

# State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Policies

---

*For Public Colleges and Universities*  
2010-11

February 2011

**SHEEO**

© 2011 State Higher Education Executive Officers

State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) is a nonprofit, nationwide association of the chief executive officers serving statewide coordinating and governing boards for postsecondary education. The mission of SHEEO is to assist its members and the states in developing and sustaining excellent systems of higher education. SHEEO pursues its mission by: organizing regular professional development meetings for its members and their senior staff; maintaining regular systems of communication among the professional staffs of member agencies; serving as a liaison between the states and the federal government; studying higher education policy issues and state activities and publishing reports to inform the field; and implementing projects to enhance the capacity of the states and SHEEO agencies to improve higher education.

# State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Policies

---

*For Public Colleges and Universities*  
2010-11

February 2011

Principal Author

Allison C. Bell

Contributing Authors

Julie Carnahan

Hans P. L'Orange



**Table of Contents**

List of Tables ..... 2

Foreword..... 3

Introduction ..... 4

Tuition-Setting Philosophy..... 5

Tuition-Setting Authority and Process..... 7

Tuition Setting for Resident Undergraduate Students ..... 10

Tuition Setting for Nonresident Undergraduate Students ..... 12

Other Tuition Polices..... 13

Student Fees ..... 15

Student Financial Assistance..... 17

Appendix A: List of Data Providers..... 26

Appendix B: State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Policies 2010-2011 Survey Instrument ..... 31

**List of Tables**

*Table 1:* Tuition-Setting Philosophy ..... 5

*Table 2:* Primary Tuition-Setting Authority ..... 7

*Table 3:* Role in Tuition-Setting Process..... 8

*Table 4:* Tuition Revenue Spending Authority ..... 9

*Table 5:* Factors Influencing the Setting of Resident Undergraduate Tuition ..... 10

*Table 6:* Resident Tuition ..... 11

*Table 7:* Non-Resident Tuition Setting ..... 12

*Table 8:* Loan Forgiveness ..... 13

*Table 9:* Fee-Setting Authority ..... 16

*Table 10:* Statewide Goals of Student Financial Assistance Policies..... 17

*Table 11:* Student Financial Assistance Programs Offered ..... 19

*Table 12:* Student Financial Assistance Programs Offered by Groups of Students ..... 20

*Table 13:* Response to Federal Tax Legislation ..... 23

## Foreword

This report, *State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Policies for Public Colleges and Universities: 2010-11*, examines the philosophies, policies, and procedures that influence decision-making regarding public college and university tuition, student fees, and student financial aid programs. This report also provides information related to general higher education affordability issues.

The intent of this report is not to provide actual tuition costs, but to focus on the policies that establish those tuition, fees, and aid amounts. Other sources, including the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board, the College Board, and the National Center for Education Statistics IPEDS data, make tuition rates and revenue publicly available.

This report is the seventh in a series of updates by SHEEO on this topic. The initial report, *Survey on Tuition Policy, Costs, and Student Aid*, was produced by John Wittstruck in 1988, and provided the foundation for all subsequent work. The 1993 update by Charles S. Lenth, *The Tuition Dilemma: State Policies and Practices in Pricing Public Higher Education*, has been widely cited in public policy circles and in scholarly publications. Melodie E. Christal later produced *State Tuition and Fee Policies: 1996-97*, which included updates on what were then new initiatives in higher education: student technology fees, and state prepaid tuition and college savings plans. The 2002-03 version by Christopher Rasmussen addressed the ongoing issues of tuition and fees policies and expanded information on the various goals and objectives of state-level student financial assistance policies including a report of the impact of state legislative term limits on higher education policy. The 2005-06 version by Angela Boatman updated the 2002-03 information and for many years provided the most current analysis of the policies both undertaken and anticipated for tuition, student fees, and financial aid. The 2010-11 report by Allison Bell updates the previous reports and provides information on the impact of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding.

Although the survey has evolved over the past two decades, it continues to address consistent questions. SHEEO is indebted to Alene Bycer Russell (formerly of SHEEO), and Cheryl D. Blanco from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) who developed the instrument upon which the current version is based. Over the years, input into survey revisions has been provided by SHEEO staff as well as various representatives of state higher education agencies.

We welcome your comments on this report and encourage you to browse its associated Web site at [www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit](http://www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit).

Paul E. Lingenfelter  
President  
State Higher Education Executive Officers  
Boulder, Colorado

## Introduction

The 2010-11 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Policies survey was administered in late summer 2010 by the national association of State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). State fiscal officers from each state were invited to respond to the survey. The survey was designed to gather information on the policies and guiding philosophies for setting tuition, fees, disbursing financial aid, and the impact of federal stimulus funding on tuition and financial aid. Given the recent economic changes across the nation and heightened attention on the financing of higher education, the 2010-11 survey is a timely update. In the months leading up to the administration of the survey, SHEEO received a large number of requests for updated tuition policy information.

SHEEO has administered similar surveys on a semi-regular basis (past reports are available online). The last survey, administered in 2005, served as the foundation for this survey. Except for instances of necessity or to help with clarification, questions were left unaltered to facilitate comparability of responses over time. A section on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) was added. There were nine sections on the 2010-11 survey:

1. Tuition-Setting Philosophy
2. Tuition-Setting Authority and Process
3. Tuition Setting for Resident Undergraduate Students
4. Tuition Setting for Nonresident Undergraduate Students
5. Other Tuition Policies
6. Student Fees
7. Student Financial Assistance
8. Alignment of State Fiscal Policies
9. American Reinvestment and Recovery Act

Forty-six responses from 45 states were received.<sup>1</sup> Michigan and New Jersey both responded that they would not be participating in this round of the survey due to ongoing policy conversations in their state. Nevada, Rhode Island, and Washington did not respond.

This report provides a summary of the survey responses.<sup>2</sup> While reviewing the report, it is important to be mindful that there are nuances of the policy process that are impossible to capture in any single survey or report. The survey responses do not fully reflect the development of the policy process over time, the intensive behind the scenes work of institutional, state agency, and legislative staff, or the hours of public discourse that go hand in hand in setting tuition, student fees, and financial assistance levels in each state. The responses broadly highlight state policies (both formal and informal), similarities and differences across the states, and how environmental factors might influence changes in these policies. The survey responses also delineate the entities that have a formal role in tuition, student fees, and financial aid policies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Two responses were received from New York. Both the State University of New York (SUNY) and the City University of New York (CUNY) systems submitted responses. With the guidance of the data providers in New York, the SUNY and CUNY responses were combined where appropriate.

<sup>2</sup> For more detailed state-level information, full responses are available on the SHEEO Web site ([www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit/responses10.xls](http://www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit/responses10.xls)).

### Tuition-Setting Philosophy

A state’s tuition-setting philosophy or approach serves to guide policymakers and others involved in the tuition-setting process and the majority of the respondents identified a philosophy or approach in their states. Over a third of the respondents suggested that the tuition-setting philosophy was tied to institutional budgetary needs. Many respondents also indicated that the statewide philosophy is that tuition should be low or moderate. In addition to the options on the survey, some respondents suggested that the tuition-setting policy was based on the ideals of access and affordability. Other respondents identified a philosophy that allows resident students an inexpensive education while requiring nonresident students to pay the total cost of their education. No state indicated a philosophy that “tuition should be high.” Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, and Pennsylvania reported that their states did not have a formal statewide tuition-setting philosophy or approach.

Table 1 displays the responses to questions on tuition-setting philosophy and approach from the current survey and three prior surveys. Caution should be exercised when comparing across years due to methodological differences.<sup>3</sup> In comparing the last two surveys, there are notable differences in the proportion of respondents indicating that the guiding philosophy in their state is that tuition should be moderate or as low as possible. However, in both of these survey administrations, almost half of the respondents indicated that tuition policy is guided by institutional-level philosophy or budgetary needs. Further, in the 2005-06 survey, both Minnesota and Pennsylvania responded that a guiding philosophy was that tuition should be high. However, neither state gave those responses in the 2010-11 survey. In earlier surveys, a majority of the responses indicated that the philosophy was that tuition should be as low as possible.

