CUSAD Teleconference call – Nov. 22, 2000 – 9:00 AM

Topic: Fiscal Accountability Measures

According to Laura Glatt there will be two reporting levels. Primary audience will be legislatures and the goal is too report one number without pointing out one particular institution.

Peer institutions have been identified by the cabinet to be used as sources for gathering data and is currently being reviewed for agreement as acceptable in this study.

It is important to narrow down if institutions should continue to include miscellaneous expense if peer schools do not use these costs.

Dale asked how the Financial Aid Director could get involved in working on the peer list. Laura stated that this process is currently in the hands of the President and VP of Finance. Directors will need to contact these people if you want to get involved.

Bob expressed concern that not everyone defines cost items the same. Perhaps we need to be more specific in requesting information.

Sandy asked if there was a better clarification for “discounted tuition rate”. According to Laura what is currently available is all there is.

According to Bob tuition and fees are easy items to gather and compare.

Sandy inquired about these schools with laptops (such as VCSU and Mayville). Peggy pointed out that those costs are not being considered in total cost of attendance.

Pat pointed out that “discounted tuition” is handled differently at institutions. Some institutions currently use this but consider it as a grant how it is handled is currently a marketing tool. Therefore, it would be extremely difficulty to assess.

Jeff asked for clarification of the intent of what we are trying to accomplish.

Peggy stated we want to find out how we compare with peers in our group regarding costs and what is available for students to meet these costs. This information will be used to build on the final result such as do we need to increase state grants, etc.

Bob pointed out there is big difference between “cost” and “affordability”. It is important to better understand what this all means.

Dale expressed concern about “what budget” do you actually use. Many institutions have a number of budgets depending on program. Which budget do you select?

All institutions use a base budget which would be appropriate in this matter.
Alice moved that we include tuition/fees, books/supplies, room/board and miscellaneous in the cost of attendance budget for resident students.

Pat pointed out that around the nation many schools don’t even have room/board because they don’t furnish housing.

Bob seconded.

It was pointed out that it is important to define what is included in miscellaneous so this can be used in the survey for comparison purposes.

Vote was called and motion carried.

**Student affordability**

According to Pat the “cost in relationship to the medium family income” plus “cost minus financial aid” are components used in determining affordability.

Alice indicated that it could be important to report “all” types of loans including alternative and Plus. Failure to include these loans will not show a true picture of what it costs students to go to schools.

Betty also mentioned not including Voc Rehab or any of the “other” types of aid could also affect “affordability”.

Alice disagreed and also feels we should “exclude Pell” since those programs such as the Pell follow the student from school to school and are not determined by the institution.

Dale felt there could be some real concern if you agree to include Pell but not the “other” sources of aid.

Jeff pointed out that receiving these types of aid is very important when it comes to students deciding where to go to school. Bob agreed because they pursue these options to make school affordable.

Alice proposed as a starting point we consider waivers, federal grants, institutional grants, state grants, other grants, subsidized loans, unsubsidized loans, Plus and all other loans, work-study earned, other.

Dale asked where scholarships come in?

Alice wasn’t sure that they should because they are merit based.

According to Laura, in terms of reporting they will be using a fiscal year basis. The first report will be issued for July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001.

Dale stated that some of this could be done by retrieval. Scott indicated that programmers are extremely busy at their end so expecting help from them would be difficult.
Dale recommended that we also include “other institutional awards” (which would include scholarships) in Alice’s recommendation. “Other” is aid not classified as loans, grants or work-study.

Bob asked if the information counts graduate and undergraduate? Dale feels undergraduate would only be appropriate. Jeff feels this wouldn’t be a fair comparison to peers. Alice felt this is too earlier to be worrying about his issue. Laura feels it is important to “keep it simple”.

Alice continues to feel that counting “institutional scholarships” will distort the picture in comparison to the national level.

The majority agreed that “institutional scholarships” affect affordability and failure to include would be a distortion. Alice insists on going on record that she disagrees.

(Sorry, I was disconnected at this point for the last five minutes spoke with Alice and Peggy for the following)

Also included in this would be external scholarships.

What are the realistic timelines for reporting on these two areas – Fiscal year 2001, 2002, or later? As a result of discussion it was suggested that Scott check the student records side to see what is available and then a recommendation will be made as to what year to go with.

Laura Glatt informed the group that one of the outcomes would be that a manual would be produced to include such tabbed areas as definitions, data sources, survey documents, who was responsible for various components (i.e. campuses or system) just to name a few.

Respectfully submitted:

Betty Kuss Schumacher