



USA TODAY's 2006 College Tuition & Fees Survey

USA TODAY's annual survey of tuition and fees at 75 public flagship universities in 50 states looks at figures for first-year, full-time freshmen and includes all mandatory and major-specific fees assessed for students in basic Arts and Sciences programs. Room and board, books and other costs are not included.

School	In-state				Out-of-state			
	2006-'07 (\$)	2005-'06 (\$)	% chg.	% chg. since '02-'03	2006-'07 (\$)	2005-'06 (\$)	% chg.	% chg. since '02-'03
Pennsylvania State University, University Park	12,164	11,508	5.7	45.1	22,712	21,744	4.5	29.0
University of Vermont, Burlington	11,324	10,748	5.4	25.9	26,308	24,934	5.5	22.5
University of New Hampshire, Durham	10,401	9,778	6.4	27.9	22,851	21,498	6.3	28.2
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.	9,958	9,221	8.0	36.3	18,463	16,819	9.8	39.0
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	9,882	8,634	14.5	58.3	23,968	22,720	5.5	51.8
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	9,723	9,213	5.5	29.9	29,131	27,601	5.5	24.7
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	9,595	9,278	3.4	48.0	19,317	18,397	5.0	26.0
Clemson University, Clemson, S.C.	9,400	8,816	6.6	61.1	19,824	18,440	7.5	53.3
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	9,174	8,622	6.4	46.1	20,803	20,252	2.7	23.4
Michigan State University, East Lansing	8,793	8,237	6.8	43.1	21,438	19,990	7.2	40.9
Ohio University, Athens	8,727	8,235	6.0	37.7	17,691	17,199	2.9	28.0
Ohio State University, Columbus	8,667	8,082	7.2	52.3	20,562	19,305	6.5	36.0
University of Connecticut, Storrs	8,362	7,912	5.7	35.9	21,562	20,416	5.6	36.0
University of Virginia, Charlottesville	8,043	7,376	9.0	55.6	26,143	24,296	7.6	28.3
University of Maryland, College Park	7,906	7,821	1.1	34.0	21,345	20,145	6.0	41.4
University of South Carolina, Columbia	7,808	7,314	6.8	56.7	20,236	18,956	6.8	54.4
University of California, Berkeley	7,800	7,434	4.9	79.9	26,484	25,254	4.9	58.4
University of Texas, Austin	7,800	7,120	9.6	54.8	16,920	15,800	7.1	51.8
University of Missouri, Columbia	7,784	7,415	5.0	40.2	18,050	17,192	5.0	22.7
University of Delaware, Newark	7,740	7,318	5.8	34.4	18,450	17,474	5.6	20.7
Illinois State University, Normal	7,724	6,801	13.6	53.3	14,414	12,681	13.7	56.2
University of Rhode Island, Kingston	7,724	7,284	6.0	31.9	21,424	19,926	7.5	39.8
University of Maine, Orono	7,497	6,910	8.5	35.1	18,444	17,050	8.2	35.4
Indiana University, Bloomington	7,460	7,112	4.9	40.4	20,472	19,508	4.9	28.6
University of California, Los Angeles	7,143	7,062	1.1	63.2	25,827	24,882	3.8	54.1
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.	7,096	6,458	9.9	27.2	21,266	19,824	7.3	30.8
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg	6,973	6,378	9.3	47.2	19,049	17,837	6.8	32.7
Texas A&M University, College Station	6,966	6,399	8.9	45.3	15,216	14,679	3.7	34.2
University of Wisconsin, Madison	6,730	6,280	7.2	52.0	20,730	20,280	2.2	12.5
University of Kentucky, Lexington	6,510	5,812	12.0	63.8	13,970	12,798	9.2	32.7
Washington State University, Pullman	6,448	6,010	7.3	42.7	16,088	15,018	7.1	31.1
University of Kansas, Lawrence	6,153	5,413	13.7	76.6	15,123	13,866	9.1	41.5
University of Iowa, Iowa City	6,135	5,612	9.3	46.4	18,359	16,998	8.0	32.7
University at Buffalo (SUNY)	6,129	6,068	1.0	26.4	12,389	12,328	0.5	27.1
Iowa State University, Ames	6,060	5,634	7.6	47.4	16,554	15,724	5.3	29.3
