

Survey of 2005-2006 State Tuition, Fee, & Financial Assistance Policies for Public Colleges and Universities

Q10. As an alternative to raising tuition, have individual institutions or state offices responded with attempts to reduce costs (e.g., eliminating programs, freezing new hires, delaying capital outlay projects, etc.)?

No Yes

Comments

| | No | Yes | Comments |
|---------------|----|-----|---|
| Alabama | | 1 | Each institution has handled it in a different fashion but some of the things that have been done are elimination of programs, no salary increases for existing staff, freezes on hiring new staff and replacement of staff who leave, delays on deferred maintenance and other capital projects |
| Alaska | 1 | | |
| Arizona | 1 | | |
| Arkansas | | 1 | |
| California | | 1 | Nearly all of the above have been done in addition to raising student fees during each of the past 3 economic recessions |
| Colorado | | 1 | |
| Connecticut | 1 | | not explicitly |
| Delaware | 1 | | |
| Florida | 1 | | |
| Georgia | 1 | | |
| Hawaii | 1 | | |
| Idaho | | 1 | Some institutions have eliminated programs, frozen new hires, limited to a degree enrollment, and all have delayed capital outlay projects |
| Illinois | | | |
| Indiana | | 1 | Individual institutions report to having taken many steps to reduce costs and keep tuition low. Those steps include: freezing or delaying hires, consolidating purchasing, delaying capital repairs & maintenance, eliminating low demand programs, consolidating health care & prescription plans. |
| Iowa | | 1 | The Regents directed the implementation of administrative efficiencies and other cost containment measures. |
| Kansas | 1 | | |
| Kentucky | | 1 | Institutions have implemented various cost saving initiatives involving energy, personnel reductions, and reorganization and consolidation. |
| Louisiana | 1 | | |
| Maine | | 1 | -workforce reduction thru attrition and deferred maintenance |
| Maryland | | 1 | Institutions have been under hiring freezes, reduced faculty and staff levels, and implemented efficiency initiatives to find more cost reducing activities. |
| Massachusetts | | 1 | Anecdotal evidence that physical plant maintenance projects were deferred. |
| Michigan | | 1 | Dozens of examples could be cited. 2,500 workforce reduction across the fifteen universities. Many operational efficiencies instituted. The schools have also created multiple group purchasing consortiums for things such as energy/utilizes and health care. |
| Minnesota | | 1 | Each college and university reallocates funds to cover compensation and other increases not covered by projected revenue. |
| Mississippi | | 1 | All of the above |
| Missouri | | 1 | Institutions have reduced costs by eliminating programs, holding positions vacant, expanding class sizes and consolidating departments. This was done not only to become more efficient but also to minimize tuition increases |
| Montana | | 1 | Because of restructuring our educational units under 2 flagship campuses, the system has come up with different ways of savings and efficiencies. |
| Nebraska | 1 | | |
| Nevada | | 1 | Annual efficiencies are renewed by Board of Regents |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| New Hampshire | | 1 | Reduction in USNH costs is ongoing expectation of Board, and have used Separation Incentive Plans to reduce staffing and significantly shifted benefit costs to employees in recent years. 2 year- declining public support combined with rising enrollments and salary increases negotiated for all state employees have resulted in double digit increases despite also instituting cost saving measures enumerated above. |
| New Jersey | | 1 | Individual institutions have implemented various "cost savings" cost control measures, but not directly tied to minimizing tuition increases. |
| New Mexico | | 1 | Limiting faculty and staff salary increases. Attempts to reduce health care costs. |
| New York | | | |
| North Carolina | | 1 | |
| North Dakota | 1 | | |
| Ohio | | 1 | Legislative and Regents interest in cost containment and operational efficiency was high in the most recent budget deliberations. With the help of state colleges and universities, the Regents produced the first 'Results through Productivity' report and shared the results of that report widely. A copy of that report has been sent separately to SHEEO. |
| Oklahoma | | 1 | Budget cuts in FY04 led to tuition increases in order to balance budgets. To minimize the tuition increases and still maintain a standard of excellence, institutions reduced their operational budgets in every functional area and continue to demonstrate their commitment to cost-effective operations. |
| Oregon | | 1 | no salary increase, no out-of-state travel, freezing new hires in the 2003-05 biennium. |
| Pennsylvania | | 1 | Increasing University efficiencies is an integral part of the budget process. Each year, the public 4-year Universities that are part of PASSHE are required to reduce costs through all of the above-mentioned methods, as well as through collaboratively providing academic and administrative services where possible. |
| Puerto Rico | | | |
| Rhode Island | | 1 | all items cited |
| South Carolina | 1 | | |
| South Dakota | | 1 | Not all needed increases have been covered with increases and the result is that the universities have had to control costs in many ways including not offering services. |
| Tennessee | | 1 | State appropriations have barely kept pace with inflation over a 10-12 year period, so cost reduction is well-practiced and well established here. |
| Texas | | 1 | Occasional wage and hiring freezes, postponed capitol outlay, postponed addition of or expansion of degree programs |
| Utah | | 1 | Each institution has attempted to reduce costs on respective campuses in order to minimize raising tuition. Institutions have delayed capital outlay projects as a result of limited state funds and the desire not to have students shoulder the costs of opening new facilities. Institutions have reduced the number of course offerings available to students and have delayed hiring additional contract faculty. Through these efforts USHE institutions have managed to reduce the overall tuition increases that students are asked to incur. However in the state of Utah, Legislative policy mandates that higher education institutions contribute a percentage of revenues to the legislatively approved compensation package which requires an automatic tuition increase each year to cover the additional expenses. |
| Vermont | 1 | | |
| Virginia | 1 | | |
| Washington | 1 | | |
| West Virginia | | 1 | Various attempts to reduce cost |
| Wisconsin | | 1 | State mandated administrative reductions have limited our ability to offset tuition increases (\$60M in FY04 and \$30M in FY05 of cuts not offset by tuition increases). |
| Wyoming | 1 | | |

TOTALS

16 32