Attached is the summary draft report of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee that you appointed in December, 2008. This 30-member group met four times as a committee of the whole, and several times in subcommittee meetings, each addressing one of the four primary charges concerning admissions, tuition and financial aid, classroom operations, and fees (see the attached charge letter). After the charge letter was issued, three additional members were added to the committee: Roberta Hopkins, Director, Classroom Support Services; Elizabeth Williams, a graduate student in the Evans School of Public Affairs, and Jean Paul Willynck, Student Regent and a senior in the Urban Studies program at UW Tacoma. Additionally, the co-chairs and I met four times to review comments and drafts and to plan our next steps during the course of winter quarter. One of our meetings included Dan Luchtel, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. A subcommittee of the Board of Deans and Chancellors, chaired by Dean Jim Jiambalvo, also met with me to review the drafts and to provide their comments (see attached meeting calendar and roster of subcommittee participants). The committee co-chairs (Phil Ballinger, Direct Entry; Robert Plotnick, Tuition and Financial Aid; Ed Taylor, Classrooms; and David Szatmary, Fees) were the discussion leaders and authors of the four sections in the report.

The committee achieved broad agreement on a number of important recommendations concerning these four areas, and I would like to highlight key points and provide additional commentary.

I. Direct Entry

Admission to the University, with direct entry into a major, is not a completely new idea, but it is presented here with significantly greater support than in previous discussions. Direct entry is currently being used by the College of Engineering and was piloted by the School of Business, with good success. The report details the academic benefits of direct entry and outlines key considerations. Given the changing demographics of the State high school population and what will be the increasingly competitive nature of college recruitment, there are numerous reasons why this approach, common to many institutions, should be seriously considered at the University of Washington. The report does not attempt to resolve questions regarding its implementation nor define the added resources associated with direct entry to a major, but it does provide an opportunity to consider how the University can address outreach to elementary and secondary education partners throughout the State. Recruitment, advising, and retention efforts will become increasingly essential and could be an effective component of direct entry, and the development of
such efforts could not be more timely. But if implemented, this new admissions policy would require the University to consider how to accommodate continuing students who were originally admitted at-large, transfer students from community colleges, along with those already enrolled seeking to change majors. We would need to consider how to manage the current transfer agreement across units and the impact on diversity these changes could create if not carefully constructed. Direct entry to majors would not suit all Schools and Colleges; consequently, it is presented here as a voluntary program option. Lastly, we recognize that aspects of direct entry are essential components of what are commonly referred to as activity-based funding models, where the unit of enrollment and the unit of instruction are identified early in the enrollment cycle and are tied to revenue sharing plans over the course of study towards degree completion. The short amount of time available to the committee did not permit us to delve deeper into these issues, but one conclusion was clearly stated: admissions should still be centrally managed, regardless of the system.

II. Tuition and Financial Aid

The subcommittee considered the issue of differential tuition. As with previous discussions over the years, the committee found mixed support for differential pricing by discipline but found broad support for differential tuition for lower division versus upper division enrollment. Specific problem areas, such as tuition increases for students who amass unusually high totals of credit hours, are addressed, and current policies and procedures that should be employed are reinforced. It is worth adding that recommendations from previous committees covering topics such as time to degree and dual/double majors and degrees have yet to be implemented but will go a long way in bringing clarity and closure to many of these issues. This section also reviews unmet need and increased financial aid (see attached tables illustrating scholarship awards and grant support relative to debt and tuition for the Global Challenge State peers). It should be noted that changes in tax credits and Pell Grant support were instituted during winter quarter; therefore, a more nuanced analysis of the impact that increases in federal and state assistance programs may have on different segments of the population and different family income levels will be required. Clearly, increases in tuition revenue are at the heart of this discussion, and when compared to peers, the University continues to be a significantly underpriced educational opportunity. The debate over the high tuition/high aid model (in fact, moderate by comparison) focuses on affordability, access, and the preservation of a quality education. Regarding graduate student tuition, the committee revisited “post-candidacy” status for graduate students, where the advantages of continuing enrollment, reduced tuition, and impact on research expenditures are considered. There was no agreement on differential tuition among the three campuses.

III. Classrooms

The areas examined were course configuration, class schedules, and the need for optimal room usage. Much analysis has been conducted but without the implementation needed to achieve changes in behavior for programs, faculty, and students. These are issues of increasing concern given that they will be immediately aggravated by reductions in operating budgets and teaching
assistants, in addition to larger class sizes and fewer scheduling and registration options. Almost all of the comments and recommendations in this section concern only the Seattle campus.

IV. Fees

The committee addressed the need for greater clarity of purpose and increased communication around the growing trend toward fee-based offerings. The committee sees the need for fees to be imposed or increased to cover the costs of services (e.g., admissions reviews, transcript requests, lab monitors, maintenance, materials) as well as a central unit to provide oversight to determine and regulate the impact that fees have on students and users.

V. Conclusion

The committee broadly represented the three campuses of the University of Washington, its faculty, administration, and students. It has, and should continue to be, augmented with specialists who can take specific recommendations and move them forward as you deem necessary. The entire committee, along with the specific subcommittees, should remain a standing body, capable of addressing selected tasks.
I. DIRECT ENTRY

The subcommittee charged with assessing direct entry considered a number of factors, including the general admissions process, resources, and current admissions policies. The summary of the committee’s discussions and its recommendations follow.

We recommend that the University encourage the growth of direct entry for newly enrolling students from high schools, especially into competitive colleges, schools, and majors.