University of Washington, Seattle	5,985	5,610	6.7	43.6	21,285	19,907	6.9	43.2
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	5,967	5,640	5.8	45.0	15,417	14,550	6.0	44.0
University of Oregon, Eugene	5,838	5,613	4.0	24.7	18,252	17,445	4.6	16.5
Median (half higher, half lower)	5,838	5,575	6.4	38.1	16,245	15,524	5.7	32.9
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	5,808	5,494	5.7	30.3	13,942	13,222	5.4	28.8
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks	5,792	5,327	8.7	58.2	13,786	12,659	8.9	60.4
Kansas State University, Manhattan	5,779	5,124	12.8	67.8	15,514	14,454	7.3	44.9
North Dakota State University, Fargo	5,722	5,264	8.7	63.2	13,695	12,545	9.2	63.9
University of Oklahoma, Norman	5,710	5,008	14.0	94.9	13,999	12,901	8.5	73.3
Montana State University, Bozeman	5,673	5,221	8.7	39.2	15,522	14,945	3.9	32.5
University of Colorado, Boulder	5,643	5,372	5.0	58.2	23,539	22,826	3.1	24.5
SUNY at Stony Brook	5,631	5,575	1.0	34.6	11,891	11,835	0.5	30.9
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville	5,622	5,290	6.3	38.6	17,188	16,360	5.1	38.5
Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.	5,496	5,278	4.1	45.2	15,496	14,878	4.2	39.8
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa	5,278	4,864	8.5	48.4	15,294	13,516	13.2	58.9
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater	5,267	4,830	9.0	74.1	13,839	12,854	7.7	71.3
University of South Dakota, Vermillion	5,072	4,829	5.0	31.0	6,263	9,816	-36.2	-22.1
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	5,033	4,613	9.1	30.5	19,681	18,411	6.9	30.0
The University of Montana, Missoula	4,978	4,712	5.6	24.8	14,484	13,427	7.9	34.5
University of Georgia, Athens	4,910	4,628	6.1	35.8	17,802	16,848	5.7	37.1
University of Arizona, Tucson	4,765	4,497	6.0	84.5	14,970	13,681	9.4	34.8
Georgia State University, Atlanta	4,746	4,464	6.3	36.7	16,206	15,378	5.4	36.9
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	4,717	4,562	3.4	37.3	16,245	15,524	4.6	27.9
University of Mississippi, Oxford	4,602	4,320	6.5	17.5	10,566	9,744	8.4	19.7
Arizona State University, Tempe	4,591	4,406	4.2	77.6	15,750	15,095	4.3	41.8
Mississippi State University, Starkville	4,550	4,312	5.5	17.4	10,506	9,772	7.5	19.7
University of Hawaii, Manoa	4,522	3,772	19.9	35.1	12,394	10,176	21.8	26.1
West Virginia University, Morgantown	4,476	4,164	7.5	38.1	13,840	12,874	7.5	42.5
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge	4,449	4,419	0.7	25.8	12,749	12,719	0.2	44.3
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque	4,336	4,109	5.5	36.8	14,177	13,438	5.5	24.0
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces	4,230	3,918	8.0	31.5	13,804	13,206	4.5	28.0
University of Idaho, Moscow	4,200	3,968	5.8	38.0	13,800	12,738	8.3	41.3
Idaho State University, Pocatello	4,190	4,000	4.8	33.6	12,460	11,700	6.5	32.9
University of Utah, Salt Lake City	3,972	3,628	9.5	29.9	13,902	12,702	9.4	29.9
Utah State University, Logan	3,949	3,672	7.5	36.3	11,449	10,616	7.8	39.6
University of Alaska, Anchorage	3,759	3,497	7.5	33.5	10,589	11,117	-4.7	31.8
North Carolina State University, Raleigh	3,530	3,205	10.1	25.4	15,728	15,403	2.1	11.6
University of Wyoming, Laramie	3,515	3,426	2.6	17.3	10,055	9,816	2.4	16.1
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	3,510	3,532	-0.6	34.2	13,420	13,199	1.7	29.0
Florida State University, Tallahassee	3,307	3,208	3.1	23.2	16,439	16,340	0.6	34.4
University of Florida, Gainesville	3,206	3,094	3.6	24.2	17,790	17,222	3.3	47.7

