

Appendices:

Selected comments from faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders:

Access – Admissions:

For programs found at research and regional universities it creates a class distinction that schools of education and other helping professions would find offensive. Some of the regional universities have programs that are equal to or better than those found at Research schools. We do not look at our programs in teaching or the other helping professions as being at different tiers. The Three Tier system would lead one to think of graduates from regional schools as being of a lesser quality than those who complete similar programs at a Research University and that is simply not true.

The history of programs across the state has shown that it is not only size that determines the quality of the programs. For example, some schools have been given responsibility for specialty areas that were not necessarily done on the basis of size but more for the expertise that was found in the institution. For example Minot State has the only program for Education of the Deaf while UND has the only program for Education of the Visually Impaired.

In the case of Minot State we are much more than our other regional schools in terms of size, mission, and particularly in terms of graduate programs.

While the document does indicate that some exceptions may be available for regional schools, by not allowing regional or research schools to provide remediation it limits access to some students forcing them to leave their communities to pursue their education.

The criteria refers to a consideration of high school courses completed and from data collected several years ago there is so much variability in courses with essentially the same name as to render a reference to completed high school courses as worthless.

I strongly support reconsideration of placing Minot State in the second tier. Over the last eight years, Minot State has differentiated themselves from the other three regional institutions. We have elevated our status as a graduate institution with strong research components. In addition, our new admission requirements set us apart from the other regional institutions. Our commitment to providing MSU students with engaging and successful student engagement activities makes us distinctive as well.

There are obvious benefits from accessing an online matrix to calculate admission standards for the NDUS, but it limits the motivation of the second tier universities to seek the brightest and best if we are told that what we *deserve* falls below the admission standards set for UND and NDSU. It also sends the message to the potential student that MSU cannot provide a comparable educational experience, and this is simply not the case. Many bright students choose MSU or transfer here because it is smaller. Their ACT scores alone would have given them a free ride at either first tier school. Bigger doesn't mean better. Academic rigor should not be measured by class size.

The learning experience is most beneficial for the student who feels known by his peers and his professors. Be seen. Be heard.

Some people don't have a good ACT score and class rank and some people try a lot harder when they get to college and they care so much more.

Taking in to account the older than average students that may not have a recent GPA from high school and also military students that have not gone to high school in a while.

The four component mathematical formula for the admission score seems complex and not in the spirit of true transparency.

Access appears to be limited by the 3-tier system. Students will not have access to the institution of their choice due to admission scores.

Universities in the system have spent considerable time, money, and effort to strengthen learning readiness, the cost of which will be wasted with the 3-tier plan.

Transparency for K-12 students and parents of what is required to obtain admission into the University System is a good idea. Will this be enough? What is worrisome is the facilitation and buy-in needed from the secondary system.

As tech savvy as young people are, I think the more a university can utilize things online the better they are apt to use them. Under admissions I think making an online tool to allow students to calculate their admission score would be beneficial.

The internet system for tracking a student's progress toward admission has been mentioned as just for students. Would it be possible to give access to high school counselors and NDUS admission counselors as well? I think having the information in one easily accessible spot is great. I am just not sure high school students will check it.

Will higher enrollment standards affect recruiting?

How much will it cost to bring community colleges up to standard to handle an increased enrollment and provide the additional services needed to ready students for four-year schools?

The problem with this is it paints our students as second class right out of the box. It is an elitist caste system that will suggest the bright kids go to UND and the children of lesser abilities go to MSU. It totally ignores the diversity of the intuitional missions. If you are openly branded by the state as a "lesser student" why aim for MSU? Will there later be two sets of drinking fountains?—one for UND and one for MSU grads. It is one thing for popular culture to harbor these notions as an "undercurrent." It is quite another to legislate this elitist separation and branding of the students.

We have an exemplary program in communication disorders. It is recognized across the US and Canada. Students don't pick our program because they made a geographical pick for MSU and need to major in something; our students, especially our grads, travel a long way to study with OUR faculty in OUR program. Many tell us our program is actually better than the program at UND—it's not polite to make such comparisons, but we hear this a LOT. Perhaps in programs like pre-med, the other universities are more focused on those missions, but our accomplishments and accolades speak for themselves. We are not "less than" the other universities. We are different. If the legislators want quality teachers for the schools in ND, then they need to value the Universities that produce quality teachers and encourage the "elite" students to pursue related degrees.

Components: ACT composite, High School GPA, High School percentile rank, and number of HS core courses completed.

Overall I think it's a good idea to include these factors in admissions decisions, but I think too much emphasis is given to core courses completed and High School percentile rank.

It simply establishes different levels of criteria. My main concern about this approach is the detrimental effect it will have on those institutions not included in the top tier. The clear implication is that the smart students will all be admitted to UND and NDSU, and only the less smart students will attend any other of the system's institutions. This decline in prestige can only hurt recruiting at the regional institutions, and will wind up as a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The decrease in math requirements at the 4 year institutions, sends a message that math isn't important. It could lead to an overall drop in our ACT scores.

Math 102 and 103 go hand in hand. There is a plus to being able to offer both classes from the same department. Even better if the same instructor does both classes. Similar with the English lab, 1 credit add-on. Can the two-year colleges handle all the remedial courses? Do they have the staff in hand?

Note the shift from MiSU to DCB over the past couple of years on remedial courses. DCB is already handling most of the remedial needs for Minot State.

Is high school rank over emphasized in the new admission criteria?

If all students have the high school core, is it also over emphasized?

I believe it has the ability to chase ND students to other states to attend a university if they do not meet the academic standards based upon the new mathematical model. I understand that we need to be sure students are ready to attend a particular school, but isn't it the choice of the student and the parents (if they are financing the education)?

The proposal recommends a "criteria-based admission index" which includes a prospective student's high school percentile rank. With North Dakota being such a rural state, what about the students, who only have four people in their class?

Initial thoughts of mine are in regards to the Admissions portion of the proposal, and how rural ND schools could be affected by this. The two items that caught my attention are the minimum course requirements, and the percentage of high school rank.

Looking at the minimum course requirements to attend a research institution may be more difficult for a rural high school student to obtain than their counterparts in Fargo or Bismarck. Limited courses are offered as face-to-face classes due to being rural (tight budgets, credentials of teaching staff at rural schools, both student and teacher interest, and class size).

For example, to qualify to attend a research school, the math requirement may hold back a potential student just because a course is not offered at his high school (mathematical reasoning). Another example was the recommendation of having 2 years of a single foreign language, will NDUS accept Rosetta Stone as a substitute if a language (or not enough) years are offered in Small Town, ND?