As demonstrated by the Foster School’s multi-year direct entry program, the benefits of direct entry can be significant and many for students and the University. Direct entry:

- improves the University’s competitive advantage in attracting and enrolling high-achieving students;
- allows for earlier advising as well as retention-enhancing student attachment to specific academic disciplines and faculty;
- encourages curricular and advising innovation in the first two years of study;
- allows more possibilities for student leadership activities and fosters study abroad experiences;
- permits students to pursue more complex and complete educational programs through research, double majors, and internships; and
- strengthens institutional and program loyalty.

These benefits may be magnified over the next decade as prospective student demographics substantially shift in Washington and other Western states. From now through 2014, the number of high school graduates in Washington will continue to decline and will not approximate current numbers again until 2020. This steepening decline will especially affect the numbers of prospective students intending to enroll at four-year colleges and universities. This decline will heighten the competition among colleges for students in general. In such an environment, direct entry will give the University of Washington a competitive advantage for the strongest, most sought after students. Additionally, direct entry into majors for underrepresented students may well bolster retention rates and degree outcomes. Students who enter directly into majors, schools, or colleges normally associate more strongly with a specific academic community.
research demonstrates that such association, particularly with faculty and advisers, positively influences academic and degree outcomes for students, especially underrepresented students. Lastly, increased direct entry programs may well help attract and enroll greater numbers of high achieving underrepresented students. Emile Pitre, Associate Vice President of the Office of Minority Affairs, reports that some students participating in “Shaping Your Future,” a workshop for high achieving underrepresented minority students, indicate that they do not choose the UW because they worry they will not be admitted to engineering or business.

For effective implementation of the Committee’s recommendation to encourage the growth of direct entry into colleges, schools, and majors for newly enrolled students from high schools, three coordinated processes should be initiated.

- Monitor outcomes in three areas: the enrollment of desirable students including underrepresented minorities, the retention of direct entry enrollees, and the maintenance of the current diversity of degree programs.
- Monitor the costs and resources associated with implementing direct entry programs.
- When making decisions to increase direct entry into a particular program, ensure that other programs that could be affected by such a decision are engaged and consulted in order to assess possible effects and encourage cooperation.

Monitoring and assessment needs amplify the utility of centralizing enrollment planning and implementation processes.

The Committee, while recognizing that many different admission models exist at universities that practice direct entry into colleges, schools, and majors, recommends that the University of Washington maintains a model of centralized admission to the University accompanied by subsidiary admission to colleges, schools, or majors.

If the University of Washington expands direct admission, then enrollment control should still be centralized. Direct entry programs must support overall University enrollment goals. Furthermore, unless the University were to become either highly selective or begin to admit most students directly into programs under a centralized enrollment management model, the UW should continue to practice centralized admission to the institution with subsidiary admission to the programs. Additionally, most program-specific admissions could occur within the Office of Admissions. As at some other institutions, specifically trained admission officers using parameters crafted by individual departments could unify admission processes within the Office of Admissions. This would allow both programmatic and enrollment control. Additionally, expanded direct entry enrollment will need to account for students’ development and discovery processes. Expanded direct entry admission practices may press some students to ‘commit’ to an academic discipline before they are truly ready to do so. High school students entering the University often discover areas of study of which they had no knowledge prior to enrollment. In light of this fact, the University will need to create admission and enrollment policies which address alternate majors as well as the movement between majors after direct entry admission. Lastly, in order to safeguard against losing good students not directly admitted into a selective
major of choice, cooperative recruiting, admission, and enrollment mechanisms should be developed. For example, students admitted to the UW but not to the competitive major of their choice could be identified by departments that provide good alternatives to the competitive major. A proactive approach would be to forward the application information of these students to an alternative department(s) for consideration and possible offers of admission based upon declared or identified interests.

The Committee recommends that the University encourages departments to pursue direct entry by providing necessary resources.

Direct entry admission models operate best when resources follow students. Any program that initiates direct entry admissions will necessarily add advising and probably recruiting responsibilities, responsibilities for which resources may not exist in the department. Therefore, the Committee recommends that resources at some level should accompany direct entry enrollments. While needed resources would vary according to the scale of direct entry programs, the Foster School’s experience demonstrates that additional resources in advising, administration, curriculum development, and possibly recruiting would be needed in the larger programs. The Foster School initiated a major direct entry program three years ago. In 2008, the Foster School enrolled 250 freshmen through direct entry. To support this program, the Foster School has added 1.5 FTE in advising staff, and 1.0 FTE in recruitment/admission process staff. If we use the Foster School model as a template, then competitive direct entry programs would require 1.0 FTE per 100 students admitted per freshman year (a 1:100 ratio). The overall direct entry student advising ratio in the Foster School is 1:500. This ratio may vary greatly according to type and size of academic program.

The Committee recommends re-envisioning current transfer and native student admission practices if direct entry becomes normative at the University.

One of the more difficult issues associated with greatly increasing direct entry at the University of Washington, Seattle is potential conflict with current admission practices for both transfer and native students. A proportionality agreement governs the enrollment of Washington community college students. This agreement generally commits the Seattle campus to ensuring that at least 30% of all new undergraduates admitted yearly are from Washington community colleges. If direct entry increases broadly in colleges, schools, or majors without specifically taking this agreement into consideration, then either the University will not be able to meet proportionality or transfer students will be funneled necessarily into open majors and to the branch campuses. Additionally, an increase in direct entry invites curricular innovation in departments, innovations which may not be based on the ‘two plus two’ model required by significant upper-division transfer student enrollments. One possible approach would be to amend transfer admission practices to include strong insistence on preparation for direct entry into one or more majors (at least at the Seattle campus). Another solution would be to insist that all direct entry programs meet transfer proportionality within the program. Currently, however, some selective programs do not have adequately diverse applicant pools to meet such specific proportionality requirements. Additionally, if programs that seek expanded direct entry are also to seek proportionality in their enrollment, then the junior year entry point would need to be predominantly reserved for community college transfer students. UW native students would then have to seek program
entrance within their first two years of enrollment at the University. This shift in native student admission practices would require significant changes in expectations about prerequisite courses in some areas. The Committee further notes that any diminishment in community college transfer enrollment at the University or in specific programs would probably also diminish student diversity. Low-income and other underrepresented students are disproportionately represented among transfer students from community colleges.

II. TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID

During its three meetings, the subcommittee considered a number of topics surrounding the issues of tuition (e.g., differential tuition) and financial aid (higher tuition/higher aid). Below is a summary of those discussions and recommendations.

A. Desirability and value of implementing differential tuition

Prior to discussing differential tuition, members expressed a consensus for:

- raising tuition for undergraduates: the subcommittee observed that though 10% may sound like a large tuition increase, for resident undergraduates, it is an increase of $625 in absolute terms over the 2008-09 level;¹

- following the high tuition/high aid model of financing the University. (See section B for further discussion.)

Turning to the main issue, the committee considered the advantages and disadvantages of four ways to set tuition differentials. The four are not mutually exclusive.

1. Program or major-based differentials

There were mixed views regarding setting different tuition rates for undergraduate programs. Although there was some support for charging an incremental fee for some programs, like undergraduate business or engineering, the UW will need to consider the economic and political feasibility of charging fees. We agreed that base tuition would be the same for all undergraduates. The fee may be justified as the means to finance extra program costs and opportunities of some majors or programs, such as lab costs or higher faculty salaries needed to meet the market.

Some issues that would need analysis if differential tuition is seriously considered are:

- Will undergraduates’ choice of major be unduly affected by fees?

- How would financial aid be affected by such fees?

¹ UW resident undergraduate tuition is low relative to private regional institutions. As a percentage of other institutions’ tuition in 2008-09: Gonzaga 22.5%, Pacific Lutheran 22.2%, Reed 16.5%, Seattle U. 21.8%, and Willamette 18.5%. 
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• What are the potential administrative difficulties?

• A peer university varies tuition across school and colleges, but not within. What lessons can be learned from its experience and from other universities that have tried this policy?

Some suggested that students will find many ways to game the system to keep their tuition costs lower. No one suggests setting tuition differentials among the three campuses.

Regarding graduate tuition, the subcommittee’s consensus is that professional programs should set tuition based on market considerations, subject to oversight by the Provost and the Board of Regents. It also is in favor of retaining the tiers for other PhD programs. The graduate students we spoke to suggested that the University should work harder, however, to aid professional students attempting to pursue a career in public service. They also feel that they would be better able to plan their career at the UW if their tuition increases were more predictable.

2. Lower versus upper division tuition differential

| We recommend the University explore lower versus upper division differential tuition. |

The Committee supports exploring the idea of setting higher tuition for upper division students because the cost of educating them is higher. This appears to be a better option than setting differentials by major or program. The UW needs to carefully assess the advantages and disadvantages of this policy, including how students might manipulate the system. A peer university follows this policy. Again, what lessons can be learned from its experience and from other universities that have tried this policy?

3. Increase tuition relative to credit hours

| We recommend increasing undergraduate tuition after a student’s credit hours exceed a pre-determined threshold. |

There is a strong consensus that, if practical and fair, this option is worth implementing for two reasons:

• To the extent higher tuition induces students to complete their studies and graduate, it frees up opportunities for new students who otherwise might not be allowed to enroll. The benefits of a UW education will be more widely shared among admissible persons who want to attend. But the primary benefit of charging higher tuition to these students is that UW resources are, in general, better used for increasing the number of persons who can attend than for giving students a heavily subsidized opportunity to complete a double or triple major, or take elective courses not needed to graduate.

• It will increase revenue to the extent some students choose to pay the higher amount and remain enrolled.
Before implementing such a policy, the UW should estimate the number of students who exceed the credit limit. If the number of low, it may not be worth the infrastructure costs (e.g., changes in system programming, personnel to review appeals) and the ill will from students for a limited amount of tuition revenue. Note that this policy would provide an incentive to graduate from the University, but no one would be forced or required to leave.

Several issues would require further analysis if this option were to be implemented:

- The Committee did not try to specify the threshold. The most severe threshold would increase tuition after 180 credits or, for students in majors that require more than 180, after the student reaches the required number of credits. The Committee thinks that 180 is too low and that a threshold in the range of 225 is probably appropriate.

- Should Running Start credits count toward meeting the threshold? One view is: a credit is a credit. By counting Running Start credits, students would hit the threshold sooner, be incentivized to leave, and thus to release spaces for new students. The alternative view is that Running Start credits do not necessarily reflect coursework of the quality provided at the UW, so they should not count.

- Should AP credits count toward meeting the threshold? Because the decision to accept specific AP credits rests with departments, there should not be a uniform policy requiring all AP credits to be counted toward the threshold.

- Should community college credits count towards the limit? There is a strong case to count these since the student has already benefited from subsidized state resources at the community college. However, separating community college transfer credits from Running Start credits may not be possible given current system constraints.

- Should credits transferred from private and out-of-state colleges and universities count toward the limit? The sub-committee consensus is that they should count.

- An alternative is to only count credits earned at the UW (including UW Educational Outreach and foreign exchange programs). This means that every admitted undergraduate has the opportunity to study at UW up to the threshold without paying higher tuition.

