

**Discounting of Fees (Charge 5) Work Group
Student Fee Task Force 2000
Working Document: White Paper**

Revised: April 5, 2001

Work Group members: Joe Camille, Jim Krueger, Pat McTee, Wendell Ogrosky, and Mardy Eimers (coordinator)

Charge 5

Institutional discounting of student fees, taking into account the demographic and economic characteristics of students served and the need to make each campus financially accessible and affordable, while maintaining an acceptable level of net student fee revenue.

Section I: Background: Discounting of Educational Fees

University of Missouri

Student educational fee increases at the University of Missouri are recommended to the Board of Curators by the System administration. At the undergraduate level, these fees are applied on a per credit hour basis and students are charged the same regardless of which campus they are enrolled. Of course, additional fees may be assessed (e.g., instructional fees, computing fees, etc.) and those fees certainly add to the overall cost of education. The discounting of educational fees occurs on all four campuses and allows each campus the autonomy to adjust the cost of education to specific students. Thus, individual campuses may not have the authority to set education fees but they do have the authority to discount those educational fees.

In the past decade, two key trends have occurred in regard to the discounting of educational fees at the University of Missouri. First, undergraduate students have been held more accountable for the cost of their education. That is, educational fees have increased at the University rather substantially during this period and state and federal financial aid has not kept pace with these increases. Similarly, the University has relied more extensively on student fee revenue to fuel the operations of the institution. Second, the academic requirements to gain acceptance into the University have increased during this period. Consequently, academically better-prepared undergraduate students are represented on all four campuses.

National Perspective: Discounting of Fees

The discounting of educational fees has generally been a private college and university concern. If you examine the literature, for example, nearly all of the studies have used data from private institutions at the undergraduate level. Nevertheless, there has been a growing interest in the discounting of fees at the public level. Local community and state governments continue to provide proportionally less funds to cover the costs of operating a higher education institution, and accordingly, education fee revenue from students becomes increasingly important. Further, as public institutions discount educational fees in an effort to attract students, it also whittles away at this revenue base. This revenue base is critical to the operations of the institution when other sources of revenue are reduced.

From a national perspective, the intent of student fee discounting has shifted dramatically at the undergraduate level (USA Group, 2001; National Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance [NACCSFA], 2001). Ten years ago, the primary reason that institutions discounted fees was to ensure access for students who qualified academically and to ensure affordability so that these students could continue through graduation. That is, discounting of educational fees was used in the past to attract students who demonstrated financial need according to various formulas and calculations (USA Group, 2001).

In more recent years, however, discounting has primarily been used to attract a more academically attractive and well-qualified student body. In this case, strong academically gifted students, regardless of financial need, receive scholarships and grants that in past, might have gone to economically disadvantaged students with less academic talent. The emphasis on merit-based scholarships from the institution, coupled with the growing presence of merit-based scholarships at the federal and state level, further amplifies the opportunity for good students to secure financial aid. Particularly at four-year colleges and universities, the effect has limited access and opportunity for economically disadvantaged students who want to enroll at these institutions. The USA Group (2001) examined financial aid trends from 1990-1996. According the study, “the number of academic merit scholarships and other ‘non-need based’ grants to middle and upper-income students grew by 23%, but the number awarded to low-income undergraduates fell by 11 percent” (p. 2). At the same time, the report suggests, need-based aid to low-income students only increased by 1%. The Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance (2001) echoed similar findings:

- ❑ The cost of higher education has risen steadily as a percentage of family income *only* for low-income families (in contrast to middle- and high-income families),
- ❑ This shift in policy priorities away from access at all levels has caused a steep rise in unmet need of low-income students, and
- ❑ In response to these excessive levels of unmet need, low-income students frequently must abandon plans of full-time, on-campus attendance, and attend part-time, work long hours, and borrow heavily (p. v).

Interestingly, the conclusions of the USA Group (2001) study were not as dire as anticipated. Among the private colleges and universities examined, the researchers reported that the discounting strategies used to attract higher profile students did not, on average, significantly increase median admission test scores of entering students. Furthermore, discounting strategies apparently did help institutions to attract more low-income students. However, the discounting of educational fees has had its most dramatic effect on net revenue. The researchers concluded, “the rapid use of tuition discounting led to large losses in net tuition revenue and have resulted in decreased spending on instruction and other services to students” (p. 3).

Why Discount Educational Fees?

