60 to \$395 for courses such as Field Geology, Human Nutrition, Animal Science, Nursing Practice and Music. In Oregon, the fees range from a \$4.00 lab fee to \$300 for a scuba diving course. In Utah, there are Instruction, Laboratory and Class Fees for classes ranging from Accounting, Art, Biology, Chemistry, Communication, Computer Science, French, Sociology, Psychology and Education classes that can range from \$1 up to \$80. Requests for special class fees must be necessary for the successful completion of course objectives, outline the justification or purpose of the fee or deposit, the basis upon which a deposit per students was calculated, semesters in which the course is offered, and the local department account where the revenue and related expenses will be recorded. Fees under \$50 that comply with the previous requirements are not required to go before the Arizona Board of Regents for approval. Special Course Fees may be approved in six different categories: off-campus field trips or specialized equipment/facilities use, private instruction, expendable materials, technology expense fees, models for art classes and clinical practice class, and deposits for expensive equipment.

The University of Hawaii has the ability to charge a special course fee for in-state or out-of-state courses delivered by telecommunications. Hawaii uses the following factors in determining whether a special course fee should be charged, and how much it should be:

- 1) Salary of faculty or other professionals providing instruction or service; honoraria for resource people and professionals

- 2) Program and course development costs
- 3) Costs associated with telecommunications delivery
- 4) Student support service costs
- 5) Academic support costs
- 6) Institutional support including general administration and technology costs
- 7) Facilities costs
- 8) Other costs required to deliver the course/program

There are special course, lab or computer fees for a few accounting and art classes. The course fees range from \$5 up to \$95 (Photography). Internships are assessed a \$10 per quarter fee.

### **Special Program Fees**

A number of states are able to charge some kind of special program fee for programs that have critical needs or are underfunded.

Arizona has special program fees for advising, placement, and instructional labs. The student pays the standard university fee plus additional fees for specific services according to classes in the program area in which the student enrolls. These fees range from \$525 for the first level of Golf Management up to \$1000 per semester for the Pharmacy program.

North Dakota also has program fees for specific programs that have exceptional and critical needs that are not adequately funded through other sources. Currently, students in Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Engineering, Food and Nutrition, Interior Design, Nursing, and Pharmacy pay an additional fee at certain points in their educational program to take classes in those areas. These fees currently range from \$10 per credit hour for Architecture and Landscape Architecture to \$500 a semester for the Pharmacy program.

Oregon has a program resource fee, basically an access or "use" fee, that is assessed on certain programs such as engineering, graduate psychology, business and management, law, and architecture and landscape architecture. This category encompasses the technology fee, as well as any other fees particular to a program.

For the 2000-2001 school year at Oregon State University, the engineering fee was increased to \$150 per term and was expanded to include undergraduate students as well as graduate students. Southern Oregon University established two new resource fees to be assessed to Masters degree students in Applied Psychology in the Mental Health Counseling track (\$333) and the Group Facilitation and Training track (\$167). The resource fee for students admitted to the Architecture and Landscape Architecture programs at the University of Oregon is \$30 per term. The University of Oregon also assesses a \$100 resource fee for undergraduates in the College of Business Administration and \$500 for graduate students. There is also a resource fee for the Masters of Management and the MBA, but these fees differ by the various institutions that offer the program. Portland State University has created a new fee of \$50 per term for all undergraduate students in the School of Business. The University of Oregon proposed two new resource fees in the College of Arts and Sciences for undergraduates majoring or undeclared in the College of Arts and Sciences (\$15) and for undergraduates majoring in science intensive programs, including Anthropology, Environmental Studies, Environmental Science and Geography (\$35).

With the elimination and reduction of certain course fees in their review of their course fee structure, it was also recommended that certain programs be assessed a tuition surcharge. These changes affected the Forestry Program and the Social Work Program, which is a new program at University of Montana. The Forestry Tuition Surcharge is \$200 a semester for all upper division students enrolled in Forestry majors, replacing the \$70 per semester Forestry Fee. Selected lower division courses (introductory soils) and specialized upper division courses (wilderness and civilization and the recreation capstone program) and programs now have laboratory/field trip fees and non-forestry students pay for selected upper division courses (field ecology). This new pricing structure would benefit lower division students who are exploring their career options and only take a limited number of Forestry Courses. The justification for this change is that natural resource curricula are relatively high cost due to extensive field and laboratory requirements in order to offer a high quality program that meets the students needs. The Social Work Surcharge is \$4,000 per year in order to begin a Master's in Social Work program.

North Dakota has in their Board policy program fees, which are restricted to students enrolled in a particular program in order to support programs that have exceptional and critical needs that are not adequately funded through other sources, such as law, nursing or engineering. The revenue from program fees must be allocated for the primary benefit of students enrolled in that program. The fees are intended to meet exceptional and unique needs in a program and not those common to all programs; they are not intended as an extension to course fees or other fees that are generally charged to all students. Program fees may be instituted or increased only through approval of their Board, and there is a requirement for student input prior to any approval of a program fee. At North Dakota State University, program fees are assessed to students in Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Engineering, Food and Nutrition, Interior Design, Nursing, and Pharmacy. The program fees range from \$10 for the part time second year students in the Architecture and Landscape Architecture program to \$500 for students formally accepted into the professional Pharmacy doctorate program. The program fee has different amounts assessed dependent on where the student is in the program, and whether the student is full-time or part-time.