Lastly, evaluation of the Admissions Score formula in regards to using the percentage of high school rank may need some additional attention. This may work well in larger ND cities, but again, in rural ND there may or may not be competition which either way may skew this percentage. And, a student may rank lower in a large city, but not have as much competition in rural ND where he may rank higher... that may need some tweaking, or a standard weighting and determination of how classes are graded throughout the high school

system, so this percentage is comparing similar results for the final high school rank and ultimately the admissions score.

The whole point of the proposal is "... to have a more efficient and transparent system ..." Unofficially, but practically, we have always been concerned about enrollment numbers; high numbers are good and low numbers are bad. Efficiency will not be concerned with high or low numbers. Efficiency will seek to find the "right" number of students for the resources available or to obtain the "right" amount of resources for the available students. More students mean more tuition income. If we are no longer concerned with more students, but the right number of students, will the funding model change for the new paradigm?

The admissions score is not my expertise; however, I question the use of "% of HS rank" as part of the score. In rural ND we can have some small graduating classes. It is theoretically possible for a good student to be overlooked in this formula in a small graduating class.

Secondly, many of Chancellor Shirvani's ideas will cut our numbers down immensely. I heard this morning in a meeting that so far, out of the few dozen freshman students that one of our admissions coordinators have looked at, almost none of them would have been accepted according to Chancellor Shirvani's scoring method. And the shocking factor is that some of these students were fantastic when it came to scores. They had mid-twenties for ACT scores and over a 3.5 GPA. The scoring method seems, to be completely honest, a bit off.

Thirdly, I want to emphasize what would become the brutality of this amazing university. It is clear to me that UND and NDSU would clearly become the two research schools, and therefore be the only four-year institutions in North Dakota. In my opinion, everything that the whole faculty and staff has worked at in the past decade to achieve the vision of this campus and to achieve a constantly improving life-style, and healthy educational system, would be shot to pieces, and for nothing. Related to this is where we are at now, not only number-wise, but also the health of our University. Looking at the numbers, one can see that we are down a bit from last year, and that should be no surprise. BUT if you look at specifics from where these students are coming from, you can see that for example, Minnesota and California doubled in number of students. In the five years I have been here, four as a student and one as staff, I have truly seen improvement in how this campus operates and also the number of international students and out-of-state students is growing very nicely! This leads me to my last point.

Changes in admission standards to be implemented as soon as 2013: I have already met with many current high school students who are considering enrolling at MSU next fall. Any changes in admission requirements for 2013 are already too late, particularly if there is not a plan for waiving any of those requirements. Students are already enrolled in their high school classes; they may not be able to add additional high school courses to meet new requirements.

I would hope that a standardized admissions policy for all Tier 2 institutions would be mutually developed and agreed upon by the four institutions; this will take time to reach consensus.

This item particularly caught my attention...(2 x ACT Composite) + (1 x **percentage HS Rank**) + (20 x HS GPA) + (5 x # of HS core courses) = **NDUS Admission Score**

Others will probably submit this, but the NDUS Admissions Score calculation seems discriminatory as I read it in its use of % HS Rank. In a town like Minot, with large graduating classes, it probably doesn't matter as much, as the scale is large. North Dakota though is full of small towns and schools. A graduating class of 20 or less isn't uncommon. Why a student with the exact same criteria (ACT/GPA/HS Core Courses) in a small graduating class versus a large graduating class should be penalized makes no sense. For example, graduating 5th in your class:

Class size = 40 graduating students % HS Rank = **5 of 40** = top 13% (**scores 87**)

Class size = 20 graduating students % HS Rank = **5 of 20** = top 25% (**scores 75**)

While the same student most likely wouldn't come in fifth in both a class of 20 and a class of 40, they would most likely receive a different rank and resulting score for each grouping. The smaller the sample group, the more extreme the differences will be. Why should this factor in to college acceptance?

As a real life example, half way through high school I moved from Gwinner ND to Stanley ND. I left a class of 17 and joined a class of roughly 40. Had I graduated from the class of 17 rather than the class of 40 two years later, it would have had no significance on my ability as a college applicant. My rank and resulting score would have differed though, but would ultimately have been meaningless as the only changing factor would have been the size of my immediate graduating peer group.

GPA is already used in the formula; % HS Rank just uses GPA to produce a second value of questionable usefulness especially amongst small groups.

There are issues with some of the components in the plan. Penalizing students based on peer size as part of the admissions criteria is redundant and discriminatory, in my opinion. Delegating all remedial work to community colleges takes away freedom of choice and creates potential roadblocks for many. It is true that many college freshmen are not prepared and require remedial classes. I believe that number is increasing.

But remedial support is also very important to retain students in upper classes. Emotional responsibility and motivation are non-academic factors that can directly influence success or failure, whether it apply to those enrolled in remedial classes or honors classes. It is important to have support available for personal and/or academic development as individuals both enter into and move through their college experience. These services should be available at the institution of choice, otherwise the process of getting a degree becomes fractured and overly complex.

In the CD dept we need to know the changes in admissions standards NOW for recruiting purposes. On my recruiting trips or at my informal meetings with students in Canada, I am always quizzed about the admissions and the standards in comparison to the Canadian schools. This is key for students to make their plans early. Students are already planning for "next year". Many students may decide to "stay home" initially and only transfer when it makes sense to get the degree stamped on their transcript. Right now it is attractive for students to begin and end their tenure at MSU. It will be harder to sell to them if they are worried about finances.

Quality – College Readiness Report

If the goal is to provide access to educational goals of the highest quality then the previous section on access limits this by limiting schools to a more restrictive list of offerings.

The sample of a “College Readiness Report” found in Appendix 3 does not provide data on, a) Success in entry level credit bearing classes, or b) First to Second year overall college retention of students.

I support the idea of more closely aligning secondary and post-secondary standards and expectations. However, I don’t know that this contributes to increased quality so much as increased student success. Feedback to the high schools is good.

We are facing a changing population in North Dakota and we are changing how we communicate as well. Moving towards more formal reports and less on personal relationships and feedback to the schools.

How will these reporting changes affect People Soft? Do we need a different type of data management system? Who will write all the reports that are needed? It is very difficult to get reports now from the system IT office.

Will the NDUS reporting system tie into the K-12 data system?

We already do some of this type of reporting with the requirements for NCATE and state accreditation for teacher ed programs.

The ND High School to College Readiness Report may be a useful tool for the system schools.

Many factors contribute to the success of first year students. Readiness is just one of the factors. Minot State University has initiated many programs to help ensure the success of incoming students. A student could be ready academically, while still having issues with living away from home and having the freedom to make their own choices. I feel that locality plays an important part in ensuring the success of the student. The freedom to attend the institution of their choice should also be considered.