Universities and colleges discount educational fees for several reasons: to increase the academic characteristics of entering students; increase revenue from educational fees; to enhance ethnic and economic composition of students who attend; to reward high school students of high ability; and to compete adequately with institutions vying for the same students (USA Group, 2001; UM Financial Aid Officers, personal contact). Of course, there are times when the reasons for discounting educational fees can conflict with one another. For example, trying to attract an economically diverse student body may conflict with trying to attract students of high academic ability. Or, an effort to increase the academic caliber of incoming freshmen might impinge on net educational fee revenue. In any regard, the discounting of fees can have both positive and negative implications on the institution and acknowledging these implications is critical to an effective discounting strategy.

Section II: Charge 5 Initiatives

One of the first steps to understanding the discounting of educational fees at the University of Missouri was to find out what the current “discount rate” was at the four campuses. If we could do this, we could then dissect the components of these rates and understand the “discounting” on each campus in a more cogent manner. This exercise noted two observations. First, discount rates had been computed at each campus. However, these discount rates included educational fees and scholarships and grants from all students—undergraduate, graduate and professional students. Although this might be useful information from a broad perspective, it would not provide the detailed information we needed to make policy recommendations. Second, a couple of the campuses had developed more refined discount rates (e.g., an undergraduate discount rate), but the method of calculating these rates were quite different and consequently, the rates not comparable.

We also perceived that educational fee discounting, as approached by the Student Fee Task Force, was most important at the undergraduate level. This is where the most student fee revenue is generated, it is the initial point at which students are denied or provided access to higher education, and it is where discounting has been used the most

to intentionally shape the student composition of the institution. Thus, our focus was exclusively on undergraduate discounting of fees.

The Charge 5 Workgroup outlined the following initiatives.

Initiative 1. We will define the term educational fee “discount rate” based on previous national studies and reports.

Initiative 2. We will review how the discount rate is calculated on each campus. This will include specifically what is identified in the numerator and the denominator of the equation, and note differences that might exist among the campuses. We will develop an operational definition for the discount rate (i.e., identify the specific elements that should be included in the numerator and denominator). Based on what we learn, we may recommend that different discount rates can be computed for each campus (e.g., a discount rate that only includes general operating funds, or a discount rate that includes general operating funds and endowment funds, etc.).

Initiative 3. Using the operational definition(s) noted in Initiative 2, we will have each campus compute its discount rate(s). We will also ask each campus to provide the data, the data sources, and general assumptions it used in preparing its discount rate.

Initiative 4. We will review the discount rates and accompanying data that have been computed for each campus. It is critical that we not only examine the discount rate, but also the underlying components of the numerator and denominator.

Initiative 5. We recognize that there are differences among the four campuses of the University of Missouri. This is particularly true when taking into account the demographic and economic characteristics of students served and the need to make each campus financially accessible and affordable. In preparing our recommendations to the Student Fee Task Force, campus differences in mission, objectives, and competitive environment will be carefully considered.

Section III: National Perspective: Standard Definitions of a Tuition Discount Rate

There is not one definition for the term “discount rate.” Rather, this and related terms are used by different persons for varying purposes, often with slightly different definitions according to Ronald Allan (1999). Allan identified three constituencies and set forth three specific definitions of the term “tuition discounting” in Table 1 of his paper—see attachment. Note that the denominator is the same in all three cases. Allan stated that the definitions are successively broader with each numerator containing all of the elements of

the previous definition plus additional items. He also stated that the three constituencies should not be considered mutually exclusive, especially since most persons who work in higher education administration can wear several hats.

Allan defined Simple Tuition Discount as all forgiveness of a student's tuition whether in the form of a waiver (the tuition is never charged to the student's account) or in the form of a grant (the tuition is charged to the student's account and paid for with an "institutional grant.") The Administrative Constituency uses this definition because it needs to know the amount of money that is available to operate the institution, regardless of the source of funds. Thus, tuition paid from Gifts and Endowments is the same as tuition paid directly by students.

Allan defined Scholarship Allowances as the sum of Simple Tuition Discount plus tuition payments made from gift and endowment funds. The Financial Constituency uses this definition because it is interested in the financial health of the entire entity, including endowment funds. He stated that the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) has used the definition for scholarship allowances in its tuition discounting surveys since it began the surveys in 1991. The results of the latest survey, which applies only to independent institutions, were reported in the March 2000 issue of the *Business Officer*. In addition, according to Allan, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) adopted this definition in its standard that applies to private college and university financial statements.