- Students might exceed the threshold if they were unable to enroll in required courses because UW did not offer enough sections. How should they be treated?

- What financial aid should be available to students who exceed the threshold? Under current policy, students are eligible for all types of aid, with a few exceptions, up to five years of full time attendance. So a student who is making normal progress – about 45 credits a year – has five years to complete a bachelor’s degree. Then aid is extended beyond this on an appealable basis. The decision of whether to impose a surcharge is somewhat separate from determining eligibility for aid.
• Should the differential increase as the number of credits above the threshold increases? For example, a 10% increase for the first 30 credits above the threshold; 20% for 31 to 60 credits, etc. Clearly, many variations on this theme are possible, but it would be difficult to administer.

• An appeals mechanism would need to be established.

4. Lower tuition for “post-candidacy” graduate students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We recommend that the University set substantially lower tuition for “post-candidacy” graduate students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There is some support for charging a much lower rate of tuition for “post-candidacy” graduate students who are working primarily on dissertation research, rather than taking classes. The lower rate would cover costs such as library access, IT infrastructure and use, and minimal faculty time. Students would still earn credit for a full quarter’s worth of independent study credits. It should be noted that The Graduate School, as well as some graduates students we spoke with, strongly support this idea.

Post-candidacy reduction would improve the research environment for grant/contract-funded Research Assistants (RAs) in two ways. First, because there is an NIH cap on total cost for a graduate student (salary + benefits + tuition), and many programs are at or near this cap, lower tuition would increase room for a high post-candidacy salary. Alternatively, in disciplines lacking marketplace pressures to raise RA salary levels, Principal Investigators would experience lower total costs to support a graduate student, allowing grant funds to be invested elsewhere. Lowering the cost of graduate education would also improve faculty recruitment and retention as well as research productivity.

This policy would increase tuition revenue by inducing some graduate students to enroll who otherwise would be on leave. Conversely, it would decrease revenue to the extent that students who would normally choose to enroll at the current rate of tuition opt for the lower rate. The net impact on revenue depends on the relative size of both responses, which will depend on the difference between the two levels of tuition.

We recommend that The Graduate School appoint a task force to assess the advantages and disadvantages of post-candidacy tuition and develop options for the Provost.² One assignment would be to estimate the number of post-candidacy students likely to change enrollment status, the impact on revenue, and how the impact varies as a function of the difference between the two levels of tuition. If the revenue projections are negative, the task force would examine options for mitigating the loss. A second would be to examine possible non-financial benefits of such a policy. For example, departments may find it easier to communicate and engage with students who elect to enroll at the lower rate. A third would consider whether students electing to enroll at

---

the lower rate would be eligible for RA positions. Administrative issues would also deserve consideration.

An alternative to offering much lower full-time tuition would allow students to register for two credits in fall, winter and spring while continuing their independent work.

Many of our peer institutions charge lower tuition for “post-candidacy” graduate students. This policy change would make the UW more competitive to top students and thus aid recruitment efforts. The experiences of peer institutions who offer two rates may be informative regarding the nature and size of both the financial and non-financial benefits.

B. Need for additional financial aid following an increase in tuition and fees

This section reviews data on the relationship between increases in tuition and increases in the need for financial aid at the University of Washington. It then summarizes the subcommittee’s discussion about (1) how financial aid might be affected by a significant increase in tuition and (2) how the UW can better communicate financial aid opportunities for Washington residents. The discussion focused on financial aid issues stemming from across-the-board increases in tuition, especially for resident undergraduates. It ignored financial aid issues that might arise if some type of differential tuition policy is enacted.

1. The relationship between higher tuition and the need for financial aid

Data in the committee’s background materials show the relationship between higher tuition and unmet need. In 2008-09, total unmet need for all types of students is $63.8 million, and gross tuition revenue is $396.1 million. Column 3 of the table below shows the increase in unmet need for different increases in tuition based on algorithms from the Office of Institutional Studies. Column 4 shows the gross additional tuition revenue generated by each tuition increase. Column 5 shows the percentage of the increased tuition revenue that would need to be spent on additional aid to keep the level of unmet need at its 2008-09 level ($63.8 million). Column 5 does not make allowances for increases in other educational expenses or new federal spending on financial aid in the recent stimulus legislation (larger Pell grants, the $2,500 tax credit for expenditures on higher education).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage increase in tuition</th>
<th>Dollar increase in 2008-09 resident undergraduate tuition</th>
<th>Increase in unmet need (in millions)</th>
<th>Gross increase in tuition revenue (in millions)</th>
<th>Increased need as % of increased revenue*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$438</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
<td>$27.7</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$9.9</td>
<td>$39.6</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$938</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>$59.4</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$20.9</td>
<td>$79.2</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage rises because, besides the additional need of students currently receiving aid, higher tuition makes more students eligible for aid.
As an example, assume a 10% increase in tuition and no increase in federal spending on financial aid. The UW would then have to **devote 25% of the additional revenues to financial aid to keep students at a constant level of unmet need from tuition increases alone.** That is, students would receive additional grants to cover the cost of tuition increases, but the higher grants would not cover any aid needed to respond to increases in other costs.

There is another way to view the situation. If the University is devoting 7.5% of its adjusted gross tuition revenue to aid, then current aid is about $24.4 million.³ To increase aid by $9.9 million, which would offset the increase in unmet need created by a 10% tuition increase, the share of adjusted gross tuition revenue dedicated to institutional aid would need to increase to 9.6%. This is 2.1 percentage points (28 percent) higher than current policy.⁴

To eliminate the existing unmet need of approximately $63.8 million and the increased unmet need due to a 10% tuition increase, the UW would need to provide additional aid of $73.7 million beyond the base of $24.4 million. This would be a total commitment of $98.1 million to the aid programs. **To meet this commitment, the UW would need to devote 27.4% of each tuition dollar to aid -- more than triple the current percentage.** Some student need would still remain unmet, however, because of rising costs of other expenses and losses to family income during this recession.