Will telling the secondary institutions how their students are doing help to ensure the readiness of students?

Obtaining the buy-in of the secondary schools will take more than just giving them a score card. This could be an extremely costly and time consuming aspect of the plan.

By segregating students to different schools based on an arbitrary number and not what they are passionate about, the system will be stifling to an individual’s success. When a university system tells a student they can only attend certain colleges, then they are dictating the future of this student.

I like this proposal as it adds to the transparent dimension to let those in high school prepare for their future. I do wonder about the additional resources that will be needed to provide this service and the efficiency of such an effort.

I'm a big fan of creating this report. It gives high schools a good idea of how their students are performing after high school and also gives universities a good idea of what schools might provide the best return on time and money when recruiting future students.

Affordability

Financial Aid

Adult Learner

These goals are laudable but they do not match with the other areas of the report such as reducing the portion of waivers allowable for use by the university, etc.

In general, I support proposals for increased recruiting of adult learners to NDUS campuses. I am a little skeptical of giving credit for life and military experience; I would need to see this worked out much more specifically before possibly approving it.

I strongly support the expansion of need-based financial aid. I am uncertain as to how willing the state legislature will be to allocate the money needed to make this possible.

It also seems to me that the per credit tuition model, listed under accountability, would increase tuition costs for many students, thus making it less affordable.

One positive thing that is in the plan is the new adult education program that looks at people that have credits but not have finished a full degree yet. They will be trying to attract them to come back and finish their degree.

We will need to define prior learning experience credits and then set up a fairly rigorous system to be able to grant them.

There needs to be a distinction between credits “for living” and those extended because of training and/or guided learning opportunities through a person’s job or military experience.

Will there be fees imposed for the review of PLE portfolios? Will an outside entity also be involved in the reviews?

I understand the need to do more for those students that demonstrate a financial need, but does that mean we will have to reduce the number and amount of scholarships for those high performing students?

Maybe the chancellor could approach the oil industry companies about scholarships for potential/future employees. Such as an incentive for college juniors and seniors to want to finish their degrees and enter into future employment with said company. Or perhaps this would work better for the non-traditional student already in the work force that just needs to finish a few courses.

I strongly support the need for a mechanism for prior learning credit for life and military experience. There are hundreds of former students in ND and elsewhere that have completed some college coursework but not finished a degree. We need to help those potential college graduates. I believe MSU should develop an exceptional adult experiential learning program for a few programs – primarily in business and criminal justice.

In addition, financial aid programs should be reviewed to determine how funds could assist the returning adult learner in their quest to complete their college degree.

Affordability of a college education has more aspects than just the aid available. If tuition rates are increased many students will be tempted to forgo an education to avoid going into debt or to take high paying oil-field positions.

Many adult learners are working and going to school and would not qualify for need-based aid. A tuition model increase would be a hurdle to adult learners who might be averse to going into debt for an education.

Eliminating hurdles and straightening the path to graduation for adult learners will be costly for schools that have most of their resources invested in obtaining and keeping students.

Adult learners require more access during non-standard hours.

I thought the idea of accelerating learning opportunities for adult learners to make it easier and faster for them to graduate is great. I am curious as to how feasible that will be at MSU though. Due to the smaller size of the university, not all classes are offered every semester. Adult learners tend to be out-of-sync with the normal path a four-year student would take, and the course schedule is set up for the four-year students. Adult learners also tend to take classes in the evenings or online, and many of the courses at MSU are only offered during the day.

I like the idea of creating more incentives for adult learners, especially for those that are only able to attend part time.

Is there going to be direction on what groups (i.e. new freshmen, transfer students, military students, and adult learners) should receive the majority of our marketing and recruiting efforts?

I think the mechanism for assessment for prior learning/experience is an excellent idea that needs to be implemented system wide.

Several of our students worry about their math component. Some choose to take the "remedial" math (102) in the semester prior to the semester they are enrolling in their "college" math. If they have to enroll in different university programs to do this, additional application fees and then transfer arrangements will be necessary. This is an added burden to the student and does not make for a smooth transition into the university system. Remedial classes are often taken along with university credit classes which provides for an ease of acquiring the necessary general education and pre-requisite credits.

Learning

Remedial/Developmental Coursework

Dual Credit

Common Core Standards

While we agree with the goals listed, it is somewhat offensive to have the document infer that “making students educational goals our highest priority” is not already the focus of the state higher education institutions.

ND already has programs in place that prepare our teacher education graduates to be able to teach the Common Core and we have prepared them to be able to do that for a long time. The testing mandate that came with NCLB has provided data that ND graduates know the material required to teach the common core as evidenced by Praxis II results.

It is unclear to me what the advantage would be of restricting dual credit offerings to the community colleges. I don't believe that this is necessary in order to achieve common state standards. The amount of money you get reimbursed going to dual credit would go away.

Remedial courses on campus are really important on campus because some people that are on campus would not be able to be here if they were not offered.

There is almost no mention of assessment in this section of the proposal.

There is a plan for dual credit but no data is presented to support the plan.

MSU has worked very well with DCB to develop remedial/development coursework and the Passport program. This proposal would erase all the progress that has been made. The same goes for the Dual Credit Courses with the high schools. MSU has worked very closely with the surrounding community's high schools to provide this advantage to ambitious students. This would be a major setback in MSU's identity and strategic plans.

I have struggled to understand the reasoning to support shifting supervision of dual-credit courses away from the institutions' professors most likely to teach those students seeking the dual-credit courses in the first place. Is there a fundamental flaw in the current system? *If each town had a high school beside a community college, beside a university, and a surplus of highly qualified academics hungry to serve as adjuncts in these local high schools, some of these ideas might work, but we are North Dakota, and things are beautifully spread out. Does this even work in California?*

My main concern is the possibility of losing our dual credit program. Several years ago, my office (CEL) was responsible for developing and implementing MSU's first dual credit programs. We did this by working with the departments and divisions. I believe we have offered a high quality program to the high schools and our regular and adjunct faculty has prepared students for their degree program. Plus I believe most of the high schools we currently work with want to partner with a graduate institution and not a community college.

Dual credit programs give us direct access to potential degree seeking students and funding. I would hope we would be the “exception” that is noted in the draft.

It is pertinent DPI and the university system continues to align curriculum to ensure students are prepared for the appropriate university’s program of study.

Dual credit courses should be allowed to be offered by all campuses without needing special approval (proposal indicates mostly by community colleges). Each campus currently has a close working relationship with area schools/teachers which could/would be jeopardized. This is also a great recruiting tool for each campus.

The dual credit will no longer be available to students through MSU.