Allan defined Student Tuition Discount as the sum of Scholarship Allowances plus external grants. The Marketing Constituency uses this definition because it has the viewpoint of the student who is interested in knowing how much tuition has to be paid from family contributions and self-help (loans and work).

In previous UM research, Steve Chatman, Nilufer Joseph-Tipton and Alisha Rychnovsky (1999) used the term Institutional Discount Percentage. The numerator was defined as Unrestricted Scholarships and Fellowships and the denominator was defined as Gross Unrestricted Student Fees. Chatman, Joseph-Tipton, and Rychnovsky used IPEDS Finance Survey data to determine the institutional discounting percentage for the four campuses in FY1997.

These percentages were as follows: UM-Columbia, 26%; UM-Kansas City, 23%; UM-Rolla, 26%; and UM-St Louis, 10%. We calculated the overall percentage for UM in FY1997 as 22.5%, which agreed with the percentage reported as the Student Aid Reliance ratio in the *UM Financial Report* for FY1997. Note that these calculations include all student levels--undergraduate, graduate, and professional.

TABLE 1

TUITION DISCOUNT RATE BY CONSTITUENCY

Rate = Numerator / Denominator

Constituency	Numerator	Denominator
ADMINISTRATIVE Institutional Discount Rate: President, Board of Directors, Provosts, Academic Finance Officers, Financial Aid Directors	SIMPLE TUITION DISCOUNT	GROSS TUITION REVENUE
FINANCIAL FASB Definition: Treasurer, Financial Administrators, Auditors and Analysts	SCHOLARSHIP ALLOWANCES (Simple Tuition Discount + Gifts & Endowments)	GROSS TUITION REVENUE
MARKETING Student Definition: Admissions Directors, Enrollment Managers Public Relations, College Books	STUDENT TUITION DISCOUNT (Scholarship Allowances + External Grants) Simple Tuition Discount + Gifts & Endowments + Pell Grants + SEOG Grants + Other External Scholarships	GROSS TUITION REVENUE

Since the IPEDS Finance Survey data comes from the audited financial statements, we asked Jennifer Doll in the UM Controller's Office to provide the individual campus percentages for FY2000. In talking with Jennifer, we found out that the term now used is Total Student Discount Rate and that the definition has changed. Although the denominator is the same, the numerator now includes both Unrestricted and Restricted Scholarships and Fellowships minus Pell Grants. Using the new definition, the overall UM percentage for FY2000 was 27.6%, which is reported in the UM Financial Report. The individual campus percentages are as follows: UM-Columbia 33%, UM-Kansas City, 24%; UM-Rolla, 38%; and UM-St. Louis, 13%. Note again that these calculations include all student levels.

Thus, given our focus on undergraduate students, we needed to go beyond these calculations.

According to Joe Camille, UM-Columbia currently calculates a discount rate for undergraduate students only. The numerator is the sum of General Operating funded awards to undergraduates and the denominator is the sum of undergraduate educational fees. Note that in this definition, all other "required and assessed fees" are not included in the denominator. Joe said that this definition is used for practical reasons because all other "required and assessed fees" are not currently reported by student level.

The Work Group also reviewed the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 35 (GASB 35), which applies to UM as a public university. Based on a handout that Kathleen T. McNeely provided at a conference hosted by the UM Controller's Office on September 27, 2000, the term "scholarship allowances" appears to be used for GASB 35 purposes. The term has a broader definition, however, in that it applies not only to educational and related fees, but also to housing and meal plans as well as the provision of educationally related supplies acquired from an institutional bookstore. The amounts of the scholarship allowance should be disclosed for all revenues impacted by such scholarship allowances.

Institutions subject to GASB 35 will be required to report net tuition and fee revenue in a Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets. The gross amount of tuition and fee revenue may be reported less the related scholarship allowance, provided that the scholarship allowance is displayed immediately below the gross revenue amount. Alternatively, a single net tuition and fee revenue amount may be reported with the amount of the scholarship allowance being disclosed in the notes to the financial statements.

According to McNeely's handout, financial aid provided to students from institutional resources will be recorded as scholarship allowances in an amount up to the amounts owed by students to the institution. Any institutional resources provided in excess of amounts owed by the students to the institution and refunded to the students will be recorded as an institutional expense.