*It is important to recognize that greater federal spending on financial aid will reduce unmet need below the figure in column 3, perhaps by a substantial amount.* Consequently, to keep students at a constant level of unmet need, the UW would actually have to devote less than 25% of the additional revenues (or, equivalently, 9.6% of adjusted gross tuition revenue) to financial aid. And to cover all unmet need, the percentage of each tuition dollar spent on aid would be less than 27.4%.

Note: The subcommittee completed all projections and estimates in this section before the details of the Federal stimulus package could be incorporated into the analysis. We did not have the resources to estimate how the package’s financial aid provisions would affect the results. Since the effects are probably substantial, we recommend that the UW redo the analysis to account for the stimulus package before deciding the share of new tuition dollars to be allocated for financial aid.

³ The background materials showed total tuition of $396 million. However, since gross tuition revenue is adjusted down before applying the 7.5% calculation, the aid figure of $24.4 million is less than 7.5% of $396 million.
⁴ For resident undergraduates, since 2003-04 unmet need has risen 52% in total and 41% on a per student basis, while resident undergraduate tuition has risen about 37% (figures not adjusted for inflation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total unmet need, resident undergraduates</th>
<th>Average unmet need, resident undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$36.8 million</td>
<td>$3,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$45.0 million</td>
<td>$3,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$55.8 million</td>
<td>$4,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Subcommittee discussion

In view of the subcommittee’s support for the high tuition/high aid model of financing the University, members expressed a strong consensus that:

- Tuition should be increased to cover the cost of the high quality education that is not provided by the State subsidy. When tuition increases, families that can afford to pay more, will. Some of the increased revenue should be used to expand financial aid to students who cannot afford the total costs.

- Moving in this direction is important because it serves the University goal of maintaining and, ideally, expanding the diversity of the student body, which improves all students’ quality of education. It also serves the broader goal of enhancing social justice in Washington.

- The University should ensure needy students continued access to the UW. This would require allocating sufficient funds in order to keep unmet need equal to the current level, after the tuition increase.

- Graduate students we spoke with cautioned that, in moving to the high tuition/high aid model, the University should be careful that financial aid allocation remains flexible enough to ensure that students from wealthy backgrounds who do not receive parental support are not precluded from receiving an education.

There is also support for continuing to raise tuition because doing so would further cover the educational costs not provided by the State subsidy and provide additional revenue to expand aid. Even with a 20% increase, UW tuition would still be more than $600 below the mean of the other 10 Global Challenge State universities. (This assumes the other universities do not raise tuition at all. If they all raise it only 5%, UW tuition would be about $1,200 below the average of these peers.)

The current budget crisis almost surely will result in a major cut in State support that will reduce the quality of UW education along many dimensions. The subcommittee observed that, while it would be unfortunate, UW leadership may not want to allocate enough additional tuition revenue to offset the increase in unmet need created by a tuition increase. Instead, leadership may prefer to use most of the revenue to make up for cuts in other resources that also affect educational quality (e.g. instructional staff, library services, IT services and equipment, student recruiting). The UW could partially offset the unmet need created by the higher tuition. To do so, it would need to allocate more than 7.5% of additional tuition revenue to financial aid, but less than the percentage needed to fully offset the increase in unmet need.

Expanding the share of adjusted gross tuition revenue allocated to financial aid may be a realistic goal in the long run, but perhaps not in the next biennium. Raising the share of tuition revenue to finance enough aid to eliminate all unmet need is probably infeasible given other budgetary pressures. Our graduate students noted that increasing tuition without commensurately increasing
financial aid transforms the “high tuition/high aid” model into, quite simply, a “high tuition” model.

The subcommittee recommends that the UW obtain data on peer institutions’ financial aid policies as a point of reference for assessing its own policy. For example, what fraction of tuition revenue do peer institutions allocate to financial aid? Which have a policy similar to Husky Promise? We recognize that for some policies it may be difficult to obtain data that can be meaningfully compared across institutions.

The subcommittee briefly discussed how the UW can better communicate financial aid opportunities for Washington residents. The Office of Financial Aid now has a “Financial Aid Estimator” on its web site that provides prospective applicants and their families an estimate of the type and amount of aid they might receive at the UW. We recommend that this valuable tool be prominently displayed on the opening page of UW’s admission and financial aid web sites.

We agreed the UW needs to develop more effective ways to communicate to parents and prospective students the variety of financial aid that is available (e.g., Husky Promise). Because of limited time, we did not develop specific recommendations for how to accomplish this.

The subcommittee agreed that announcing the new fall tuition before students decide whether to enroll at the UW would help them make a better informed decision on whether to enroll and improve their ability to make financial plans.

We spent most of our time discussing the implications of higher undergraduate tuition for financial aid, because it is the politically hot button issue. We did not delve into the implications of higher graduate tuition for financial aid because of limited time and the complexity of financial aid arrangements for doctoral and professional students (waivers, stipends, TA- and RA-ships, professional vs. doctoral students). We also lacked time and information to consider the implications of more costly fee-based programs for financial aid.

We acknowledged that reductions in TA-ships and RA-ships in response to the budget crisis will make it harder to recruit high quality graduate students, and, in the case of TA-ships, reduce the quality of undergraduate education. A UW task force is considering these issues in more detail and will provide recommendations for future graduate student financial aid policy.

