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1. Revenue

2. Productivity

3. Centers of Excellence

4. Strategic Planning

5. Serving the Underrepresented
Objective statement

• To develop a sustainable funding model that meets the system’s strategic directions and is consistent with state’s higher education objectives.
Assumptions

• Maintain access

• Consider all forms of revenue and financial aid

• State support will continue with limited increases
Work group

- Comprised of college and university administrators in academic affairs, student affairs, finance and financial aid, along with Officer of the Chancellor staff.
- Have met five times.
- Researched and reviewed all prominent forms of funding in higher education.
- Included discussions with Dennis Jones.
- Narrowing options to a few.
Primary characteristics

1. Maintain **affordability** to increase access

2. **Sustainable** (model will be used for foreseeable future)

3. **Predictable** revenue stream

4. **Positive revenue** stream
Preliminary findings

- No silver bullet
- Comprehensive approach employing several alternatives
- Design new strategies for existing revenue sources
  - major existing sources: tuition or state appropriation
Approaches still being considered

1. Need-based tuition grants (discounting)

2. Fund-raising

3. Alternative approaches to state appropriation

4. Differential tuition
Need-based tuition grants (discounting)

• Using tuition and institutional grants to establish different net prices for students based on need.

• Generating net positive revenue.

• Setting net price so that education is “affordable”.
**Fund raising**

**Advantages**
- Less dependent on state or student-generated revenue
- May temper tuition increases
- Can focus on needs of institution

**Disadvantages**
- Extremely small portion of current funding stream
- Perception that fund raising may be difficult for a government supported organization
Alternative approaches to state appropriation

1. Base biennial budget request on promoting affordability

2. Link to K-12

3. Others (developed during biennial budget process)
Differential tuition

• By program or major
  – Charging different tuition rates for different programs or majors

• By level
  – Charging different tuition rates for upper division and lower division
## Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue model discussion with Dennis Jones</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary policy options presented to Board</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary options discussed with constituent groups</td>
<td>Oct - Dec 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Council and Board review preliminary recommendations</td>
<td>January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents make final comments on proposals</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Council Reviews and Board approves recommended policy changes</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy incorporated into FY08/FY09 biennial budget request</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008/FY2009 budget request approved by Board</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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