Section IV: Defining an Undergraduate Discount Rate at the University of Missouri

As noted, the discount rates here to fore reported for the four University of Missouri campuses were discount rates that included all students—undergraduates, graduates and professional students. Since graduate students receive on average more institutional aid in the form of scholarships, fellowships and fee waivers than undergraduate students, and because there are differences in the number and percent of graduate students on each of the four campuses, it seemed appropriated to determine an undergraduate discount rate for each of the four campuses so that a more accurate discount rate comparison could be derived.

The first attempt to determine an undergraduate discount rate used the FY 2000 Financial Reporting System (FRS) for the University of Missouri as its source. Using FRS we were able to determine total undergraduate educational fees and total undergraduate non-resident educational fees. However, the supplemental fees for all students are collected in one account on each campus. The same is true for computing fees. In order to determine the amount collected from undergraduate students for the supplemental and computing fees we determined the total undergraduate educational fees—resident and non-resident—at each campus and expressed it as a percentage of the total educational fees collected from all students. For each campus we then multiplied the derived percentage by the total supplemental fees collected and again by the total computing fees collected and added the calculated undergraduate total of these two fees to the total undergraduate educational fees and thus obtained the total fees for undergraduate students at each of the four campuses. This gave us an accurate denominator for the discount equation to calculate the undergraduate discount rate on each campus.

We then used the FY2001 Operating Budget for the four University of Missouri campuses to determine the amount of general operating funds budgeted as grants and scholarships for undergraduate students on each of the four campuses. We were able to do this quite easily for the Columbia campus because the undergraduate grants and scholarships have their own separate accounts. However, on the other three campuses, budgeted expenditures for undergraduates, graduates and professional students are combined into the same accounts. If we had used the budget book to determine anticipated expenditures we would have overstated the numerator of the discount equation and the discount percent would also have been overstated.

We then turned to the MDHE 14 report to accurately determine the amount of general operating fund gift assistance. The MDHE 14 report is an annual report submitted to CBHE that shows the total financial assistance given to all students for each year at each campus. This report is divided by source of financial aid—federal, institutional, state, and private. It is also lists the type of aid—gift or grant aid, loans and employment. Finally, the report is divided by undergraduate and graduate student aid expenditures. Since all four campuses must submit this report on an annual basis the data existed. However, there was an additional problem. While the institutional section of this report listed all gift aid for undergraduates it did not make a distinction between general

operation funds (GO) and endowed funds. Therefore a program had to be written to pull out the GO expenditures from the total institutional gift aid expenditures. The Columbia campus wrote the required program and shared it with the other three campuses.

One obstacle remained. The four financial aid offices--because of federal aid regulation--begin the fiscal year with the fall term, then add winter term and finally the summer term. The University accounting system (FRS) begins the fiscal year with the summer term, then adds fall and winter terms. Therefore the fiscal years for FRS and the MDHE 14 report are not entirely parallel. Both the St. Louis and the Columbia campuses decided to calculate two different undergraduate GO discount rates: the first would use the two sources of data—FRS and the MDHE 14 report—in their current form; the second report would alter the MDHE 14 report to use data for the exact same fiscal year as FRS. The purpose was to determine if any difference in the GO discount rate existed. After doing these calculations both St. Louis and Columbia reported no difference in the undergraduate GO discount rate. However, we also calculated a discount rate for GO plus endowed dollars and there was a slight but not significant difference. Finally, we calculated a third discount rate for all gift aid and again there was a small but not significant difference in the two calculations. We came to the conclusion that this extra calculation was unnecessary.

In order to replicate these three calculations in future years—GO discount rate, GO plus endowed funds discount rate, and a discount rate that includes gift aid from all sources—please use the Financial Reporting System of the University of Missouri to determine all undergraduate student fees and the following lines from the MDHE to determine gift aid expenditures: lines 140,150,160,170 and 180 for institutional aid. Remember, a special program will have to be run to pull out the GO dollars from the total. Then to determine the third discount calculation sum total undergraduate gift aid from all sources by adding the following lines from the MDHE: lines 10, 40, 140, 150, 160, 170, 180, 230, 240, 242, 260, 261, 270, 280, 281 and 300.

Section V: The Undergraduate Discount Rate at the University of Missouri

The following table displays the three undergraduate educational fee discount rates for each campus. As noted in the previous section, the primary sources of these data were the DHE 14-1 Report entitled “Student Financial Aid Awarded.” The financial aid office on each campus completes this report annually for the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. Total undergraduate fee revenue was secured from FY2000 figures in the Financial Reporting System.