III. CLASSROOMS

The subcommittee examined key issues regarding the use of general classroom space on the UW Seattle campus. The comments and recommendations are restricted to the Seattle campus (excluding health sciences), in recognition of the unique situations of Bothell, Tacoma and health science instructional programs;

We considered:

- the role of centralizing classrooms;
the ways to incentivize the scheduling of more classes earlier and later in the day and to increase the number of classes held on Fridays; and

the ways to streamline time schedule configurations.

In the past two years, two reports have addressed our existing policies and practices and made important recommendations. They are:

- Summary Core Campus Buildings Memorandum –prepared by Ad Hoc Committee, 2009

During the course of our discussions, we identified three key problems:

- disconnects between campus capital planning and classroom needs;
- distinction between bottleneck courses and high demand courses;
- imbalance of course offerings to maximize student advancement and planning.

The summary of our discussions is below.

A. Campus Capital Planning and Classrooms

Appropriately sized and equipped classrooms and a knowledgeable instructor are prerequisites for successful classroom-based student learning efforts. Over the past ten years, demand for suitable classroom and learning space at UW Seattle has grown appreciably. As undergraduate enrollments have increased over time, more courses and sections have been added to the curriculum. Despite increases in demand for instructional space, the number of general use classrooms has not kept pace with this demand. Although new classrooms have been added over the years, building renovations and demolitions have resulted in a net decrease in total classroom space. In recent academic terms, demand for classrooms has so seriously exceeded the available supply of space that rooms are not available, at the times and days requested, for many instructors. Most recently, the renovation and subsequent removal of a subset of classrooms from service in winter and spring terms of 2008-2009 have diminished available classroom access to the point where nearly 500 courses had no assigned rooms just prior to the start of Winter Quarter 2009.

Many aspects of our course offerings create demand for classroom space and pressure on the process of assigning courses to the pool of general use classrooms. Just as the number of courses offered at UW Seattle has steadily increased over the past five years, the array and complexity of course meeting times is also a considerable problem. Courses array in a complex pattern of times and days of the week, although the large majority are one hour long (at any given meeting) and typically meet in one of six combinations of one or more days of the week. Finally, most classes are scheduled in the morning and early afternoon hours. Those departments scheduling the most
courses in the curriculum disproportionately program their courses to start within the 8:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. window. In one sense, the classroom problem can be seen as a problem of the “commons.” What is best for individual departments/programs may not lead to the best outcome for the community as a whole. Departments are incentivized to seek more classroom space rather than to optimize classroom space usage.

To meet this challenge it is imperative that clear and cogent coordination and communication exist between classroom planning and scheduling.

B. Distinction between bottleneck courses and high demand courses

At major research universities, like UW Seattle, large-size lower-division lecture course sections are fundamental building blocks of the undergraduate curriculum. Often accompanied by quiz sections and lab sections, the large-size lecture is still one of the most economical ways to share knowledge with a large number of students. However, classrooms (i.e. lecture halls or auditoria) of sufficient size to accommodate large classes are expensive to build, maintain, and operate and are therefore of limited number at any institution. At UW Seattle the limited number of large lecture halls and the expanding number of large enrollment course sections often result in classes that cannot be accommodated during the usual daytime periods.

In 2002 then Provost Huntsman established a prioritization mechanism to resolve conflicts between these large enrollment courses. Intended as a three-tier grouping (bottleneck courses, high demand courses, and all other large enrollment courses), over time large enrollment courses have consolidated into either bottleneck or high demand courses. Originally, the bottleneck courses were to be given first scheduling priority into lecture halls. These courses were identified as having significant, cross discipline student demand and that without access to these courses undergraduate students were being denied entrance to many majors. The second tier courses, or high demand courses, were to be scheduled next. These lecture courses were generally courses that large numbers of undergraduate students desired due to the need for general distribution credits, compelling subject matter, and advisor recommendations for exploring potential majors. Any other large enrollment course, not listed as bottleneck or high demand, were the last to be scheduled into general use auditoria.

As noted above, the prioritization schema for large enrollment courses has not kept up with the evolving course offerings of our UW departments. Scheduling conflicts between large enrollment courses are growing, and conflicts are expected to be exacerbated as departments lose academic positions at all ranks and consolidate smaller sections into fewer large class sections. Early indications for Autumn Quarter 2009 show departments have asked for a 4.5% increase in the number of large (150 students or larger) courses. Readjusting the meeting times and days for large lecture sections also results in the need to readjust the many affiliated quiz and lab sections for the course as well. The after-the-fact adjustments burden departments as well as central office scheduling staff who are juggling 8,000 to 10,000 individual course sections for every academic quarter, trying to find appropriate meeting venues at the desired times and days of the week.

Ironically, anticipated budget reductions may alleviate some of the pressures currently affecting the general classroom pool. The College of Arts and Sciences, the largest user of the general use
classrooms, estimates that between 311 and 381 course sections will be dropped from the teaching schedule due to staffing cuts. As a consequence as many as 43,000 student “seats” may be lost.

In essence, there is a need for clear and cogent coordination and communication between central classroom scheduling of large courses into the available auditoria.

C. Balancing Departmental Rights vs. University Responsibility

Students need access to classes so they can progress toward their degree goals in a timely fashion. When multiple, required courses are scheduled concurrently, students are forced to delay enrolling in needed courses, which delays admission to majors and completion of degrees. Since economic factors confronting today’s students often require students to be employed as well as attend the university, students are seeking coordinated and compact class schedules that provide them opportunities to work, engage in public service and service learning, complete out-of-class group assignments and engage in informal learning and recreational opportunities that make up a vital college experience.