**Table 1: Tuition-Setting Philosophy**

Philosophy	2010-2011		2005-2006		2002-2003		1996-1997
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Tuition should be as low as possible.	14	19%	15	21%	14	28%	28%
Tuition should be moderate.	14	19%	8	11%	6	12%	28%
Tuition should be high.	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%	4%
Tuition policy is guided by institutional-level philosophy or budgetary needs.	23	31%	22	31%	12	24%	23%
No statewide tuition philosophy exists.	7	9%	9	13%	9	18%	
Philosophy differs by sector.	8	11%	5	7%	N/A		
Other	8	11%	9	13%	9	18%	17%
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>74</b>		<b>70</b>		<b>50</b>		

<sup>3</sup> In the 2010-11 and 2005-06 surveys, respondents were given the opportunity to select as many responses as they felt applied to their situation, so the total number of responses is greater than the number of respondents.

States were also asked to further elaborate on the rationale behind their tuition philosophy. Unsurprisingly, states often identified multiple rationales. These include:

**1. Meeting budget requirements in light of state fiscal outlook.**

Many states noted the need to offset changes in state budgets with changes in tuition rates. State budgets are shrinking, requiring higher tuition levels to meet institutional budgeting needs.

**2. Tuition levels should promote access and affordability.**

States are concerned with providing high quality education at affordable rates, even in the face of challenging economic conditions.

**3. Tuition rates should consider different institutional missions.**

A number of respondents indicated that institutional missions were taken into account when setting tuition levels and that institutions have requested changes in tuition rates in order to address their mission.

**4. Balance should be considered in setting tuition.**

Many states noted the importance of balance in tuition setting. This includes balancing both changes in tuition rates with changes in the availability of financial aid as well as balancing the state and student investment in financing higher education.

**5. Tuition should be comparable to peer institutions.**

Many states use their peer institutions and surrounding states to help determine tuition levels.

**6. Tuition levels are set in accordance with guiding documents.**

Guiding documents or constitutional mandates often provide a rationale behind tuition-setting policies in states. For example, in California, tuition-setting policies are set in accordance with the California Master Plan.

#### *Formalization of Tuition-Setting Philosophy*

In two states, the tuition-setting philosophy is formalized in the constitution; 11 states include tuition-setting philosophy in legislative statute; one state reported the philosophy was formalized by state rule, and 13 states indicated it is formalized by board rule or policy. Fifteen respondents indicated that their states' tuition-setting philosophies were not formalized in law or policy.

#### *Changes to Tuition-Setting Philosophy*

About half of the respondents indicated that over the last three years economic conditions brought about short-term changes to tuition-setting policy that are in contrast to the philosophy in their states. The responses suggest the economic conditions in the past three years have prompted increases in tuition rates. Conversely, six states reported that tuition rates had been capped or limited, or that ARRA funds were able to prevent increases.

In addition to the short-term changes brought about by recent economic conditions, 18 states noted that there had been more permanent tuition-setting policy changes in their state over the last three years. Nineteen respondents reported that there are ongoing discussions about how tuition-setting policies should be changed or how changes will be implemented in the future.

**Tuition-Setting Authority and Process**

States were asked to describe the process through which tuition levels are set. The variety of answers given underscores that there are as many processes for setting tuition as there are states. In many states, the process is a multi-step process involving many entities. In 10 states, the responsibility of setting tuition is left to individual institutions. Table 2 describes which entity has **primary** tuition-setting authority in each of the states.

**Table 2: Primary Tuition-Setting Authority**

Legislature (3)	Statewide coordinating or governing agency for multiple systems (11)	Coordinating or governing board(s) for individual systems (19)	Local district governing board(s) (2)	Individual institutions (10)
California Florida Louisiana	Colorado Hawaii Idaho Iowa Kentucky Montana North Carolina North Dakota Oklahoma South Dakota Utah	Alaska Arizona Connecticut Georgia Illinois Kansas Maine Maryland Minnesota Mississippi Nebraska New Hampshire New York Pennsylvania Tennessee Texas Vermont West Virginia Wisconsin	New Mexico Oregon	Alabama Arkansas Delaware Indiana Massachusetts Missouri Ohio South Carolina Virginia Wyoming

Comparing Table 2 to the same results from the last survey administration, there are some changes in the reports of primary tuition-setting authority. In the 2005-06 survey:

- Kansas and Massachusetts reported primary authority lies with a statewide coordinating/agency for multiple systems.
- Florida, Louisiana, Illinois, Texas, and West Virginia all gave multiple responses.
- Missouri, Oregon, Rhode Island, and South Dakota all reported primary authority rests with coordinating/governing board(s) for individual systems.
- New Mexico reported individual institutions had primary authority.
- Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Nevada, Washington did not respond to the 2010-11 survey.

Although states were asked to identify which entity has primary authority for setting tuition, primary authority is not always synonymous with full authority. The responses in Table 3 illustrate that many entities are involved in tuition setting, and each plays a different role in the process.

**Table 3: Role in Tuition-Setting Process**

	<b>Full legal decision-making authority</b>	<b>Informal or consultative role</b>	<b>No role</b>	<b>Other role</b>
Governor	4	23	12	5
Legislature	10	19	12	4
Statewide coordinating/governing agency for multiple systems	14	11	13	4
Coordinating/governing board(s) for individual systems	25	5	7	1
Local district governing board(s)	9	4	18	2
Individual institutions	13	22	2	5

Institutions are not passive players in tuition setting, even if they do not ultimately have primary authority in a state. Kentucky reported that individual institutions set tuition rates within very strict guidelines or parameters established by local or state-level entities. Eight states (Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, Ohio, Virginia, and West Virginia) reported that individual institutions set tuition rates within moderate or limited guidelines established by local or state-level entities. Eight states (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Mexico, South Carolina, Vermont, and Wyoming) reported that individual institutions set tuition rates with no external restrictions.

*Changes to Tuition-Setting Process and Authority*

When asked about recent changes in the tuition-setting process and authority, 33 respondents reported that there was no change. Of those who cited some kind of change over the past three years, the most common types of changes were:

- The governor had become more interested;
- There was a change in legislative culture that changed the tuition-setting process;
- Changes in economic conditions had resulted in formal changes to the process; and
- Processes had changed so that there was an earlier approval of tuition rates.

*Tuition Revenue Appropriation and Spending Authority*

The setting of tuition levels is not the only policy that is important when considering tuition policies. Equally as important (and as varied across the states) are policies on spending authority. That is, who “owns” the tuition revenue and has the prerogative to decide how it is to be spent. This authority might lie with institutions, states, or coordinating and governing boards.

Thirty-eight states reported that tuition revenues are retained at individual institutions; eight states reported that tuition revenues are deposited into separate institutionally designated state tuition accounts from which all funds must be appropriated prior to expenditure; three states reported that tuition is appropriated as a direct offset of the state general revenue appropriation; and one reported that tuition revenues are retained at the state level but under the direct control of a state governing or coordinating board. Table 4 displays the state-level detail. Note that some states may have multiple responses due to the possibility that tuition revenues for different systems are handled differently.

**Table 4: Tuition Revenue Spending Authority**

Tuition revenues are controlled and retained by individual institutions or campuses. (38)		Tuition revenues are deposited into separate institutionally designated state tuition accounts from which all funds must be appropriated prior to expenditure. (8)	Tuition is appropriated and is a direct offset of the state general revenue appropriation. (3)	Tuition revenues are retained at the state level but under the direct control of a state governing or coordinating board. (1)
Alabama	Mississippi	California	California	South Dakota
Alaska	Missouri	Hawaii	New York	
Arizona	Montana	Idaho	Texas	
Arkansas	Nebraska	Kansas		
California	New Hampshire	North Carolina		
Connecticut	New Mexico	New York		
Delaware	North Carolina	Tennessee		
Florida	North Dakota	Virginia		
Georgia	Ohio			
Illinois	Oklahoma			
Indiana	Oregon			
Iowa	Pennsylvania			
Kansas	South Carolina			
Kentucky	Texas			
Louisiana	Utah			
Maine	Vermont			
Maryland	West Virginia			
Massachusetts	Wisconsin			
Minnesota	Wyoming			

### Tuition Setting for Resident Undergraduate Students

There are many factors that influence decision making about tuition levels for resident undergraduate students. Out of 15 predefined factors, the top five most influential in 2010-11 were: 1) state fund general appropriations; 2) prior year's tuition; 3) institutional mission; 4) tuition charged by peer institutions; and 5) availability of/appropriations for financial aid.