Assisting with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards in K-12 is a great way to increase readiness for college. I agree with this, while at the same time wondering how much assistance will be required. Secondary schools are facing their own issues with learning objectives and they might not have the resources to help in this implementation.

If a student is ready as early as 9th grade, they should be allowed to take dual credit courses in their high school.

I think the plan looks good on paper, however, I do not believe that it will be very efficient in practice. This might be the way to go if the system were just beginning, but campuses have things in place already. It is not necessarily efficient to reinvent the wheel. For this reason I note the exceptions available which one hopes would work favorably for the campuses; dual credit, for example. We have eleven campuses in ND each based in a particular town/city. Students from larger towns/cities want to attend the campus down the street, so the “community colleges” will end up having a physical presence on the larger campuses (just as DCB is on MSU’s campus now.) We will have more than one campus represented on a single campus. This is not an efficient model. I know this exists already and even to our favor as we have offices on BSC’s campus, but it is not efficient if you want a system approach.

Dual credit is a large portion of income for us. It’s also a built in source of income from students that are already living here and aren’t hindered by having to find housing. If the courses are on site at regional and research universities, will there be any profit sharing with the community colleges that are administering the programs?

I am concerned about the quality of the dual credit classes if they are taught through other institutions (especially Math 103). The dual credit Math classes that have been taught by local high school teachers through Minot State University have been under our guidance and criteria. They have been using the same text and are covering the same topics we have been on campus. The classes on campus and those taught for dual credit in the local high schools take the same test at the end of the semester. Requiring the dual credit to be taught through the two year or community colleges is a concern of mine.

The same issue comes up for the remedial courses in Math. We show the students how to use the calculators in Math 102 so they will be able to use them more effectively in Math 103 or Math 240. Some of the online remedial courses other institutions are using do not use the calculators. Some students have come to us, after completing Math 102 in an online format, and don't know how to use the calculators, which

leaves them at a major disadvantage. In the remedial courses we teach on campus, we prepare the students for what they will need so they can be more successful in our GenEd Math classes (Math 103 or Math 240).

Dual credit courses are a tricky business, because often High School teachers are teaching university subjects in the High School classroom. Too often, those teaching at two year colleges are no more qualified to teach the courses than are the High School teachers doing so. As a result, they are in no position to oversee and serve in an advisory capacity to our dual credit teachers. Issues of academic quality—always quick to arise when discussing dual credit courses—can only be further be made difficult.

Shifting remediation exclusively to the two year colleges, just as doing so with Dual credit, seems to attempt a certain social engineering of reality. That is, students needing remediation do not necessarily live near a two year college, and so in many instances are put in a position of receiving what needs to be the most personal kind of academic enterprise instead at a distance. Why not let the universities closest to the student serve the need?

How practical would it be to force all students accepted into the NDUS who are in need of remedial education to educate all of them at the three two-year campuses? Will those campuses have enough teachers and classroom space? Or is the idea behind this proposal to not accept any students into the NDUS that are in need of remedial education? If “that” is the idea, how does that serve North Dakota high school students who want and need to get a college degree but need extra help to accomplish that goal? How affordable will it be for such students to have to travel to Wahpeton, Bottineau or Williston to take such courses? Or will these be afforded all across the state via IVN?

How will North Dakota high school students react to the severely limited access to dual credit courses?

How will campuses now offering dual credit courses make up for the budget shortfall when these courses are reallocated to other campuses?

Accountability

Tuition Model

Fees

Tuition Rates

Waivers

While the plan recognizes the importance of balancing educational costs with the need to attract top quality students it seems to put road blacks in place for attracting folks from outside the state.

The tuition model of having students pay for each credit rather than benefit from the 12-18 credits for the same price seems to fly in the face of giving students better access. This model will increase revenue but when put together with the out of state tuitions of 150% to 175% will cause a severe financial burden for those in our contiguous regions plus those from out of state. A quick calculation for a student from Alberta currently paying \$2293.92 for 18 semester hours of coursework plus fees will pay \$6021.54 plus fees on the proposed Three Tier System, an increase of 162.5%. This kind of change will be very detrimental to programs at Minot State.

Tuition Three Tier system			Change	% increase	plus fees
ND Student	12 credits	\$2,293.92	\$-	0%	plus fees
ND Student	16 credits	\$3,058.56	\$764.64	33.33%	plus fees
ND Student	18 credits	\$3,440.88	\$1,146.96	50.00%	plus fees
Contiguous	12 credits	\$3,440.88	\$1,146.96	50.00%	plus fees
Contiguous	16 credits	\$4,587.84	\$2,293.92	100.00%	plus fees
Contiguous	18 credits	\$5,161.32	\$2,867.40	125.00%	plus fees
Out of State	12 credits	\$4,030.32	\$1,736.40	75.70%	plus fees
Out of State	16 credits	\$5,352.48	\$3,058.56	133.33%	plus fees
Out of State	18 credits	\$6,021.54	\$3,727.62	162.50%	plus fees

Obviously, the “tuition rates by residency status” is likely to harm our national and international recruiting efforts. One of our strengths in recruiting is our affordable tuition rates. I certainly would hate to lose that.

I am glad to see that tuition waivers for graduate students has not been arbitrarily limited to a given percentage. I hope, however, that the budget planning process allows this to be a priority.

Among the advantages that NDUS institutions offer are access and reasonable tuition. Many other states have difficulty providing sufficient access to college campuses within their borders to meet the demand. One of the things that NDUS institutions have been able to do is to make college education both accessible and affordable for many of these students. Instituting the proposed changes to out-of-state tuition rates will make tuition less affordable, and is likely to result in the enrollment of fewer out-of-state students, and thus enrollment declines.

As noted earlier, the per credit tuition model will have negative consequences for affordability. The proposed tuition waiver policy will have negative consequences for student recruitment.

The tuition rates will definitely affect people on campus because there is a large number from out of state. A big plus to this campus is the attraction of in state tuition rates to everyone. We need to specifically look at the tuition rates for out of state people because of the high number of Canadians and out of state people on campus.

It will affect housing on campus because they are the people that stay in the halls. It will affect a wide variety of things on campus. It is very important that we have an open forum to discuss this with everyone on campus.

The per credit tuition will affect people in state because if you have to pay for every single credit you are taking instead of the lump sum. Going to a private university would be cheaper than going to MSU because of the per credit charge.

The waivers will not be eliminated they will be reduced in the amount that they are able to given to each student. This will affect many people.

This would also be a major setback for MSU. MSU has identified goals and is working very hard to achieve them in the effort to become a premiere institution within the greater Great Plains. Raising the tuition across the board as is proposed would be a major detractor to out-of-state and international students.