Similarly, departments plan course schedules juggling many factors: availability of instructors; availability of teaching assistants; availability of time in teaching class labs or studios; student demand and interest; and the historical pattern of offerings, to name a few. At the same time, the demands on faculty time for committee service, student advising and mentoring, issues surrounding research (securing increasingly scarce funding, completing research), scholarly writings, family and child care responsibilities, and larger teaching loads make it very difficult to convince faculty to accept class schedules outside fairly narrow time parameters.

With growing student enrollments and a static or decreasing number of general use classrooms, the question of how to maximize the use of the classrooms becomes a higher University priority. One of the scarcest resources at UW Seattle is space for new initiatives and programs. General use classrooms, especially those that appear to be underutilized, are targets for conversion and reassignment. The assumption that teaching can be accommodated ‘next door’ is commonly heard as justification for reducing classroom space during building renovations or new construction projects.

Autumn Quarter 2008 data reports that 83% of the courses assigned to general use classrooms are undergraduate level sections of which 70% are scheduled to start between 7:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Graduate level course sections make up 17% of all the sections in general use classrooms and 40% of graduate sections also start between 7:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Current data for the upcoming Spring 2009 quarter (the smallest of the three academic quarters in terms of course sections offered) show that there is zero availability of classrooms on a daily basis during the 10:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.-2:30 p.m. time periods; zero availability of classrooms on Wednesday during the 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. time period, and zero availability of classrooms on Tuesdays and Thursdays during the 11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. time period. (The Office of the Registrar was still seeking classrooms for approximately 44 course sections for Spring Quarter 2009 as of February 23, 2009.)

As a community, it is time for us to address the following questions:
• How do we satisfy the competing and sometimes opposing factors involved in course planning, scheduling, and teaching?

• Is the need to use classroom space throughout the normal work week (Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) incompatible with student access to courses or faculty work schedules?

• Is there value to the University to have its course offerings spread evenly across the day and across the week?

• How will departments adapt to budget reductions, and how will these impact traditional course offerings?

• What values are we as a learning community expressing by our current decentralized class planning?

• What “cultural changes” may be required in order to improve course access for students?

It is clear that budget cuts will likely lead to departments asking for larger classrooms, yet we have no space for additional classes of 300 students or above.

The University must improve the process of assigning courses to classroom space. Improvements must address the general challenges outlined above, establishing campus-wide policies on the use and the scheduling of classrooms, enhanced management support for room assignments and the scheduling process, closer coordination of room scheduling and classroom support services, and increased access to room scheduling information by departmental room coordinators, administrators and faculty members.

We recommend the following steps be taken between now and July 1, 2001:

**Prior to July 1, 2009:**

| The Provost, working with Undergraduate Academic Affairs (UAA) and the Office of the Registrar (OR), should implement technical changes for scheduling large-size (250+ enrollment) courses. |

• Redefine what constitutes a “bottleneck” course, eliminating the designation of “high demand” courses;

• Redefine the scheduling practices for large enrollment (250 or more students) courses as recommended by UAA and OR (Appendix A) including:
  - Pre-assign bottleneck courses into appropriately sized classroom;
  - Develop a rotational practice to ensure large-enrollment courses have equal access to classrooms during peak/high-demand hours over the biennium.
The Provost, working in conjunction with the Deans of the Schools and Colleges, should oblige each department, college, and school to offer more of its courses (both undergraduate and graduate level) in the early mornings, later afternoons, and evenings after careful analysis of the consequences to students, the campus culture and support activities (e.g., custodial access).

We recommend that this plan be implemented incrementally, beginning with the departments and programs that offer 50 or more unique course sections\(^5\) during any one academic quarter (starting as of Winter Quarter 2010):

- A minimum of 30% of undergraduate courses (100-499) offered at a starting time of 8:00 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. OR 1:30 p.m. or later;

- A minimum of 75% of graduate courses (500-699) offered at a starting time of 2:30 p.m. or later.

We recommend that the above minimums be incrementally increased so that:

- A minimum of 35% of undergraduate courses (100-499) be offered at a starting time of 8:00 a.m. or 1:30 p.m. or later and 80% of graduate courses (500-599) be offered at a starting time of 2:30 p.m. or later by Autumn Quarter 2010; and

- A minimum of 40% of undergraduate courses (100-499) be offered at a starting time of 1:30 p.m. or later by Autumn Quarter 2011.

We further recommend that by Autumn Quarter 2010, departments and programs that offer fewer than 50 unique course sections during any one academic quarter be required to offer:

- A minimum of 30% of all courses (100-599) at a starting time of 1:30 p.m. or later.

The Provost should charge an ad hoc group to review current institutional policies and practices and adopt University-wide values that are student driven for:

- the construction and preservation of classrooms at the University;

- the scheduling of UW classroom and learning spaces;

- the costs, academic impacts and student demand for videoconferencing in lieu of in-class meetings.

---

\(^5\) Departments with 50 or more 100-499 level sections offered (AQ2008) include: French & Italian; Physics; Communications; International Studies; History; Sociology; Spanish & Portuguese; Economics; Asian L&L; Computer Science; Music; Political Science; Psychology; Chemistry; General Studies; Mathematics; English. Joint and co-located course sections are counted as a single section. Data are from the Student Data Base, Census data.
We recommend a study of the academic impacts and student demand for videoconferencing be initiated.

The core of the discussion should include representatives from the appropriate Faculty Councils (Educational Technology, Educational Outreach, Instructional Quality, and Academic Standards). If endorsed by the faculty, a funding source to support the creation and long-term maintenance and operational support of the technology of videoconferencing should be established.

