October 20, 2010

Daniel Simmons  
Chair, Academic Council  
University of California

In Re:  UCLA Response to Proposal to Rename ‘Fees’ to ‘Tuition’

Dear Dan,

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on the proposal to rename ‘fees’ to ‘tuition.’ Upon receipt of the proposal, I asked the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, the Council on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, and the Executive Board, which speaks for the Division on such matters, to review. All responses are attached. As is our custom, all other committees are welcome to opine, as well.

The UCLA Academic Senate endorses the proposal with the following stipulation, based on concerns expressed by many undergraduate students on our Senate committees: Presently there are student advisory boards which provide oversight and consultation with regard to student fees. In changing the name to tuition, the Academic Senate feels strongly that these boards maintain or enhance their consultative standing to Chancellors, the President, and other relevant administrators, regardless of the naming of the revenue stream.

Generally speaking, committees reported that members were persuaded by the argument that the use of the term ‘fees’ no longer reflects the practice at the UC and is therefore misleading. The term ‘tuition’ more accurately describes the use of the revenue that supports student instruction. Both our Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, moreover, raised the argument that many students are currently at a disadvantage, given that many grants only cover tuition; making it onerous for current students to receive funding.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Ann Karagozian  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Senate  
Jaime R. Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
September 30, 2010

Professor Ann Karagozian
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition

Dear Professor Karagozian,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition. The Council Planning and Budget met on September 27, 2010, and had brief comments.

By a unanimous vote, the Council endorsed the proposal.

Sincerely,

David Lopez
Chair, UCLA Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Andy Leuchter, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Robin Garrell, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
October 11, 2010

To: Ann Karagozian 
   Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Darnell Hunt 
   Chair, UCLA Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools

Re: Senate Item for Review: Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition

I am writing to report that at its meeting on October 8, 2010, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools (CUARS) thoughtfully considered the proposal to rename the education and professional degree fees (but not the student service fee) as “tuition.” The committee voted to endorse the proposal, with 6 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention. The student vote was 0 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

CUARS was persuaded by the argument that the use of the term “fees” is misleading. The term “tuition” more accurately describes the actual use of the revenue that supports student instruction. For the sake of transparency to the public, the university, the students, and the legislature, CUARS feels that it is important to identify student instructional costs accurately.

Those opposed to this proposal view the “adoption of the term ‘tuition’ as an abandonment of UC’s efforts to strive for a tuition-free university where the State fully covers instructional costs.” Once the symbolic language of “fees” is dropped in favor of “tuition,” they felt, the door is open for the university to freely and continually pass on increased instructional costs directly to students.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me (x64304; dhunt@soc.ucla.edu), or Dottie Ayer (x62070; dayer@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, Academic Senate CAO 
   Linda Mohr, Academic Senate Assistant CAO 
   Dottie Ayer, Academic Senate
October 11, 2010

Ann Karagozian, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition

Dear Ann,

At its meeting on October 8th, the Graduate Council reviewed the proposal from UCOP to rename University of California “fees” as “tuition.” By a unanimous vote (12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions; GSA Reps: 4 in favor) the Council endorsed the proposal as-written. Members acknowledged that the term “fees” is inconsistent with many of the charges UC levies on its students. By renaming those that are clearly intended for instructional purposes as tuition, we provide truth in advertising about the actual costs of attending the University of California.

Members questioned if renaming fees as tuition would make it any easier to approve increases than is now the case. Some felt that a simple renaming would likely have no impact on the ease of levying increases. Perhaps most importantly, members believe that a change to “tuition” would indeed make it easier for the general public to understand what is being increased as “tuition” is a universally-accepted term that describes one’s primary expenses for an education at an institution of higher learning.

Additionally, the proposal effectively articulates problems that have arisen in the use of the term “fees” for what clearly comes under the definition of “tuition.” The council was swayed by the complications that veteran students face in applying for federal financial aid. Because we technically have no tuition, these students have faced complications in trying to secure grants that cover only the cost of “tuition.” Graduate student representatives on the Graduate Council provided their own anecdotal comments about the same issue arising when applying for certain fellowships. The bottom line is this: the term “fees” has causes confusion for funding agencies when awarding and administering fellowships and training grants to students of the University of California. These difficulties are unnecessary and are unmistakably a source of frustration for students and principal investigators when requesting support to cover one’s standard educational expenses.

Overall, members felt that the proposal was timely and well-constructed, and they encourage the implementation of the name change. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Steven Nelson
Chair, Graduate Council

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
Kyle Cunningham, Graduate Council Analyst, Academic Senate
Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
October 18, 2010

To: Ann Karagozian  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Joseph B. Watson  
Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Senate Item for Review: Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition

I am writing to report that at its meeting on October 15, 2010, the Undergraduate Council (UgC) thoughtfully considered the proposal to rename the education and professional degree fees (but not the student service fee) as “tuition.”

Many members were persuaded by the argument that the use of the term “fees” is misleading. The term “tuition” more accurately describes the actual use of the revenue that supports student instruction. The argument was also made that many students are currently at a disadvantage, given that many grants only cover tuition; making it very difficult for current students to receive funding. Members also felt that calling these costs “tuition” is sending the message to the public that UC needs funding.

Those opposed to this proposal, view the “adoption of the term ‘tuition’ as an abandonment of UC’s efforts to strive for a tuition-free university where the State fully covers instructional costs.” Once the symbolic language of “fees” is dropped in favor of “tuition,” they felt, the door is open for the university to freely and continually pass on increased instructional costs directly to the students. Students also expressed concern that by changing the name from “fees” to “tuition,” it may shift student power/advisory rights on the issue of “fees.” Currently there are student advisory groups over fees, but students posed the questions, what happens if the name is changed?

The committee voted to endorse the proposal, indicating that the distinction between the student service fee and the other fees remain clear, and that student advisory rights associated with fees/tuition not change (14 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions; student vote: 0 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention).

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me or Linda Mohr (x62470; mohr@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, Academic Senate CAO  
Linda Mohr, Academic Senate Assistant CAO  
Dottie Ayer, Academic Senate