Table 5 displays the responses states provided for each factor's level of influence along with the average level of influence (on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is "no influence" and 5 is "controlling influence"), and the rank (based on the average).

**Table 5: Factors Influencing the Setting of Resident Undergraduate Tuition**

Factor	No influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	Controlling influence	Average level of influence	Rank
	Number of Responses						
State general fund appropriations	0	0	3	33	8	4.11	1
Prior year's tuition	1	7	14	21	1	3.32	2
Institutional mission	5	5	16	17	0	3.05	3
Tuition charged by peer institutions	2	11	17	11	3	3.05	4
Availability of/appropriations for financial aid	3	11	15	14	1	2.98	5
Cost of instruction	8	12	7	14	3	2.82	6
State philosophy about the appropriate share of tuition costs to be borne by students vs. the state	6	13	17	6	0	2.55	7
Tuition policies of comparison states	11	16	13	2	1	2.21	8
Consumer Price Index (CPI)	11	18	12	3	0	2.16	9
A policy cap on the percentage or dollar increase for tuition	26	2	3	7	5	2.14	10
State workforce needs	13	15	13	2	0	2.09	11
State per capita personal or disposable income	14	15	11	3	0	2.07	12
Higher Education Price Index (HEPI)	15	16	6	4	1	2.05	13
SHEEO Higher Education Cost Adjustment (HECA)	30	9	3	1	0	1.42	14
Other inflation indices	34	4	1	0	0	1.15	15

*Limits to Raising Tuition*

Eighteen states have reported that, in the past three years, there has been a curb, cap, freeze, or other limit placed on tuition. Twenty-seven states reported that there has not been. Thirty-eight states reported that individual institutions or state offices have tried other things to reduce costs as an alternative to raising tuition. Fifteen states reported that their states have a policy that links increases in tuition to mandatory increases in financial aid.

*Differential Tuition*

Many states reported that differential tuition is used for resident undergraduate students. That is, different students might pay different tuition rates based on the following factors:

- Programmatic (varies by major or course) (28 states);
- On-site or classroom based instruction/Off-site or distance education (26 states);
- Credit/Non-credit (24 states);
- Lower division/Upper division (15 states);
- Credit hours beyond a specific number (e.g., credit hours accumulated above 140 are charged at a higher rate) (15 states);
- In-district/Out-of-district (two-year schools only) (13 states); and
- Cohort-based tuition (Fixed rate for a cohort of entering freshmen for some specified period of time) (11 states).

*Resident Tuition Rates and Variation*

Policies for setting undergraduate tuition may vary not only by state, but also by sectors and institutions within states. As Table 6 demonstrates, there is a lot of variation in the setting of undergraduate resident tuition. Seven states (Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, and Virginia) report that no statewide formal policy exists for setting resident undergraduate tuition. Most of the seven states reported that whether tuition is set per credit hour, at a flat rate, or with a surcharge above a certain number of credit hours, the method varies by institution.

**Table 6: Resident Tuition**

	Statewide Policy	Varies by Sector	Varies by Institution Within Sector
Tuition is set per credit hour regardless of how many credits the student is taking	4	8	17
Tuition is set at a flat rate for full-time students	8	7	22
A per credit surcharge is imposed at or above a specific number of credit hours	6	4	11
No formal policy exists on resident undergraduate tuition setting	7	0	5

### Tuition Setting for Nonresident Undergraduate Students

In a majority of the states, tuition setting for nonresident undergraduates is left up to the discretion of governing boards and/or institutions. Four states, California, Georgia, Virginia, and West Virginia, have mandates that nonresident tuition must cover the full cost of instruction (i.e., 100% of the cost of undergraduate instruction). In 12 states (see Table 7) nonresident tuition is indexed to resident tuition. In each of these states, nonresident tuition is at least two times resident tuition. Until 2011, Georgia's nonresident tuition was four times the resident tuition rate. In Vermont, the requirement is that in-state tuition can be no more than 40% of out-of-state tuition.

**Table 7: Non-Resident Tuition Setting**

Nonresident tuition is set at a mandated percentage of the cost of undergraduate instruction (4)	Nonresident tuition is indexed to the undergraduate resident tuition (12)	No formal policy exists on nonresident undergraduate tuition setting (22)	
California Georgia Virginia West Virginia	Alabama Alaska Connecticut Georgia Kentucky Massachusetts New Mexico North Dakota Pennsylvania South Dakota Utah Vermont	Arizona Arkansas Colorado Delaware Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Louisiana	Maine Missouri Montana Nebraska New Hampshire New York Ohio Oregon Tennessee Wisconsin Wyoming

### *Tuition Rates for Undocumented Immigrants*

In regard to policies concerning tuition rates for undocumented immigrants, seventeen states (9 more than in the previous survey) reported that policies regarding tuition rates for undocumented immigrants had been established. These include:

- States where undocumented immigrants must pay out-of-state tuition rates (Arizona, Colorado, Georgia);
- States that grant resident tuition to undocumented immigrants as long as they have established certain state-mandated residency requirements (California, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Wisconsin); and
- States that prohibit undocumented immigrants from attending state postsecondary institutions (South Carolina) unless they can satisfy certain requirements (Oklahoma).

In addition, 13 respondents reported that there has been no current discussion regarding offering resident tuition rates to undocumented immigrants in their states. This is down from 20 states that reported there were no discussions in the 2005-06 version of the survey. An additional 14 states reported that there has been discussion, but no policy has been implemented.

### Other Tuition Policies

#### *Reciprocity Agreements*

The regional associations (MHEC, NEBHE, SREB, and WICHE) have general undergraduate tuition reciprocity agreements established. In addition to regional agreements, many states report that they have other reciprocity agreements established. Examples of these are:

- *A specific reciprocity agreement with another state or states:* Iowa (for a specific program only), Idaho (if reciprocally provided to Idaho students), Kentucky, Minnesota, North Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin;
- *Reciprocity agreements for students living within a certain distance of an institution or state border:* Alabama, Arizona (with credit limits), Maine, New Mexico, and Utah;
- *Institutionally-based/system-based reciprocity agreements:* Arkansas, Florida (only with neighboring states), Maryland, Missouri, New York, South Carolina (only for institutions with students from certain counties), and Tennessee; and
- *Students from neighboring counties pay in-state rates:* Georgia, Indiana, and Ohio (not statewide).

Additionally, Oklahoma has a policy that allows institutions to grant selected out-of-state students a residency waiver so that those students may pay in-state tuition rates. Pennsylvania has a similar policy and also has a financial aid reciprocity program.

#### *Loan Forgiveness and Loan Repayment Programs*

Many states offer loan forgiveness for students who enter certain professional fields. Table 8 provides a summary:

**Table 8: Loan Forgiveness**

	Offered under state statute	On-the-job repayment	Other
Teaching	17	19	3
Nursing	14	17	3
Medicine/ Dentistry/ Optometry	12	15	3
Engineering	4	2	0
Information Technology	1	1	0
Child care	2	5	1

Nineteen states also identified other loan forgiveness programs. These include programs that include STEM fields, law, speech-language pathology, library science, and others. Some of the programs are only for graduates who are working in high-need areas or with high-need populations.

*Tuition Policy Differences Between Two-Year and Four-Year Institutions*

Twenty-five states commented on philosophy or policy differences between their two-year and four-year sectors. Some states cited that two-year colleges are less expensive by philosophy, policy, or practice. The point of this is to ensure access, help with workforce training, or because two-year institutions are aligned with state affordability goals (Arkansas, California, Georgia, Indiana, Montana, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia). Alabama and Colorado cited that limits on tuition increases, caps, or freezes have been implemented or were easier to implement at two-year institutions. In many states, no specific philosophical differences were reported between the sectors, but respondents suggested there may be inherent differences due to two-year institutions having different boards than four-year institutions.