### **Extreme Example of Differential Fees**

In South Dakota, several factors impact an individual's tuition, including residency, Minnesota reciprocity, citizenship, the type of class it is (internet, independent study, correspondence, remedial), the location of the class, and which campus the course is taken from. To begin with, South Dakota uses the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI), an inflationary measure that tracks the appropriate broad market basket of costs associated with higher education. South Dakota then uses seven criteria for establishing tuition rates using the following assumptions and guidelines:

- South Dakota students should have reasonable access to higher education opportunities in South Dakota with proper consideration given to economically disadvantaged students and minorities
- Tuition rates in adjacent states
- Nonresidents pay more than residents
- Graduates pay more than undergraduates
- Reciprocity agreements (with Minnesota) have the potential to benefit South Dakota
- School of Medicine tuition rates should be comparable to rates charged in other medical schools with a community based hospital environment
- Low enrollment graduate programs, though high quality, must maintain a critical mass sufficient to offer a quality program, and enrollments are influenced by graduate tuition rates

Additionally, South Dakota divides the tuition rates for courses into Self-Support Courses and State-Supported Courses, and charges a differential rate depending on a number of factors.

- Standard State-Supported tuition rates charge undergraduate and graduate students by the credit hour, medical school residents and nonresidents by the year, and law school residents and nonresidents by the year.
- Undergraduate and graduate self-support tuition rates are charged per credit hour. At the institution in Sioux Falls, the rate is comprised of the self-support tuition rate plus a surcharge equivalent to 20% of the resident tuition rate for undergraduates and graduates respectively.
- Internet courses have differential pricing as well. If a student is enrolled in any course on a campus and is taking an internet course from the same university, the state-support tuition rate and all applicable fees will apply. If a resident student is taking only an internet course from a campus, the self support off-campus tuition rate will be charged. If a nonresident student is taking only internet courses, the self support tuition rate will be charged.

South Dakota also has a salary enhancement fee that is assessed to students taking certain courses, in order to bring their faculty members salaries up to par.

Examples of pricing at South Dakota State University for the 2001-2002 school year are:

- State supported resident graduate rates per credit hour are \$94.75, and \$62.40 for undergraduates.
- Self support-classes taught at USD-SDSU-DSU at Sioux Falls are \$200.55 for graduates and \$154.70 for undergraduates.
- Self support for distances courses and classes taught outside SF are \$181.60 for graduates and \$142.25 for undergraduates.

The criticism of this method is that no one can easily figure out how much a student will be required to pay for any given course. Too many factors and criteria are used to determine the tuition rate.

### **Decision Making Criteria**

The institutions that use differential pricing for tuition, courses, or programs usually have some set of criteria that are used in the decision making process. Each institution has a different set of criteria they use in making the decisions that will work for their institution. Some of these criteria are:

- Acknowledge differing costs of instruction by student level (undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, engineering, law, pharmacy, medicine)
- Affordability to students
- Accessibility for students
- Benefits to the entire university by having the course or program
- Cost of the course or program
- Financial aid availability and use
- Importance of reciprocity agreements with other states, especially those nearby
- Increased earnings potential of graduates

- Market pricing (tuition rates in neighboring states)
- Mix of students (ethnic, resident/nonresident)
- Quality
- Reflect the different mission of the major university units
- Relative standing in terms of tuition charges at like regional and national institutions of higher education

Alaska charges tuition based on the following criteria:

- The number of credit hours the student is enrolled
- The level of the course

In Alaska, residents pay \$79 per credit for freshman and sophomore level courses, \$90 per credit for junior and senior level courses, and graduate courses are \$178 per credit. The University of Alaska website even offers a simple calculator for figuring out what the student would pay, based on how many classes a student takes at each level.

When determining tuition for the institutions in Arizona for the upcoming school year, the institutional presidents told the Board that tuition increases were necessary to maintain the quality of education at the universities and to keep Arizona's workforce competitive. They identified several areas that have been targeted for the potential use of increased tuition revenues: information technology, advising and mentoring programs, employee salaries, financial aid, and debt service for academic facilities. Arizona decides its differential tuition for selected graduate programs, on the following seven criteria:

- Access
- Affordability
- Benefits to the entire university
- Cost of the program
- Increased earnings potential of graduates
- Market pricing
- Quality

According to some recent Arizona Board of Regents minutes, actual cost of the program being approved is a very important element. Members were not supportive of professional program fees just for the sake of charging a professional fee for programs that might be qualified to charge it. Rather, they were more interested in how much the program actually cost to support.

### **Other issues to be considered**

According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the majority of public four-year institutions still charge less than \$3,500 a year for tuition and fees. Over the past few years, the cost of attending college as a percentage of family income has stabilized. However, the relative cost of attendance remains particularly high for low-income families, for whom the cost of attending a public four-year institution represents more than 60 percent of annual income. The cost of attendance at four-year public institutions, as a percentage of family income, remains stable. This cost has held relatively steady for middle and high-income families since the early 80s. However, college costs as a

percentage of family income escalated significantly for low-income families throughout the 1980s and 1990s. A critical question to ask is what the appropriate balance of responsibility is between government and families for financing a college education, recognizing that this balance may differ from state to state and region to region.