Undergraduate Educational Fee Discount Rates for the University of Missouri, FY2000

	Columbia	Kansas City	Rolla	St Louis
	(in thousands)			
Financial Aid from General Operating	22,969	6,330	7,152	4,372
Financial Aid from General Operating & Endowment	29,772	8,279	9,108	5,105
All Financial Aid (Institution, State, Federal)	43,881	15,413	12,947	10,168
Total Undergraduate Fee Revenue*	88,723	32,295	22,943	33,017
General Operating Discount Rate	25.9%	19.6%	31.2%	13.2%
General Operating + Endowment Discount Rate	33.6%	25.6%	39.7%	15.5%
All Financial Aid Discount Rate	49.5%	47.7%	56.4%	30.8%

Source: FY2000 DHE-14 Student Financial Aid Awarded and FRS.

Note: Matched reporting periods of the DHE-14 with the University fiscal year (Summer, Fall, and Winter).

* Includes Undergraduate fee revenue, undergraduate supplemental fees, and undergraduate computing fees.

Although three discount rates were computed, the one of most interest is the General Operating discount rate. It denotes the percentage of undergraduate educational fee revenue that is used for undergraduate institutional scholarships and grants. This percentage ranges from 13.2% at UM-St Louis to 31.2% at UM-Rolla. If the General Operating discount rate is subtracted from the General Operating & Endowment discount rate, you would get the percentage of undergraduate scholarships and grants that originate from endowed sources. For example, UM-Columbia ($29.7\text{M} - 22.9\text{M} = 6.8\text{M}$ or $33.6\% - 25.9\% = 7.7\%$) secures an additional 6.8 million dollars for scholarships from endowed sources. The All Financial Aid discount rate shows, on average, how much educational fees are discounted if you consider all sources of financial aid (e.g., institutional, state, federal and other external). At UM-Kansas City, for instance, undergraduate students on average pay about 52.3% ($100\% - 47.7\%$) of the “sticker price” to attend college. This discount rate is particularly useful for marketing and promotional purposes.

Section VI: Recommendations and Rationale

The following recommendations and rationale are put forth by the Charge 5 workgroup.

Recommendation #1:

On an annual basis, report the undergraduate educational fee discount rates as defined and calculated in this report. This would include the General Operating Discount Rate, the General Operating & Endowment Discount Rate, and the All Financial Aid Discount Rate.

Rationale

This is the first time that the campuses of the University of Missouri have developed and reported common undergraduate educational fees discount rate(s). Reporting these rates would enable each campus to evaluate, on an annual basis, how general operating funds have been used to attract students in accordance with campus goals. For some campuses, these rates may be perceived as being too high (too much of general operating is being dedicated to attract students); for others, these rates may be perceived as being too low (not enough of the general operating funds is being used to attract students). In addition, it would allow trends to be followed and enable additional information to be reported such as the percentage of general operating funds that are used for need-based versus merit-based scholarships, how endowed scholarships are used, and how federal and state aid supplements institutional sources of financial aid. These discount rates would also allow the University to access the net revenue secured from undergraduate educational fees on an annual basis.

What is an “appropriate discount rate” for one campus depends greatly on the campus mission, objectives, and its competitive environment. For example, in an effort to reduce its undergraduate discount rate, UMKC could limit or even eliminate non-resident fee

waivers. However, an essential aspect of the UMKC mission is to serve the greater Kansas City metropolitan area—regardless of state boundaries. Reporting a commonly defined discount rate on an annual basis will provide the campuses and the University with a general extent of how scholarships and grants are used on each campus. Nevertheless, a more important question would be whether the campus is using scholarships and grants in the most effective manner to meet its mission and objectives in light of its unique competitive environment.

Recommendation #2:

We recommend that each campus carefully consider the opportunity for prospective undergraduate students from low-income groups to enroll on and graduate from the campus. In cases where opportunities to enroll and graduate are hindered because of limited need-based aid, we encourage the campus to provide scholarships and grants in this critical area. This recommendation may be particularly applicable to the Kansas City, Rolla, and St Louis campuses as these campuses currently provide little if any need-based aid from institutional sources.

We recommend that the amount of need-based aid from institutional sources be reported on an annual basis for each campus.

Rationale

According to recent national reports, the composition of educational fee discounting has shifted from being largely need-based scholarships to being largely merit-based scholarships. A review of scholarships offered at the University of Missouri and state of Missouri supports this trend: Scholarships offered from institutional sources and state sources are primarily awarded based on the academic merit of the student. Furthermore, the resident educational fees charged at the University of Missouri, in contrast to resident fees charged at other four-year public colleges, have increased at a greater rate during the past decade (Initial Charge to Student Fee Task Force, 2000).