## Student Fees

Just as there are a range of policies to set tuition levels, there are a variety of policies across the states for setting student fees. In this section, the term “fees” applies only to mandatory fees, as opposed to designated fees. Mandatory fees are defined as charges that most full-time students are required to pay in addition to tuition. Designated fees are defined as charges that apply to specific classifications only, such as certain courses, programs, services, or groups of students.

### *Statewide Student Fees Philosophy*

States reported that institutions can set fees, governing boards can approve fees, or a combination of the two exists in their state. When setting mandatory fees, there were different philosophies that guided decision making. Both Connecticut and Hawaii specifically mentioned a philosophy that student fees should be minimized. Other states (such as Arkansas, Indiana, Utah, and Vermont) reported that institutions set fees based on institutional budgetary needs or in response to lower levels of state support. In Florida and Pennsylvania, fees are set at 10% of tuition. Students are given a voice in decisions about fees in Colorado and Georgia.

Only Arkansas reported that the coordinating board has the constitutional authority to establish fee policies for funding purposes but local boards have the authority to establish the actual fee rates. Twelve states reported that student fee policies are defined in legislative statute. About half (21) of the states reported that the fees philosophy was defined by board rule or policy. Eleven states reported that they had no formal policy on student fees.

### *Changes in Fees Policy*

Only a handful (5) of states reported that their fee policies have changed in the last three years. Examples from four of these states follow:

- The Florida Board of Governors now can approve new fees up to 10% of tuition;
- Fees at the four-year institutions in North Carolina have been capped at 6.5% of tuition;
- Oregon has rolled all programmatic fees into tuition for the university system;
- Georgia’s policies have changed so that student participation on fee committees has been expanded and fees are required to be used for the purposes for which they were collected.

Looking forward, only six states report that changes in fee policies are being considered. California, with a large deficit, reports that there is always potential for fee policy changes. Indiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Ohio indicate there are reviews of student fees underway.

*Limits on Raising Student Fees*

In the past three fiscal years, 13 states have considered or placed limits on fee increases or charges. Examples of these include:

- In Florida and North Carolina, fee increases are limited to a set percentage of tuition;
- In Idaho and Kentucky, fees are limited to a certain percentage increase;
- Governors in Georgia, Oklahoma, and West Virginia recommended a moratorium on fee increases;
- Montana reported that fees are not permitted to increase more than the CPI;
- Maine reported that fee increases could only be as high as the percentage increase in tuition.

*Authority to Set Student Fees*

Authority to set student fees tends to be the prerogative of institutions and system governing boards. In 15 states, the state coordinating or governing board has the authority to set fees (see Table 9). Virginia reported that the governor has the authority to set mandatory and designated fees, although the governor has not exercised this right to date.

**Table 9: Fee-Setting Authority**

	<b>Mandatory Fees</b>	<b>Designated Fees</b>
Governor	1	1
Legislature	7	1
State coordinating/governing agency	15	7
Individual system governing board(s)	23	13
Local district governing boards	12	8
Individual institutions	22	26

Note: Respondents were able to select all that apply

*Student Fee Policy Differences Between Two-Year and Four-Year Institutions*

In eleven states, there are differences by sector in setting student fees. In Idaho, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming, the differences are attributed to different boards governing the two-year and four-year sectors in these states. Arkansas and West Virginia reported philosophies that intentionally keep two-year institution student fees low. Virginia and Texas commented that student fees at two-year institutions are lower because there are fewer activities supported by student fees. California state law restricts increases of mandatory community college fees and Florida’s two-year institutions must seek legislative approval for any student fee increases.

### Student Financial Assistance

Most of the states surveyed reported on their statewide student financial assistance programs. These programs help defray the cost of attending higher education for students and their families. Different states' programs have different goals and rationales behind them. Table 10 summarizes the goals of student financial assistance policies in the states. States were asked to rank the level of influence each goal has on their financial assistance programs on a scale of 1 to 4 (where 1 was "no influence" and 4 was "significant influence"). Table 10 also displays the average level of influence and the rank (based on the average level of influence) of each goal.

**Table 10: Statewide Goals of Student Financial Assistance Policies**

Goal	No influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	Average level of influence	Rank
	Number of Responses					
Promote broad access to higher education	0	1	4	28	3.82	1
Improve the affordability of higher education	0	1	7	25	3.73	2
Keep talented students in the state	5	4	13	11	2.96	3
Promote student retention and degree completion	4	10	12	7	2.87	4
Recognize talent and reward effort of students	4	7	15	7	2.80	5
Facilitate student choice among higher education providers in the state	5	13	8	6	2.55	6
Prepare and place students into specific careers	4	10	16	2	2.41	7
Help equalize tuition between public and independent institutions in the state	14	10	7	1	1.80	8

Not only do access and affordability get the highest scores, they also are selected as the most influential factors in a majority of the states (14 states indicated that they promote access, 9 states indicated affordability, 9 states indicated both, and 5 additional states included access and affordability in a list of factors). The rankings of the factors have not changed since the last administration of the survey.

Of the states with a formalized financial aid policy philosophy, 20 states reported that the financial aid philosophy is in legislative statute and one reported that it is in the constitution. In 10 states, the financial aid philosophy is by board rule. In some states, the financial aid philosophy can be found in more than one of these. For example, Massachusetts reported that financial aid policy is in legislative

statute, state rule, and board policy. Thirteen states do not have a formalized philosophy on student financial assistance.

#### *Changes in Financial Aid Policy*

A number of states identified changes and proposed changes in their financial aid policy. New programs were established in Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin. Changes to existing programs were reported by:

- Colorado, where institutions will have more flexibility in allocating state aid beginning in fiscal year 2011-12;
- Florida, which changed its Bright Futures program to a flat award;
- Maryland, where several workforce-related programs were consolidated;
- Nebraska, where the Pell eligible need-based parameter fell to \$6,000;
- New York, where requirements for Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) funds have tightened;
- Oklahoma's legislature dedicated a funding source for the fiscal year 08-09 Oklahoma's Promise;
- Wisconsin, where the University of Wisconsin System Board developed new financial aid policy principles and the state provided funding for a tuition increase grant program; and
- Wyoming, where the opportunities for students in community colleges to transfer and receive state scholarships to the universities have been expanded.

#### *The Merit/Need Balance*

Thirty-nine states reported that there is no policy regarding the mix of merit-based and need-based aid. Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Texas all reported a formal policy. Specifics of each of these states' policies can be found in the full results available online at the SHEEO Web site ([www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit/responses10.xls](http://www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit/responses10.xls)).

#### *Statewide Student Financial Assistance Programs*

Need-based grants and programs designed to increase access are the most prevalent types of financial assistance programs. Only one state (Georgia) does not offer need-based grants, and only four states (Missouri, Nebraska, Virginia, and Wyoming) do not have specifically targeted programs. Table 11 displays student financial assistance programs offered in the states. Table 12 displays student financial assistance for particular groups of students.

**Table 11: Student Financial Assistance Programs Offered**

	Offered under state statute	Offered through a formal policy but not in statute	Offered at discretion of institutions	Not offered
Need-based grants	42	1	12	1
General statewide merit-based scholarships	25	6	11	7
Specifically targeted merit-based scholarships	17	3	20	8
Loan forgiveness programs	34	3	3	6
State-funded work-study programs	12	3	5	23
State-funded guaranteed loans	9	1	0	30
Programs designed to increase access/participation of members of specific groups/populations	24	9	10	4
State tax credits or tax deductions	18	1	0	19

Note: Respondents were able to select all that apply

**Table 12: Student Financial Assistance Programs Offered by Groups of Students**

	Offered under state statute	Offered through a formal policy but not in statute	Offered at discretion of institutions	Not offered
Graduate assistants	7	0	31	0
Student Athletes	2	0	36	2
Faculty/staff members	6	0	21	2
Dependents of faculty/staff members	4	0	19	8
State employees/civil servants (other than faculty/staff)	4	0	6	31
Dependents of state employees/civil servants	3	0	3	37
Dependents of deceased police officers or firefighters	32	0	2	8
Participants in public service programs	6	0	8	28
Military (Active)	30	0	5	4
Military (Honorably discharged)	26	0	8	7
Dependents of military	24	0	7	7
Senior citizens	18	0	11	8
Students who qualify for need-based aid	18	0	17	4
Students who qualify for merit-based aid	12	0	23	3

Some states identified groups that were offered waivers other than those displayed in Table 12. For example, Illinois offers special education grants, Department of Children and Family Services Scholarships and Fee Waivers, foreign exchange student waivers, and student service waivers. Minnesota offers waivers to wards of the state or war orphans.