Prior to July 1, 2011:

We recommend that the Provost coordinate classroom planning and campus capital planning.

- Redefine standard capital project agreements to ensure preservation of classrooms in major renovation projections;

- Work with UAA, the University Libraries, and the Schools and Colleges to establish campus capital goals and on-going permanent funding for classroom maintenance and technology upgrades to ensure continuing usefulness of learning spaces;

- Work with UAA and the Schools and Colleges to establish future goals for inclusion of new classrooms and learning spaces in all major new construction projects in the central campus geographical zone. As a minimum, we recommend that all new academic and research buildings of over 20,000 gross square feet be required to dedicate a minimum of 5% of usable square feet to general use classrooms. Wherever feasible, the general use classrooms should be located on the ground or main floor of the new facility to maximize the public access to the teaching and learning spaces within the building.

We recommend the Provost charge an ad hoc group to address the issue of coordination of course offerings among departments to ensure student access

- Define when a bottleneck course section(s) should be scheduled based on a University, not departmental plan;

- Consult with department chairs and advisors on how to coordinate course schedules to enhance student progression towards acceptance into a major and towards degree completion;

- Determine how to better track teaching and learning in departmentally-owned spaces to upgrade the accuracy of reported utilization figures for UW Seattle;

- Modify classroom scheduling parameters to allow the Office of the Registrar the latitude needed to schedule course sections into general use classrooms, using class enrollment limits and technology needs as the higher priority, rather than geographical proximity to department headquarters during the peak demand hours of 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
The Provost should charge an ad hoc group to evaluate the current organizational structure of units and coordination of efforts by units responsible for:

- Classroom planning
- Classroom scheduling
- Instructional support
- Instructional research and development
- Faculty instructional training
- Faculty instructional tools
- Videoconferencing

IV. Fees

The Fees subcommittee addressed two issues: (1) fee-based degrees, and (2) UW student fees for matriculated students. The discussions surrounding these issues and subsequent recommendations follow.

A. Fee-based Degrees

An internal and external communication plan should be implemented.

After a brief discussion and a review of the materials, the subcommittee felt that fee-based degree programs had adequate principles, policies, guidelines, and procedures. However, they wanted to emphasize that fee-based degrees should not diminish the efforts of the University to acquire funding from the State or to undermine the mission of the University as a public good.

The group also suggested a communication plan for both internal and external audiences. Vice Provost Szatmary should spearhead an internal communication plan to better describe fee-based degrees to the University community to dispel any myths or misunderstandings. He should start with the Deans, Vice Provosts, and Vice Presidents and include relevant student leadership. After the State Legislature has finalized its budget decisions, he will also begin an external communication campaign to illustrate the student access that fee-based degree programs provide to the general public.
B. UW Student Fees for Matriculated Students

A central administrative unit within the University should proactively manage and oversee fees for matriculated students.

The subcommittee identified the two types of student fees that currently exist:

- user or service fees (e.g., a fee for use of the placement center, the request for transcripts), and
- course fees, which might be instructional or material/equipment based.

The subcommittee also focused on the categories of people assessed these fees:

- prospective students
- current students
- graduates of the UW

The group understands the complexity of the fee issue from the perspective of both the administration and the students. The administration wants to charge fees that cover costs but not to the extent that the fees become an undue burden to students or become a significant hidden expense. Fees must be transparent to students with an inclusive process involving student participation and with adequate notification to allow students to plan for extra expenses. The UW should consider the impact of the additional fees on student aid recipients.

The UW student fees have implications for the services provided to students and for student ability to attend the UW in a timely and holistic manner. To add further complexity, State laws, such as Initiatives 601 and 960, limit fee increases.

Currently, a general policy exists for UW student and other types of fees in the UW handbook in Administrative Policy Statement 33.1 (http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/APS/33.01.html). This policy relegates authority to establish fees to the Regents, the President, the Provost, the Deans and Vice Presidents in a decentralized fashion. Though the Office of Planning and Budgeting must maintain a database and circulate a list of the fees every two years, there appears to be no one office that has a proactive role to maximize fee collection, identify the impact of fees on the cost of a UW degree, or advocate changes in the general fee policy (e.g., Deans could make decisions about fees less than $100, rather than $50).

Because of the important services that fees fund and the complexity of the issue, the subcommittee strongly recommends that University student fees be managed proactively by a central unit in the UW, such as the Office of Planning and Budgeting. This type of central oversight would expand the current role of the Office of Budgeting and Planning to offer a central office to:

- develop a list of fees at the UW and their uses that would be circulated annually;
• review the establishment of new fees in the context of current UW tuition and fees before any new fee could be implemented;

• offer guidance about the pricing a new fee;

• automatically contact the appropriate UW units to suggest annual increases in student fees;

• understand and communicate the nuances of State regulations, such as 601 and 960;

• manage fees holistically to assess their impact as part of the total cost of a degree;

• identify a policy for the allocation of fee revenues between central administration, the school/college, and the department;

• refine and communicate the fee approval process; and

• develop a review process for new fees and fee increases that includes student leadership and Faculty Senate participation.
APPENDIX A

Bottleneck Courses\textsuperscript{i}
As of Autumn Quarter 2008

Applied Math .................................................301
Biology .........................................................180, 200, 220
Chemistry ......................................................142, 152, 162
Computer Science & Engineering ...............142
Economics .....................................................200, 201
Mathematics .................................................111, 112, 120, 124, 125, 126
Physics .........................................................114, 115, 116, 121, 122, 123

\textsuperscript{i} Applies only to large (125+ enrollment) course sections