Regarding: a per credit tuition model for all delivery methods; differentiated by program, where appropriate.

I pray that reason will prevail and grant exceptions for **music ensembles**. The typical MSU music education major will secure a teaching position in the smaller North Dakota school, and will teach K-12, general music, band and choir. Through ensembles and private lessons, MSU provides valuable opportunity to hone the skill sets needed for the teaching discipline or for continued graduate level study. At MSU, music ensembles are not scheduled on top of one another. A voice major can participate in percussion and marimba ensembles to strengthen rhythm skills. She may opt to engage in private lessons in percussion or in a band instrument; she may also participate in the Concert Choir, Women’s Chorus and Marching Band. These are not *all* required in the degree, but the elective nature of the some of the credits does not render them any less essential in terms of the student’s success after graduation

Forecasts of the declining numbers of North Dakota high school graduates sufficient to sustain the NDUS system used to cast a pall. MSU cast a wider net, while at the same time securing qualified faculty and modern facilities to provide

a liberal arts education on par with its aspiration peers. Who could have envisioned the huge impact of the oil industry? It not only entices the recent North Dakota high school graduate away from college studies, but draws his parents away from their established careers as well. Who could have foreseen the housing crisis related to the oil boom and the devastating flood?

MSU's out-of-state students help offset this shortfall. In the first week of classes, I have met students from Canada, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Montana, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Ohio. Incoming music majors have roommates from New York. Would these same students have been drawn to MSU without the tuition break? Maybe not, but they recognize the multiple values of pursuing a degree at Minot State, and I am grateful for the recruitment that brought them here. MSU has a marketing strategy that works and it should not be penalized for its initiative to seek qualified students beyond the state borders. This issue is a bit embarrassing to me: the rest of the country is struggling with unemployment, and North Dakota has an *enormous* surplus. I think we could be a beacon of light here, but to attempt a businessman's posture without any true business acumen, to have 66% of a consumer's dollar is better than having none of it.

There will be no surer way to chase the best and brightest ND high school students AWAY from the state of North Dakota than: reducing or removing their tuition waivers, charging them per credit (a practice that clearly will penalize those motivated students who take heavy course loads or pursue double majors, multiple minors, honors classes, etc.), and giving not the slightest consideration to merit and/or performance-based scholarships in improving the current system. Our focus ought to be on retaining top QUALITY students for the future ND work force, in ALL the system schools. In the interest of doing so, the NDUS should be exploring ways to reward consistently outstanding student performance with financial incentives for students to REMAIN in (and graduate from) their programs and then remain in the state of ND thereafter.

We must be careful not to build in obstacles and disincentives that will discourage our best students from pursuing excellence right here in ND.

On a minor point, the per-credit tuition plan, with fees and such further "differentiated by program, where appropriate" needs to take into account the existence of double majors and of the vast number of students who change programs midway through their academic careers.

At this point I don't have enough information to comment on the per credit hour model and how that may or may not work for our campus. I know it was studied a few years ago.

I am concerned about the tuition rates by residency. Our athletic programs will suffer greatly from losing the Grow ND option. Requiring our Canadians to pay 150% will cause an enrollment decrease and the momentum with our international students will be stymied.

What happens to our military students within this group? How is their residency determined?

The reduction in waivers would be catastrophic. I can't imagine how we recruit student-athletes (over 65% of our student-athletes are non-residents) if we lose Grow ND and have a reduction in waivers. I understand the reduction would affect other subgroups.

The Tuition Model will be difficult to post for comparison if there are differential rates among various programs and tiers. It appears to be more complex to the average person than easy to understand and transparent.

Tuition waivers could be reduced, but to no longer offer them except in a handful of cases sounds a bit extreme.

The Accountability category appears to be contradictory to the Affordability category. Minot State University's tuition model has appealed to many in-state as well as out-of-state students. We have been able to draw students from many states.

Right now at MSU, if you take a class on campus you pay the same amount of tuition no matter where you are from. The 3 tier proposal's changes to the ratio of in- and out- of state tuition and the limit on tuition waivers could cause students to be unable to afford to attend MSU. MSU has a many students from the base who are not ND residents who if forced to pay non-resident tuition might decide to spend their money on an online program with a different university. It will also be harder to attract quality out-of-state students because of the limit on tuition waivers.

With so many different tuition/program/course fees, there will be a massive amount of item types to enter and maintain.

A move to a per-credit tuition model will help the University, but may keep some students away. The change in tuition rates by residency status will again help the University, but may keep some students away.

Transparency regarding the tuition model is much needed. Although there must be consistency throughout the system for reporting purposes.

It will be interesting to see what the proposed tuition model will do to enrollment numbers, especially considering the drop of students due to the flood.

Just thinking about our waiver programs if we have to cut them back to 5% we would lose:

- Athletic Awards
- Kevin's 4 year waiver programs
- Marching Band waivers
- Spouse and Dependent waiver
- Graduate School waivers
- Just to name a few.

Perhaps if this is a direction we have to go... then it should be implemented over a 4 year period. This time frame would give us an opportunity to "RE-TOOL" our waiver programs.

Per-Credit Tuition:

Assuming we would take our 12 hour tuition rate and apply that rate to 15 credits to get a per-credit hour charge. So we would go from \$100 per credit hour to \$85 (example only). Currently we have a large group of part-time students, which means our tuition collections would go down for that group. I question if we would make of the tuition collections with the students enrolled in more than 12 credits.

The stated purpose is to have "... fiscal policies that are in the best interest of all students." In our case, it is clearly NOT in the best interest for our students who currently pay the resident rate to have a tuition increase of 50% or 75%. Higher tuition is NOT in the best interest of "all students." It is in the best interest only to

those who pay the resident rate. The full quote from the purpose paragraph is, "Strengthening our campuses must be balanced against fiscal policies that are in the best interest of all students." It is a known fact that diversity is difficult to come by in North Dakota. Our campuses are not strengthened by raising tuition for non-ND students as the diverse students will be less likely to come to ND. The resident/non-resident model makes sense if we don't have "room" for the students. We have room! (Exception for our current housing situation.) Why would we price ourselves out of the market to have empty seats in the classroom? This is not efficient.

The argument is that as a school funded (in part) by state dollars that the non-tax paying student must pay more in a sense of fairness to the taxpayer. This argument fails to see that our current model brings in tuition dollars that we would not receive if the tuition costs were higher for non-ND residents. I know this is a traditional model for campuses across the nation, but if we must have the variable rates, have we considered setting a tuition and providing waivers to ND students? Same result, just a different presentation.