One of the largest populations receiving financial assistance is members and family members of the military. The states that offer some kind of assistance to the military include Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Maine, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The most common form of assistance is to offer in-state tuition to military (and often their dependents) regardless of their state of legal residence.

#### *Differences in Philosophy by Sector*

Most states did not comment about differences in student financial assistance philosophy or policy by sector. A few responses from states that did note differences include California where community colleges are authorized to operate a specific “fee waiver” program that the four-year sector is not authorized to use. Arkansas, Indiana, and Kansas cited the lower cost of two-year institutions as a reason for differences in financial assistance. Tennessee and Texas noted that a higher amount of financial aid funds is distributed to four-year institutions.

#### *Financial Assistance to Students Attending Independent Institutions*

Many states reported that there are financial assistance funds available for students attending independent institutions. Only Montana and New Hampshire reported that there are no financial assistance funds for students attending independent institutions. There is variation among the states as to how financial aid dollars are awarded to students attending independent institutions:

1. There is no difference in eligibility for students attending either independent or public institutions in:
  - Florida
  - Kansas
  - Louisiana
  - Massachusetts
  - Maryland
  - Maine
  - Minnesota
  - Missouri
  - New York
  - South Dakota (eligible for merit-based aid only)
  - Utah
  - West Virginia
2. A separate program exists for students attending independent institutions in:
  - Alabama
  - Oklahoma (students also eligible for other state scholarships)
  - Virginia
  - Texas
3. Need-based aid and work-study dollars available for students enrolled in independent institutions in:
  - Colorado
  - Delaware
  - Iowa
  - North Dakota
  - Nebraska
  - South Carolina
  - Wisconsin
4. Students attending independent institutions are awarded higher amounts of aid in:
  - Ohio
  - Tennessee

Additionally, Kentucky reports that the cost differential is factored into the determination of need-based aid at private institutions and North Carolina reports that all residents attending the state's private colleges are awarded funds, with additional funding available based on need.

*Prepaid Tuition or College Savings Account Plan Changes*

Twelve states commented on the possibility of changes being made to a prepaid tuition or college savings account plan. Maryland is considering a broker-dealer plan in the future (there are already two programs offered directly by the state). Ohio is hoping to reinstate a prepaid tuition program within the coming year. Utah has simplified the enrollment process for its plan. One state, West Virginia, is no longer accepting new applicants for its plan although existing agreements are being honored. Iowa, Indiana, Massachusetts, Maine, Minnesota, North Carolina, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin reported that there are no changes planned for existing plans.

## Alignment of State Fiscal Policies

Twenty-two states reported that some kind of initiative is being discussed to address the issue of college affordability for students and their families. These states are Alaska, Alabama, Delaware, Iowa, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Additional information on these initiatives can be found in the full survey responses on the SHEEO Web site ([www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit/responses10.xls](http://www.sheeo.org/finance/tuit/responses10.xls)).

### *Response to Federal Tax Legislation*

States had various responses to federal tax legislation when considering tuition and fee policies. Table 13 summarizes these. The most common response was to create a college savings plan or prepaid tuition policy.

**Table 13: Response to Federal Tax Legislation**

	Action taken	Under consideration	Not under consideration
Raise tuition to take advantage of new tax credits	1	1	37
Take federal tax credits into account when calculating state student aid eligibility	2	2	34
Create state-level programs that replicate the federal initiatives	3	1	35
Conform the state tax code to federal policy to simplify the tax process for families	3	3	31
Create a state prepayment or college savings plan	25	1	15
Publicize the availability of federal tax credits as a means to finance college	10	3	24
Provide bridge loans to students	0	1	36

*Relationship between Policies*

As expected, there are varying levels of coordination between tuition and fee policy and tuition and financial aid policies. In Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York (SUNY), Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, and Wisconsin, there is no formal relationship between tuition policies and fee policies. In a majority of the other states, there is an informal relationship or it was reported that they are viewed as similar. In a handful of states, there is a single policy covering both tuition and fees.

The relationships between tuition policies and financial aid policies are a little more complex. In some states, financial aid is a mandatory percentage of tuition; in other states a less formal relationship was reported. Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Maine, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, and West Virginia reported that no relationship exists.

### **American Reinvestment and Recovery Act**

Beginning in fiscal year 2009, American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funds have been available to states. ARRA funding was distributed in order to help replace declining state funds. In 2009, about \$2.3 billion was used by states to replace appropriations for higher education. Every state participating in the 2010-11 State Tuition, Fees, and Student Financial Assistance Policy study except Wisconsin reported having received ARRA funds. Twenty-nine of these states reported that the availability of ARRA funds helped to keep tuition and fee increases at a minimum. Ten states reported that the availability of ARRA funds likely prevented reductions to state financial aid.

**Appendix A:  
List of Data Providers**

**Alabama**

Susan Cagle  
Director, Institutional Finance and Facilities  
Alabama Commission on Higher Education  
P. O. Box 302000  
Montgomery, AL 36130-2000  
(334) 242-2105  
[susan.cagle@ache.alabama.gov](mailto:susan.cagle@ache.alabama.gov)

**Alaska**

Saichi Oba  
Associate Vice President for Student Services &  
Enrollment Management  
University of Alaska System  
910 Yukon Drive, Suite 202  
P.O. Box 755000  
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5000  
(907) 450-8144  
[stoba@alaska.edu](mailto:stoba@alaska.edu)

**Arizona**

Gale Tebeau  
Assistant Executive Director for Business and  
Finance  
Arizona Board of Regents  
2020 North Central Ave., Suite 230  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
(602) 229-2522  
[gale.tebeau@azregents.edu](mailto:gale.tebeau@azregents.edu)

**Arkansas**

Jackie Holloway  
Senior Associate Director for Finance  
Arkansas Department of Higher Education  
114 East Capitol Ave.  
Little Rock, AR 72201-3818  
(501) 371-2026  
[Jackie.Holloway@adhe.edu](mailto:Jackie.Holloway@adhe.edu)

**California**

Kevin Woolfork  
Budget Policy Coordinator  
California Postsecondary Education Commission  
770 L Street, Suite 1160  
Sacramento, CA 95814-3396  
(916) 445-1000  
[kwoolfork@cpec.ca.gov](mailto:kwoolfork@cpec.ca.gov)

**Colorado**

Andrew Carlson  
Budget and Financial Aid Director  
Colorado Department of Higher Education  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1600  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 866-2723  
[andrew.carlson@dhe.state.co.us](mailto:andrew.carlson@dhe.state.co.us)

**Connecticut**

Nancy Brady  
Director, Finance & Administration  
Connecticut Department of Higher Education  
61 Woodland Street  
Hartford, CT 06105-2326  
(860) 947-1848  
[nbrady@ctdhe.org](mailto:nbrady@ctdhe.org)

**Delaware**

Maureen Laffey  
Director  
Delaware Higher Education Commission  
Carvel State Office Building, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
820 N. French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 577-5240  
[mlaffey@doe.k12.de.us](mailto:mlaffey@doe.k12.de.us)

**Florida**

Tim Jones  
Chief Financial Officer  
Florida Board of Governors  
State University System  
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1614  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400  
(850) 245-0466  
[tim.jones@flbog.edu](mailto:tim.jones@flbog.edu)

**Georgia**

Usha Ramachandra  
Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Affairs  
Board of Regents of the University System of  
Georgia  
270 Washington Street, SW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334  
(404) 657-1312  
[usha.ramachandran@usg.edu](mailto:usha.ramachandran@usg.edu)