These trends suggest that academically qualified, prospective undergraduate students who come from economically disadvantaged groups may find access to the University increasingly difficult. Furthermore, those who do enroll may find that completing four or five years of college economically prohibitive.

Need-based Undergraduate Scholarships, Fellowships, and Grants Awarded from Institutional Sources, FY2000

(\$ in thousands)	Columbia	Kansas City	Rolla	St Louis
Students receiving Need-Based Aid	2,538	222	0	65
Need-Based Aid (\$)	\$3,655	\$201	0	\$87

Source: FY2000 DHE-14 Student Financial Aid Awarded

Non-Need and Need-based Undergraduate Scholarships, Fellowships, and Grants Awarded from Institutional Sources, FY2000

(\$ in thousands)	Columbia	Kansas City	Rolla	St Louis
Scholarships, Fellowships, and Grants	\$29,475	\$8,279	\$9,108	\$5,169

Source: FY2000 DHE-14 Student Financial Aid Awarded

Although we stopped short of offering a specific recommendation, we considered recommendations such as “of the total undergraduate scholarships and grants offered from institutional sources, x percentage should be need-based” or “ x percentage of any educational fee increase during the next five years should be earmarked for need-based aid.” Among others, one concern of the workgroup was that some merit-based aid is certainly going to economically disadvantaged students.

Recommendation #3:

We strongly encourage the campuses to enhance the number and amount of undergraduate scholarships and grants that come from endowed sources. Depending on campus circumstances, this financial aid from endowed sources could be used to 1) supplement the overall level of institutional financial aid provided to undergraduate students, or 2) replace the financial aid that comes from general operating sources so that these institutional funds can be directed toward other priorities.

Rationale

Scholarships and grants that are generated from endowments become permanent sources of financial aid, available each year. As the campuses look for more sources of “outside” funds to run their operations, endowed scholarships are a viable source of undergraduate scholarships and grants.

Recommendation #4:

State sources of need-based financial aid are less than adequate for economically disadvantaged students attending four-year public colleges in Missouri. Thus, we recommend that the University administration influence the State of Missouri to put more funds into the Missouri College Guarantee Program, a newly created need-based aid program. While the State of Missouri is scheduled to spend \$10.3 million dollars in this program for academic year 2001-2002, that amount should be greatly expanded to assist a greater number of economically disadvantaged students to attend Missouri's four-year colleges.

Rationale

National reports have suggested that low-income groups have the least access to four-year colleges and universities (e.g., USA Group, 2001). These reports have also predicted that access to four-year institutions is not likely to improve for these students. In addition, several state of Missouri programs (e.g., A+ Schools, etc.) have made community college attendance more economically attractive for all prospective college students in the state. Academically qualified students deserve an opportunity to attend and succeed at four-year institutions without undue economic burden. The prospect of securing an economically diverse student body in the future could be jeopardized at the University if legislative action is not encouraged.

Recommendation #5:

The University of Missouri System should play a leadership role in supporting efforts to increase federal need-based aid for students. The University should work directly through its lobbying efforts as well as participating in efforts undertaken by appropriate national educational associations to help insure access for qualified students.

Rationale

The recently released report “Access Denied: Restoring the Nation’s Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity” (Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 2001) set forth four key policy priorities (pages 23 and 24) for the Administration and Congress. Although not everyone may agree with these specific recommendations, the overall objective of increasing federal need-based aid should be a high priority of the University of Missouri System.

Section VII: References

Allan, Ronald. “Tuition Discounts, Institutional Student Aid and Scholarship Allowances,” published in Sallie Mae Education Institute’s Monograph Series, June 1999.

Chatman, Steve, Joseph-Tipton, Nilufer, and Rychnovsky, Alisha. “1999 Educational & Required Fees Study, Office of Planning and Budget, University of Missouri System, June 1999.

McNeely, Kathleen T. Missouri State GASB 34 Presentation Slides, September 27, 2000.

National Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance. "Access Denied: Restoring the Nation's Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity." Washington DC, February, 2001.

USA Group Foundation, "Discounting Toward Disaster: Tuition Discounting, College Finances, and Enrollments of Low-Income Undergraduates, February, 2001, www.usagroup.com/foundation/discounting.htm.