I'm not sure what is meant by "... differentiate rates among tiers ...". Does this mean that all of the four-year schools will charge the same tuition? I think each campus still needs the flexibility to define its own need. I'm also wondering of how all of the tuition model discussion relates to the funding model used by the legislature and the SBHE. Tuition is just one part of the equation. Where in the proposal is the discussion about the state funded part of the budget? We cannot assume that such funding is correct in the first place. I know I'm too simplistic in this, but why doesn't the state fund the whole thing and then we can reimburse them with the tuition? If the tuition model will be dictated, then let the state take the risk and not each individual campus.

If we return to a system that charges out of state students extra to attend our universities, it will significantly reduce our ability to attract out of state students. Many of our top students come from out of state. 55% of our student government officers are not from North Dakota. 38% of all of our student officers and senators are not from North Dakota. I believe that the reduction of students who don't attend a North Dakota university because they would pay a higher rate would cause a higher loss in revenue than what would be generated by increases in revenue by students paying a higher tuition.

Are UND and NDSU going to be discernibly more expensive than the regional universities?

If the proposed increase for out-of-state and international students includes those taking online classes, it is likely that we will lose about 15% of our students. It makes sense to me that because these students are not leaving their home countries or states, that they should not be charged out-of-state tuition. They are completing their education within their own states and countries and will most likely continue their studies with a school that does not charge them an inflated tuition rate.

Dr. Shirvani's tuition plans would kill us as an institution. So many students come here because it beats everyone else. I am ok with the international rate being at 175% of the current cost because it is still extremely competitive. But for out-of-state residents, I think the 150% cost would drive them away. Instead of paying around \$24,000 for tuition over four years, they would be paying \$36,000. For many students, an extra twelve grand would make or break the decision. If we were to raise tuition I believe two things MUST happen. First, current programs that need to be improved and re-structured, or structured at all, need to be, and secondly, additional programs should be added to keep the competitive edge.

Optional programs, minors, honors, first year experience, and students learning for the sake of learning will all be compromised. The financially prudent student will take the minimum number of credits, not explore other areas or enhance their diversity because of the extra expense.

The diversity of our student population will drop like a rock. Not only do we as individuals value diversity, our accrediting agency, ASHA, bases its accreditation, in part, on our ability to attract and retain a diverse student population.

Online enrollment will likely soar, and all we have done to make Minot State a “Destination” will be lost. The campus climate efforts will be wasted.

Online classes should cost more because they demand much more of the instructor’s time.

Pay per credit is a narrow view that “college life” is only about the specific classes required for the degree, and appears designed to diminish intellectual curiosity, diversity, engagement with the community/ faculty, etc....and all the things the last 5 years have been about.

Per credit tuition will kill the First Year Experience program, the Honors program, as well as general intellectual curiosity. Students will only take courses that are absolutely required for their degree. Also, I suspect very few students will pursue minors since they will cost more. This seems to be contradictory to the core concept of education: don’t we want to encourage students to be curious and maximize their university education?

In the majority of meetings I have with prospective students and families, they comment that one of the primary reasons they chose MSU is the current tuition model, that is the 12-18 credits for one price AND the all students pay the same model. For example, in the past week, I have met with students from Nova Scotia, California, Saskatchewan, Michigan, and Illinois; they all mentioned the reason they are here is that we have a good program and the tuition price was attractive. I have no doubt in my mind that an increase in tuition for out of state and international students will significantly decrease our enrollment.

Our program accrediting body, the Council on Academic Accreditation for the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, values student diversity. This tuition model appears to discourage diversity as it discourages anyone from out of state and out of country from coming to the university. We will have a difficult time explaining to CAA that our university system really doesn’t promote diversity and, in fact, discourages by policy and practice any “outsiders” from attending.

Athletics discussion focused on two proposals that we felt would have a major effect on our operations:

- 1) The loss of Grow ND (100%, 150% and 175% tuition rates).
- 2) The reduction of tuition waivers to 5% of the institution’s gross tuition collections.

Loss of Grow ND

With over 68% of our student athletes from out-of-state, this will have a major effect on the recruitment and retention of student athletes. In 2012-13, we will grant just under \$900,000 in athletic aid for our student athletes (this is 73 full scholarship equivalencies). Approximately 75% of that \$900,000 goes to out-of-state students (\$675,000 or 55 equivalencies). With the increase in tuition rates to the 150% and 175% rates, we estimate that we will have to increase our fundraising by \$204,150 just to give the equivalent number of scholarships.

Reduction of tuition waivers

The athletic department currently utilizes over \$500,000 in tuition waiver dollars. As stated above, the total allotment of athletic aid is approximately \$900,000 (\$400,000 in Beaver Booster cash + \$500,000 in tuition waivers). If our institutional waivers are cut by 50% (\$1.5 million to \$750,000), then I would assume our

athletic waivers would be cut to \$250,000. This would add another \$250,000 to the total in the paragraph above ($\$204,150 + \$250,000 = \$454,150$). In round numbers we would have to double what we are fundraising for scholarships at this time. This doesn't take into consideration that we are trying to fundraise significant dollars to fund our operating budgets.

We did discuss the impact of the admissions standards. Although we didn't conduct a study of the effect on current student athletes, a study through the admissions office had 26% of 2011-12 freshmen class being denied with the new standards. We feel this would be similar for athletics. This would limit our pool significantly and have a major impact on recruiting.

The bottom line is we need a minimum number of student-athletes to field teams. With the changes listed above our recruiting pool would be significantly reduced causing a competitive disadvantage. We can see this negatively affecting sports such as wrestling who wishes to carry 35+ students, many of them walk-ons or receiving very little aid (\$500 to \$1000). A \$500 scholarship when the cost is \$12,300 has some impact. A \$500 scholarship when the cost is \$16,050 (the 175% rate) has less impact and will cause some to look elsewhere. This may cause the wrestling team to only carry 25 students instead of a desired 35+. This would be a similar situation for teams such as softball, track and field and baseball. Overall, we estimated that we could lose up to 50 student athletes due to the reasons listed above. We currently have about 330 student athletes. This could be reduced to 280 with the implementation of the proposal. Multiply this loss of 50 by the NACDA factor (every athlete brings in two additional students) and you would have a decrease in 150 FTE with athletics.

Last Thursday I had the good fortune of helping a young transfer student from another state register for fall semester classes. When I asked her how she got to Minot and Minot State she said she came here because two of her best friends were here for athletics and they encouraged her to come up. She is not an athlete so she is here for her education. I know for a fact if we follow the 150% suggestion re tuition neither she nor her friends would be here. Many others would follow. We need to stand firm on our tuition rates because right now they are what is keeping MSU afloat.