**Hawaii**

Linda K. Johnsrud  
Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy  
University of Hawai'i System  
Bachman 204  
2444 Dole Street  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
(808) 956-7075  
[johnsrud@hawaii.edu](mailto:johnsrud@hawaii.edu)

**Idaho**

Scott Christie  
Financial/Performance Audit Manager  
Idaho State Board of Education  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0037  
(208) 332-1581  
[scott.christie@osb.idaho.gov](mailto:scott.christie@osb.idaho.gov)

**Illinois**

Matt Berry  
Assistant Director, Fiscal Affairs  
Illinois Board of Higher Education  
431 East Adams, 2nd Floor  
Springfield, IL 62701  
(217) 557-6360  
[Berry@ibhe.org](mailto:Berry@ibhe.org)

**Indiana**

Joe Gubera  
Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning  
Studies  
Indiana Commission for Higher Education  
101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1984  
(317) 464-4400  
[jong@che.in.gov](mailto:jong@che.in.gov)

**Iowa**

Brad Berg  
Policy and Operations Officer  
Board of Regents, State of Iowa  
11260 Aurora Avenue  
Urbandale, IA 50322  
(515) 281-3936  
[baberg@iastate.edu](mailto:baberg@iastate.edu)

**Kansas**

Diane Duffy  
Vice President for Finance and Administration  
Kansas Board of Regents  
1000 SW Jackson St., Suite 520  
Topeka, KS 66612  
(785) 296-3421  
[dduffy@ksbor.org](mailto:dduffy@ksbor.org)

**Kentucky**

William Payne  
Senior Associate, Finance  
Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education  
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 320  
Frankfort KY 40601  
(502) 573-1555 ext. 226  
[bill.payne@ky.gov](mailto:bill.payne@ky.gov)

**Louisiana**

Barbara Goodson  
Associate Commissioner for Finance and  
Administration  
Louisiana Board of Regents  
P.O. Box 3677  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677  
(225) 342-4253  
[Barbara.goodson@regents.la.gov](mailto:Barbara.goodson@regents.la.gov)

**Maine**

Miriam White  
Director of Budget and Financial Analysis  
University of Maine System  
16 Central Street  
Bangor, ME 04401  
(207) 973-3343  
[mwhite@maine.edu](mailto:mwhite@maine.edu)

**Maryland**

Geoffrey Newman  
Director of Finance Policy  
Maryland Higher Education Commission  
839 Bestgate Road, Suite 400  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
(410) 260-4554  
[gnewman@mhec.state.md.us](mailto:gnewman@mhec.state.md.us)

**Massachusetts**

Alison MacDonald  
Director of Administration and Finance  
Massachusetts Department of Higher Education  
One Ashburton Place, Room 1401  
Boston, MA 02108  
(617) 994-6907  
[amacdonald@bhe.mass.edu](mailto:amacdonald@bhe.mass.edu)

**Minnesota**

Susan Anderson  
Program Director for Budget  
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities  
Wells Fargo Place  
30 7<sup>th</sup> Street East, Suite 350  
St. Paul, MN 55101-7804  
(651) 201-1707  
[susan.anderson@so.mnscu.edu](mailto:susan.anderson@so.mnscu.edu)

**Mississippi**

Chris Halliwell  
Director of University Financial Analysis  
Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning  
3825 Ridgewood Rd.  
Jackson, MS 39211  
(601) 432-6561  
[challiwell@mississippi.edu](mailto:challiwell@mississippi.edu)

**Missouri**

Paul Wagner  
Deputy Commissioner  
Missouri Department of Higher Education  
3515 Amazonas Drive  
Jefferson City, MO 65109  
(573) 751-2361  
[paul.wagner@dhe.mo.gov](mailto:paul.wagner@dhe.mo.gov)

**Montana**

Mick Robinson  
Deputy Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs/Chief of Staff  
Montana University System  
2500 Broadway St., P.O. Box 203201  
Helena, Montana 59620-3201  
(406) 444-0319  
[mirobinson@montana.edu](mailto:mirobinson@montana.edu)

**Nebraska**

Carna Pfeil  
Associate Director  
Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education  
P.O. Box 95005  
Lincoln, NE 68509-5005  
(402) 471-0029  
[carna.pfeil@ccpe.ne.gov](mailto:carna.pfeil@ccpe.ne.gov)

**New Hampshire**

Ken Cody  
Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs & Treasurer/CFO  
University System of New Hampshire  
19 Garrison Ave.  
Durham, NH 03824  
(603) 862-1622  
[ken.cody@usnh.edu](mailto:ken.cody@usnh.edu)

**New Mexico**

Debbie Garcia  
Senior Financial Coordinator  
New Mexico Higher Education Department  
2048 Galisteo St.  
Santa Fe, NM 87505-2100  
(505) 476-8207  
[deboraha.garcia@state.nm.us](mailto:deboraha.garcia@state.nm.us)

### **New York**

Cathy Abata  
Acting Deputy Budget Director  
City University of New York System  
230 West 41<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10036  
(646) 746-4274  
[catherine.abata@mail.cuny.edu](mailto:catherine.abata@mail.cuny.edu)

Wendy C. Gilman  
SUNY System Administration  
State University of New York System  
State University of New York, State University  
Plaza  
Albany, NY 12246  
(518) 320-1319  
[wendy.gilman@suny.edu](mailto:wendy.gilman@suny.edu)

### **North Carolina**

Karen Russell  
Accounting Technician  
University of North Carolina, General  
Administration  
910 Raleigh Rd.  
P.O. Box 2688  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514  
(919) 962-4606  
[ktr@northcarolina.edu](mailto:ktr@northcarolina.edu)

### **North Dakota**

Laura Glatt  
Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs  
North Dakota University System  
600 E Boulevard, Dept 215  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0230  
(701) 328-4116  
[laura.glatt@ndus.nodak.edu](mailto:laura.glatt@ndus.nodak.edu)

### **Ohio**

Kathleen Hensel  
Director, Finance  
Ohio Board of Regents  
30 East Broad Street, 36th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
(614) 466-6675  
[khensel@regents.state.oh.us](mailto:khensel@regents.state.oh.us)

### **Oklahoma**

Amanda Paliotta  
Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance  
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
655 Research Parkway, Suite 200  
Oklahoma City, OK 73107  
(405) 225-9126  
[apaliotta@osrhe.edu](mailto:apaliotta@osrhe.edu)

### **Oregon**

Ken Mayfield  
Senior Fiscal Analyst  
Oregon University System  
P.O. Box 3175  
Eugene, OR 97403-0175  
[Ken\\_Mayfield@ous.edu](mailto:Ken_Mayfield@ous.edu)

### **Pennsylvania**

Lois Johnson  
Director of Financial Management  
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education  
2986 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Dixon University Center  
Harrisburg, PA 17055  
(717) 720-4122  
[loisjohnson@passhe.edu](mailto:loisjohnson@passhe.edu)

### **South Carolina**

Gary S. Glenn  
Director for Finance, Facilities & MIS  
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education  
1333 Main St., Suite 200  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 737-2155  
[gglenn@che.sc.gov](mailto:gglenn@che.sc.gov)

### **South Dakota**

Monte R. Kramer  
Vice President for Administrative Services  
South Dakota Board of Regents  
306 E. Capitol, Suite 200  
Pierre, SD 57501-2545  
(605) 773-3455  
[Monte.Kramer@sdbor.edu](mailto:Monte.Kramer@sdbor.edu)

**Tennessee**

Russ Deaton  
Associate Executive Director, Fiscal Affairs  
Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
404 James Robertson Parkway, Suite 1900  
Nashville, TN 37243  
(615) 532-3860  
[russ.deaton@tn.gov](mailto:russ.deaton@tn.gov)

**Texas**

Dominic Chavez  
Interim Senior Director  
External Relations  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
P.O. Box 12788  
Austin, TX 78752  
(512) 427-6117  
[dominic.chavez@theccb.state.tx.us](mailto:dominic.chavez@theccb.state.tx.us)

**Utah**

Darren Marshall  
Manager of Audit and Financial Services  
Utah System of Higher Education  
The Board of Regents Building, The Gateway  
60 S. 400 W.  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
(801) 321-7104  
[dmarshall@utahsbr.edu](mailto:dmarshall@utahsbr.edu)

**Vermont**

Richard Cate  
Vice President for Finance and Administration  
University of Vermont  
Waterman Building  
Burlington, VT 05405  
(802) 656-0219  
[richard.cate@uvm.edu](mailto:richard.cate@uvm.edu)

**Virginia**

Yan Zheng  
Assistant Director for Finance Policy  
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia  
101 North 14th Street, 9th Floor  
Richmond, VA 23219  
(804) 225-3145  
[yanzheng@schev.edu](mailto:yanzheng@schev.edu)

**West Virginia**

Patty Miller  
Budget Officer  
West Virginia Higher Education Policy  
Commission  
1018 Kanawha Boulevard  
Charleston, WV 25301  
(304) 558-0281  
[miller@hepc.wvnet.edu](mailto:miller@hepc.wvnet.edu)

**Wisconsin**

Freda Harris  
Associate Vice President, Budget and Planning  
University of Wisconsin System  
1520 Van Hise Hall Room 1520  
1220 Linden Dr.  
Madison, WI 53706  
(608) 262-6423  
[fharris@uwsa.edu](mailto:fharris@uwsa.edu)

**Wyoming**

Suzann M. Koller  
Associate Director, Office of Institutional  
Analysis  
University of Wyoming  
1000 E. University Ave.  
Laramie, WY 82071  
(307) 766-2896  
[ssavor@uwyo.edu](mailto:ssavor@uwyo.edu)

**Appendix B:**  
**State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Policies 2010-2011 Survey Instrument**

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

The purpose of this survey is to update the information gathered from the 2006 survey on state-level policies and procedures governing public higher education tuition, fees, and student financial assistance. This is NOT a survey of the actual rates or amounts of current tuition, since other sources already exist for those data. The term "tuition" as used in the survey includes all standard student charges including required "education fees" in states that prohibit tuition per se.

There are nine sections to this survey (please note numbering restarts at the beginning of each page):

1. Tuition-Setting Philosophy
2. Tuition-Setting Authority and Process
3. Tuition-Setting for Resident Undergraduate Students
4. Tuition-Setting for Nonresident Undergraduate Students
5. Other Tuition Policies
6. Student Fees
7. Student Financial Assistance
8. Alignment of State Fiscal Policies
9. American Reinvestment and Recovery Act

Please be as complete as possible in your responses to each of the questions. Your responses will be saved as soon as you hit the "Next" button at the bottom of the page. If you click "Exit This Survey," your responses for that page will not be saved.

If you have any documents to submit, please send them to Alli Bell ([abell@sheeo.org](mailto:abell@sheeo.org)).

Thank you very much for your participation. If you have any questions, please contact Alli via email ([abell@sheeo.org](mailto:abell@sheeo.org)) or at (303) 541-1607.

**\* 1. Before you begin, please provide us with your information. These five information items must be completed in order to move on to the survey.**

Name (first and last):

SHEEO Agency or Higher

Education Agency:

State:

Email Address:

## Tuition-Setting Philosophy

**1. Which of the following statements best describes the overall tuition philosophy or approach for public colleges and universities in your state? (Check all that apply)**

- Tuition should be as low as possible.
- Tuition should be moderate.
- Tuition should be high.
- Tuition policy is guided by institutional-level philosophy or budgetary needs.
- Philosophy differs by sector.
- No statewide tuition philosophy exists.

Other (please specify):

**2. Describe the rationale for the philosophy stated above (e.g., tuition should be low to maximize access, high tuition is combined with high financial aid, institutions best understand their fiscal situations, etc.):**

**3. Is this tuition philosophy formalized in the state constitution, by legislative statute, by state rule, board rule or policy, or not formalized? (Please check one)**

- Constitution
- Legislative statute
- State rule
- Board rule/policy
- Not formalized

Clarifying comments

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**4. Have economic conditions over the last three years led to any short-term actions or policies on tuition that differ from general philosophies describe above?**

No

Yes

Please describe

**5. Describe any tuition policy changes in your state in the past three fiscal years (not changes in tuition levels).**

**6. Please describe any potential tuition policy changes under consideration for the immediate future in your state.**

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

## Tuition-Setting Authority and Process

### 1. Please briefly describe your state's tuition-setting process.

### 2. What role does each of the following individuals or entities play in establishing tuition rates and/or tuition policies in your state? (Check all that apply)

	Full legal decision-making authority	Informal/consultative role	No role	Other role
Governor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legislature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statewide coordinating/governing agency for multiple systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinating/governing board(s) for individual systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local district governing board(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3. Which of the entities above has primary authority for establishing tuition? (Please check one)

- Governor
- Legislature
- Statewide coordinating/governing agency for multiple systems
- Coordinating/governing board(s) for individual systems
- Local district governing board(s)
- Individual institutions

### 4. If individual institutions have primary authority, which of the following statements best describes the nature of their authority? (Please check one)

- Individual institutions set tuition rates within very strict guidelines or parameters established by local or state-level entities.
- Individual institutions set tuition rates within moderate or limited guidelines established by local or state-level entities.
- Individual institutions set tuition rates with no external restrictions.
- Not applicable

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**5. How has the the tuition-setting process and authority changed in your state over the last three years and what has caused those changes (e.g., changes in legislative leadership, term limits, etc.)?**

**6. What incentives (explicit or implicit) exist at the state or institutional level to minimize tuition increases?**

**7. Which of the following tuition revenue appropriation policies are in place in your state? (Check all that apply)**

- Tuition revenues are controlled and retained by individual institutions or campuses.
- Tuition revenues are deposited into separate, institutionally designated state tuition accounts from which all funds must be appropriated prior to expenditure.
- Tuition is appropriated and is a direct offset of the state general revenue appropriation.
- Tuition revenues are retained at the state level but under the direct control of a state governing or coordinating board.
- Tuition revenues are deposited into state general funds, with their return to higher education only inferred.

Other (please specify):

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

## Tuition-Setting for Resident Undergraduate Students

**1. The following factors may be used by various individuals/groups who set public resident undergraduate tuition rates in the states. Please indicate the level of influence exerted by each of the factors in decision-making about tuition levels in your state. If individual institutions are responsible for setting tuition, use your best judgment in assessing the role of each factor in the statewide aggregate.**

	No influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	Controlling influence
Consumer Price Index (CPI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher Education Price Index (HEPI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SHEEO Higher Education Cost Adjustment (HECA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other inflation indices (Please specify in comment box below)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State per capita personal or disposable income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State general fund appropriations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tuition charged by peer institutions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tuition policies of comparison states	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Institutional mission	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cost of instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior year's tuition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of appropriations for financial aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State workforce needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State philosophy about the appropriate share of tuition costs to be borne by students vs. the state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A policy cap on the percentage or dollar increase for tuition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify):

**2. If you indicated that cost of instruction has an influence, please indicate here approximately what percent tuition is of the cost of instruction.**

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**3. Of the above list, please indicate the three most influential factors in setting resident undergraduate tuition rates in your state over the past three fiscal years:**

1.
2.
3.