Charging out-of-state and out-of-country students more to attend a NDUS campus, especially Canadian students for whom North Dakota is the only geographic option for in-person, face-to-face higher education, seems politically and financially problematic and a potential "cut our nose off despite our face" decision, especially when the fluctuation of exchange rates between the United States and other countries are taken into consideration. We should be "encouraging" students to come here to maintain and increase enrollments at all of the campuses, not discouraging enrollment (unless the idea behind this proposal is to eliminate all but the two premier campuses, and/or to force everyone to get a degree online, since that is, of course, more convenient, more affordable, and what current students of the digital generation want) Why are uniform tuition and fees a good idea? Why would a student think s/he should pay the same amount for very different kinds of degrees, work, opportunity, etc.?

Currently receive many comments that students and family choose MSU because of the current tuition model. Significant increase would decrease our enrollment

Our accrediting body values student diversity...this would discourage any "outsiders" from coming to MSU

Will significantly decrease enrollment in our major. Our program is approximately 2/3s Canadian. We are an attractive option for Canadian students because of our tuition but also because of our standards. We are a well-recognized program in our national accrediting body. Our students are KNOWN across North America. If they are now being perceived as a "tier 2" group, this will significantly distract from the program.

Pay per credit will kill First Year Experience...students will refuse to pay for classes they "don't need" like the Interdisciplinary Studies classes that are part of FYE

Pay per credit will stifle intellectual curiosity and exploration...why would anyone do an additional minor or the honors program or just take a class to increase knowledge?

pay per credit may encourage students to jump into the university credit class rather than take the remedial class (i.e., math 102) prior to taking the university credit class because they don't want to have to pay extra or have to enroll in a different program to achieve this credit. It might work for some students and it might backfire for those who are weak and end up failing the class and having to retake it, paying even more for the credit.

Responses to 3-tier proposal & other miscellaneous observations

I think the general thrust is fairly positive; it could have the impact of elevating MSU's status and enhancing the caliber of students attracted to this institution.

I think a Fall 2013 implementation is too ambitious. Students, parents, guidance, counselors, etc., need more preparation time to make quality decisions

It seems to me that this entire model is based more on previous experience in the California system (which is not doing very well these days), and only limited knowledge and understanding of the NDUS and the institutions within it.

I think it is also important to consider exactly how UND and NDSU differ from the rest of the NDUS schools. Two main factors are the increased breadth of offerings that their larger enrollments make possible, and the much more significant presence of graduate programs. It is a mistake to assume that every undergraduate program at these institutions is of higher quality than those at any other institution in the state. It is important to remember that at the research institutions lower level undergraduate classes are commonly taught in large sections, often with teaching assistants providing a significant portion of the experience, while the regional institutions offer smaller classes and the opportunity for a great deal of personal contact between the professor and the student. The three-tier system would lead one to expect that everything is higher quality at the research institutions when this is not true.

I think it is worth noting that the three-tier approach provides uneven treatment across the system. "Middle tier" institutions will lose out on both ends (the students who meet higher admission standards will want the prestige of attending the tier one schools), while remedial courses and dual credit courses will be taken away and given to the community colleges.

Finally, I would like to point out that there are significant differences among the "middle tier" institutions. For example, Minot State University offers an accredited and internationally recognized program in communication disorders, including a master's program. This type of program would be far out of reach for a smaller regional university. Treating all four of the regional institutions as if they were exactly the same risks damage to the strong programs that each has to offer.

This would be a move to balance out all of the schools which would be beneficial to be able to classify things. But MSU offers grad programs which don't fit well with the group of universities that we are placed with.

It seems to take away from the desired uniqueness and competitiveness of each institution.

The NDUS institutions cater to a wide variety of students, who should not be discouraged from seeking the best fit for their educational needs. Admission standards are but one part of the equation. We are not Wal-Marts similarly stocked from corporate warehouses. Our state's institutions are already known for the strengths of particular programs; it is slapdash to place Minot State in the same category with Mayville, Valley City or Dickinson. We are part of an extremely small system, and it would take little time to become acquainted with what each campus offers. The student should ultimately have the right to choose the school most closely linked to his/her needs, and that involves specific faculty, proximity to work, friends and family, and aspirations.

Though none would argue against working toward retention and completion, it is demoralizing to reduce our *raison d'être* to that of simply churning out graduates for the workforce. The student who gains an appreciation for Mozart, Rembrandt, James Joyce or Shakespeare is better for having taken the class whether or not he graduates. That being said, I like the notion that the system would reach out to those who did not complete their degree, and possibly provide financial assistance.

To sum up, I really believe that this proposal is exactly what we DO NOT NEED. Right now, we are on the up-and-up not only as a university, but as a booming small city. Minot State is one of the “rocks” of Minot and always has been. I believe Dr. Shirvani does not understand where he has come and who he has been given authority over. In North Dakota, we have high standards. Let those standards stay, and let us press on as we grow as Minot State University to bigger and better things as a “premier institution in the great, great plains!”

A further problem I see with the Tier system is that Minot State University is almost exclusively hurt by it. Not only does it take away the tuition model that allows us to draw students from across the nation, it presumes that as an institution we have more in common with the other four year colleges around the state than we do with the two research institutions. Yet any experience with our NDUS system makes it altogether clear that there is a profound learning gulf between what is offered at the VCSUs, the Mayville States, and the Dickinson States, and what is offered at Minot State University, just as there is a smaller difference between what is offered at UND, NDSU, and MSU. In short, the new tier system sticks MSU—a university with an academic reputation on the rise—in with colleges that are often questioned for their legitimacy as institutions of higher education at all. AT ALL. MSU has been trying to escape the orbit of these four year colleges for many years, and the tier system wrongly ascertains that we have failed to do so.

What I would like to see is the opportunity for open debate on the 3-tier access plan without prejudice. Input from academic leaders across the state could result in a solid and workable plan that would ultimately benefit all students. What concerns me however is what I am seeing in local publications and elsewhere, calling for the plan to “be accepted as a whole”, in order for it to succeed. That somehow the effectiveness of the plan will be lost by “segregating pieces you don't like.”

Rep. Mock made the statement that “there are some areas where we need to see how this aligns with reality, how practical it is for implementation.” I am hopeful that will be the sentiment from the campuses and public at large when finalizing policy(s) meant to assist students who want to succeed in the ND university system, the only system we have and one with a history of high achievement.

What guarantees will be put in place to make sure that “all” the campuses in the NDUS will be adequately funded by the State, if NDSU and UND become “premier” institutions and the other campuses are relegated to 2nd and 3rd class status? How can each of these 2nd and 3rd class institutions grow if they are limited in their academic reason for being?

How will educational accountability be implemented fairly, equitably, and uniformly?