**4. Has there been a curb, cap, freeze or other limit placed on tuition at any time in your state in the past three fiscal years?**

- No  
 Yes

**5. 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

**6. Does your state have a policy that links a portion of revenue from tuition increases to student financial aid?**

- No  
 Yes

**7. If you answered "Yes" above please describe this policy including what portion of revenue and whether or not this applies to a certain type of aid (e.g., need-based aid):**

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**8. Differential tuition results when groups or individuals pay different tuition rates based on certain criteria, such as level of study, major, etc. Indicate if each of the following types of differential tuition is used for resident undergraduate students at public colleges and universities in your state. If responses differ by sector, please indicate in the following question. (Check all that apply)**

- Lower division/Upper division
- Programmatic (varies by major or course)
- Credit/Non-credit
- In-district/Out-of-district (two-year schools only)
- On-site or classroom based instruction/Off-site or distance education
- Credit hours beyond a specific number (e.g., credit hours accumulated above 140 are charged at a higher rate)
- Cohort-based tuition (Fixed rate for a cohort of entering freshmen for some specified period of time)

**9. Please describe how the responses above differ for two-year institutions in your state.**

**10. Resident Undergraduate Block Tuition: Which of the following practices exist within your state? (Check all that apply)**

	Statewide policy	Varies by sector	Varies by institution within sector
Tuition is set per credit hour regardless of how many credits the student is taking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tuition is set at a flat rate for full-time students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A per credit surcharge is imposed at or above a specific number of credit hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No formal policy exists on resident undergraduate tuition setting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify):

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

11. If you indicated that tuition is set at a flat rate for full-time students, please indicate the number or range of credit hours taken, if known:

## Tuition-Setting for Nonresident Undergraduate Students

### 1. Which of the following statements describe how nonresident undergraduate tuition is set in your state? (Check all that apply)

- Nonresident tuition is set at a mandated percentage of the cost of undergraduate instruction
- Nonresident tuition is indexed to the undergraduate resident tuition (e.g., 2 times the resident tuition rate)
- No formal policy exists on nonresident undergraduate tuition setting

Other (please specify):

### 2. If you indicated that nonresident tuition is a percentage of the cost of undergraduate instruction or a percentage of resident tuition, please indicate those percentages.

Percentage of the cost of undergraduate instruction

Percentage of resident undergraduate tuition

### 3. Has the issue of offering resident tuition rates to undocumented immigrants been discussed in your state? (Check one)

- No discussion
- Discussion, but no policy
- Policy

If there is a policy, please describe:

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

## Other Tuition Policies

1. In addition to the general undergraduate tuition reciprocity agreements that exist within the regional higher education associations (MHEC, NEBHE, SREB, WICHE), does your state have a policy specific to students from neighboring states or individual counties (e.g., a “good neighbor” policy)? If yes, please briefly describe and provide a link to or a copy of the policy.

2. In which of the following occupational areas does your state provide loan forgiveness and/or loan repayment programs to those who provide service to the state following graduation?

	In-School Assistance	On-the-Job Repayment	Other
Teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nursing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medicine/ Dentistry/ Optometry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Engineering	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify):

3. Please describe any differences in philosophy or policy concerning tuition at public two-year vs. four-year institutions in your state.

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

## Student Fees

Unless otherwise stated, the term “fees” applies only to mandatory fees, as opposed to designated fees. Mandatory fees are defined as charges that most full-time students are required to pay in addition to tuition. Designated fees are defined as charges that apply to specific classifications only, such as certain courses, programs, services, or groups of students.

**1. Describe the philosophy in your state specifically related to mandatory student fees (for example, fees make up for tuition limitations, fees are institutionally controlled, etc.).**

**2. Is this fee philosophy formalized in the state constitution, by legislative statute, by state rule, board rule or policy, or not formalized? (Check one)**

- Constitution
- Legislative statute
- State rule
- Board rule/policy
- Not formalized

Clarifying comments:

**3. Describe any fee policy changes in your state in the past three fiscal years (not changes in fee levels).**

**4. Are any potential fee policy changes under consideration in your state? If so, please describe.**

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**5. Has there been a curb, cap, freeze or other limit placed on fees in the past three fiscal years?**

No

Yes

If yes, please describe:

**6. Please indicate which entities in your state have the authority to set mandatory and/or designated fees. (Check all that apply)**

	Mandatory	Designated
Governor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legislature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State coordinating/governing agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual system governing board(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local district governing board(s) (two-year only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify):

**7. Please describe any differences in philosophy or policy concerning fees at public two-year vs. four-year institutions in your state.**

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

## Student Financial Assistance

**1. The following is a list of possible goals of student financial aid policy. Understanding that multiple programs might exist in your state to meet a variety of objectives, please indicate the relative influence of each of the goals in the creation and adjustment of a comprehensive financial aid program.**

	No influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence
Promote broad access to higher education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve the affordability of higher education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitate student choice among higher education providers in the state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help equalize tuition between public and independent institutions in the state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote student retention and degree completion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Recognize talent and reward effort of students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keep talented students in the state	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prepare and place students into specific careers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify):

**2. Which of the above goals has the greatest influence on financial aid policy in your state?**

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**3. Is the financial aid philosophy formalized in the state constitution, by legislative statute, by state rule, board rule or policy, or not formalized?**

- Constitution
- Legislative statute
- State rule
- Board rule/policy
- Not formalized

Clarifying comments:

**4. Describe any financial aid policy changes (not financial aid appropriations) in the last three fiscal years.**

**5. Does your state have a policy regarding the mix between merit and need-based aid?**

- No
- Yes

If yes, please describe:

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**6. Check which, if any, of the following student financial assistance programs your state offers.**

	Offered under state statute	Offered through a formal policy but not in statute	Offered at discretion of institutions	Not offered
Need-based grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General, statewide merit-based scholarships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specifically targeted merit-based scholarships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loan forgiveness programs (including conditional scholarships)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State-funded work-study programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State-funded guaranteed loans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programs designed to increase access/participation of members of specific groups/populations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State tax credits or tax deductions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify):

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**7. Do the public institutions in your state provide tuition waivers (full or partial) or other financial assistance for particular categories of students (e.g., dependents of faculty/staff, military personnel, senior citizens, etc.)?**

	Assistance offered under state statute	Assistance offered through a formal policy but not in statute	Assistance offered at discretion of institutions	Assistance not offered
Graduate assistants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student athletes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faculty/staff members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dependents of faculty/staff members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State employees/civil servants (other than faculty/staff)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dependents of state employees/civil servants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dependents of deceased police officers or fire fighters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participants in public service programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Military (Active)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Military (Honorably discharged)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dependents of military	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior Citizens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students who qualify for need-based aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students who qualify for merit-based aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify):

**8. Please provide any necessary clarifying comments for the above question (for example, if you checked an option for "military" please specify which branch).**

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**9. Please describe any differences in philosophy or policy concerning student financial aid at public two-year vs. four-year institutions in your state.**

**10. Describe the financial aid policies in your state in regard to students attending independent institutions.**

**11. If your state is considering any development of, or changes in, a prepaid tuition program or a college savings plan, please describe it.**

**12. What consideration, if any, has been given in your state to the impact that tuition prepayment programs or college savings plans may have on tuition levels? By whom?**

# 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

## Alignment of State Fiscal Policies

1. Describe any initiatives being discussed in your state to address the affordability of college for students and their families. Include any initiatives or collaboration with other agencies to provide consumer information on college price and the financing of higher education, including financial aid programs. Please provide a link to or a copy of any written materials developed.

2. Below is a list of possible state policy responses to federal legislation creating various education tax credits and deductions, including the HOPE Scholarship and Lifetime Learning tax credits. Check which of the following actions, if any, have been taken in your state, those currently under consideration, and those not under consideration. (Check all that apply)

	Action Taken	Under Consideration	Not Under Consideration
Raise tuition to take advantage of new tax credits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Take federal tax credits into account when calculating state student aid eligibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Create state-level programs that replicate the federal initiatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conform the state tax code to federal policy to simplify the tax process for families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Create a state prepayment or college savings plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publicize the availability of federal tax credits as a means to finance college	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide bridge loans to students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (please specify):

## 2010-2011 State Tuition, Fees, and Financial Assistance Survey

**3. Describe the relationship (formal or informal) between the tuition policies and fee policies in your state (e.g., viewed as similar but different source of funds, no relationship, etc.).**

**4. Describe the relationship (formal or informal) between tuition policies and financial aid policies in your state (e.g., high tuition/high aid, no relationship, etc.), including any differences that might exist between sectors.**

**5. How is your state working to coordinate state appropriations, tuition, and financial aid policies?**

## American Reinvestment and Recovery Act

**1. Has your state received any ARRA funding?**

Yes

No

**2. How has the availability of ARRA funds influenced the tuition setting in your state?**

**3. How has the availability of ARRA funding influenced the student financial assistance policies or offerings in your state?**