What does the public whom we serve think about this proposal?

I don't think accountability, affordability, and academic governance can, are, or should be mutually exclusive. There is an inviolate symbiotic relationship between “all” aspects of higher education, both traditional face-

to-face, in-person higher education and digital, real-time, at-your-own-pace electronic higher education, that needs to remain in place and be cultivated and strengthened, “if” the word “higher” in “higher” education is to have any positive meaning at all, now and in the future, for the people who “work” in higher education, the people who “fund” and “contribute” to higher education, the people who educate and thereby better themselves and their societies and communities “through” higher education, and the people who benefit in countless ways “from” higher education. How will this proposal accomplish, strengthen, and improve upon these vital, essential and unequivocal aspects of higher education in general and particularly within the State of North Dakota?

What is the role of tribal colleges in Shirvani’s plan?

Exactly how does a three-tier system improve graduation and/or retention rates? What evidence is there that it does?

What if anything in Shirvani’s plan addresses the real and documented problems that have arisen in the NDUS system in the past years—problems it must be noted that are very localized to specific and individual problems on specific and individual campuses?

What if anything in Shirvani’s plan actually improves educational quality and opportunity for North Dakotans? Accountability and transparency are very popular buzz-words, but what about actual educational quality and opportunity?

There are many problems with the proposed 3 tier plan for the North Dakota University System. As I see this unrolling our new chancellor and the presidents of the Universities and Colleges would be well served to gain an understanding at what transpired at the University of Virginia last year. If the legislature of North Dakota starts looking for the same accountability they did in Virginia... every president should find another job because no institution here can match UVA for academic success and prestige.

Amongst the most glaring oversights in the plan is a lack of understanding of the growth of the North Dakota economy and this is a glaring reflection of poor leadership amongst the legislature, governor, and leadership of NDUS. At this very moment North Dakota does not have the human capital to meet the needs of our economy. With the lack of the ability to fill the basic unskilled labor jobs is a larger unfilled pool of professional jobs. Engineers are in high demand on the western side of the state but there is no engineering program on the western side of the state and by implementing the plan as is you will take away the opportunity of many people who work and attend school. The plan is also geographically blind to the needs of industry in the western side of the state for Engineers, MBA’s, and JD’s. With 70% of the job openings in the state requiring a post-secondary degree why are we limiting the choices of those who will need those degrees and shutting the door on attracting talent from out of state to fill the needs that cannot be met by in state talent?

Minot State is in a rough place at the moment. The state legislature and the Chancellor are going to basically publicly announce that a diploma from here is less valuable than one from NDSU and UND.

Also, this overlooks the families who own farms. Many students stay close to home in North Dakota to assist in the family business. We are shipping them all to the eastern side of the state! I know! Let’s bring people

into the state and give them a job but no chance to improve themselves... I am sure that will bring only upstanding citizens.

The plan also overlooks that a large amount of the growth in the state has been and will continue to be on the western side of the state. As the plan is written there will be no way for someone employed by an oil company to achieve a degree higher than an AA or a second rate BA. In a time when a huge shift is being made to support nontraditional students North Dakota will pull the rug out from under the economy that is fueling the growth in this state.

The low tuition rates in North Dakota are a great way for the state to attract the human capital it will take to fill the job needs of the state. Students can attain a top education at a value and after graduating find employment here. If the students had not been attracted to North Dakota in the first place they would not be in the position to stay in the state.

There is a fundamental lack of research on the feasibility of the plan as written. NDUS is a multi-billion dollar enterprise. That there has been no study done of this besides consultation with legislature and academics is a major short coming of leadership. Do we have an understanding of what programs should be placed where? Do we know how students will respond? The plan of course benefits the large schools but it also takes away their ability to recruit students to fill the needs to build a diverse student population by funneling students to certain schools. What will happen to NDSU and UND sports? After a push by the state to move the schools to D1 they find themselves in a position where their recruiting is strictly dictated by admissions standards set by the chancellor? Does the chancellor have any understanding of the community buy in that the NDSU football team and UND hockey team have? At Minot State we will be limited even more to the athletes left over after NDSU and UND picks. What about the athletes that are not D1 athletes but still wish to participate in college? What opportunities will be left to them? This is communist in a lot of ways in that it restricts choices and dictates what people will do.

An issue in the proposal is increasing need based aid. As a state funded institution this is very unique. Most state schools offer merit aid to attract strong students but very little in the way of need based aid. Why? Because as a state funded institution the cost is supposed to be kept low and supported on the front end through state funds. Need based aid has traditionally been used as a way for expensive elite colleges to attract students of differing socio-economic backgrounds and maintain a diverse student population. With a lack of endowed funds it would appear we will be engaging in the price discounting that we see at a lot of D3 schools where the costs of attendance are shifted onto other students instead of asking the tax payers for support I have a feeling we will be straddling students with loan debt after graduation. Also, we live in a free market meritocracy. I guess this is a trickle down from Obama...

The removal of remedial courses from the universities is also short sighted in that it will remove the ability of an institution to support students who are strong candidates for admission or believe they will need support to achieve their goals.

I agree with the transparency on the fees... I just cringe that we are going to be charging 20K as a base and then slashing it in half for poor students and tacking 5K on for the upper middle class.

In the section on graduate tuition there is nothing. How do you publish an incomplete plan?

Looking at this... As a high school student at a prep school that did not rank its students, a 3.25 GPA and a 1260 SAT... I would not be a viable candidate to NDSU or UND? Who are they kidding?? I got into UF and OSU... (This was before I failed college algebra... twice!)

The NDUS institutions cater to a wide variety of students, who should not be discouraged from seeking the best fit for their educational needs. Admission standards are but one part of the equation. We are not Wal-Marts similarly stocked from corporate warehouses.

I understand that there must be huge political pressures on the NDUS to somehow change/revise what we are doing in higher education in the state. But making us all the same, by somehow eating the same manna from NDUS, is absurd. Universities must be allowed to pursue missions and visions that are focused in our local culture and societies, given the resources, personnel and needs of the surrounding geography. If we are to respond to the citizens of ND, then let us at the local level decide, with our local community input, on how to do that.

A close reading of the "three-tier system" leaves me cold. Removing the university's authority to grant waivers, set flat course credit fees, the elimination of dual course authority and several other aspects mentioned will hurt MSU. Initially, I was hoping that the development of clear lines between Community College and medium size university functions would allow MSU to achieve a better balance in utilizing faculty resources, but I am not so sure now. Ideally, for MSU to grow as a destination university, it must provide more resources to departments to encourage faculty productivity that brings recognition to the department and to MSU. At the same time, departments must maintain high quality classroom teaching.