Source: USA TODAY research and analysis by Mary Specht and Anthony DeBarros

- 1* Figures assume students will take at least one early or late course at a discounted rate.
- 2* Residents of member states in the Midwest Student Exchange Program are eligible for discounted tuition at these schools.
- 3* Residents of member states in the Western Undergraduate Exchange Program are eligible for discounted tuition at these schools.

Board of Regents of the University of Michigan**Chapter X. Fees and Charges**

- Sec. 10.01. Policies Governing Student Fees
- Sec. 10.02. Time of Payment of Fees (revised November 1993)
- Sec. 10.03. Exemptions from Payment of Fees

[Bylaws Table of Contents](#) | [Detailed Table of Contents](#)

Sec. 10.01. Policies Governing Student Fees

The Board of Regents shall determine the level of full program student fees and a schedule of such fees shall be published. All other student fees shall be fixed by the Committee on Budget Administration.

[back to top](#)

Sec. 10.02. Time of Payment of Fees (revised November 1993)

All fees are payable in accordance with regulations established by the executive vice president and chief financial officer providing only that said regulations may not defer payment of these fees beyond the end of the term for which they are assessed.

[back to top](#)

Sec. 10.03. Exemptions from Payment of Fees

No exemption from the payment of fees shall be granted unless specifically approved in advance by the Board.

This chapter of the bylaws is designed to authorize operations in the several schools and colleges which are not included in previous bylaws applicable to all.)

(Note: The Governing Bodies of the Schools and Colleges, Sec. 5.02, the Powers and Duties of the Governing Faculties, Sec. 5.03; Faculty Procedure, Sec. 5.04; Faculty Communications to the Board, Sec. 5.05; The Deans and Executive Committees, Sec. 5.06; and Administrative Officers of Other University Units, Sec. 5.07, and other pertinent bylaws applicable to all schools and colleges appear in Chapter V. These statements will not be repeated for each of the schools and colleges.

This chapter of the bylaws is designed to authorize operations in the several schools and colleges which are not included in previous bylaws applicable to all.)

[back to top](#)

[Back to . . . Bylaws Table of Contents](#) | [Detailed Table of Contents](#)

If you have questions or suggestions regarding the bylaws section of our website, please

EXHIBIT B-1

email them to nasin@umich.edu.

Bylaws updated: October 2006 (*Section 1.14*)

University of Michigan Home
© 2007 Regents of the University of Michigan
Web Design by Michigan Marketing & Design

EXHIBIT B-2

HIGHER EDUCATION COMPACT

Agreement Between Governor Schwarzenegger, the University of California, and the California
State University
2005-06 through 2010-11

The Master Plan, which has been California's blueprint for higher education for four decades, has produced the two best public systems of higher education in the world. In order to assure access, quality and affordability, the Master Plan specifies the University of California's missions as teaching, research and public service, and defines the pool of high school graduates from which the University is to admit its students. The Master Plan designates the primary function of the California State University as provision of undergraduate instruction, and defines the pool of high school graduates from which it, too, is to admit its students. In addition, the CSU mission incorporates the responsibility for applied research and community service to support business and agriculture in providing instruction opportunities for their students. By delineating the mission of each institution, the State is able to concentrate its resources within each segment to best meet priorities.

Adequate financial support for the University of California and the California State University is essential if UC and CSU are to fulfill their missions under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, contributing to a higher standard of living and better quality of life for the citizens of the state.

This Compact is based on the value of the UC and CSU to the State of California and its citizens. To ensure these institutions are well positioned to serve the State's students and industry, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger commits to a long-term resource plan for UC and CSU that addresses base budget allocations, enrollment, student fees and other key program elements for 2005-06 through 2010-11. In exchange for this long-term stability, UC and CSU commit to focusing their resources to address long-term accountability goals for enrollment, student fees, financial aid, and program quality. To allow appropriate monitoring of progress toward these goals, UC and CSU commit to providing student and institutional outcome data in numerous program areas including program efficiency, utilization of system wide resources, and student-level information. The details of this Compact are contained in the body of this document.

State's Commitments to Provide Adequate Financial Support for UC and CSU

The following represents a phased, multi-year plan for providing sufficient basic operating and capital funding needed through the remainder of this decade to support UC's core missions of teaching, research and public service and CSU's core missions of teaching, applied research, and public service. This multi-year plan is contingent upon UC and CSU agreeing to report progress, and to sustain or improve performance on the accountability measures delineated in this agreement. This Compact is developed within the context of the fiscal crisis currently confronting the State of California. UC and CSU have faced several consecutive years of base budget cuts and unfunded cost increases. Salaries at the segments have fallen significantly behind the market, cost increases related to employee benefits, energy, libraries, instructional

technology, maintenance, and inflation have not been funded, and base budget cuts have seriously reduced the basic infrastructure of UC and CSU.

Both segments have significant unmet funding needs, both related to budget cuts over the last several decades and insufficient funding of programs critical to the academic enterprise. This Compact does not meet all of the segments' budget needs, but does provide the minimum level of funding needed to prevent further erosion to their budgets, while accommodating enrollment growth, and maintaining quality.

The Administration, UC and CSU share a deep concern for both preserving the quality of the higher education system in California, and for maintaining the ability of the segments to meet their basic missions under the Master Plan. By providing fiscal stability in the initial two years of this Compact, the State is able to prevent further erosion of support for higher education in California. Funding commitments in the third year and beyond reflect the belief that the State will return to a position of fiscal health based on moderate economic growth that will allow some recovery of vital needs for UC and CSU, such as the ability to provide competitive salaries, and to address several years of underfunding of core programs.

Basic Budget Support: The State will provide a General Fund increase of 3% to the prior year's base in both 2005-06 and 2006-07. This will help prevent further erosion in the segments' ability to fund competitive faculty and staff salaries, health benefits, maintenance, inflation, and other cost increases. Beginning in 2007-08 and through 2010-11, the State will provide a General Fund increase of 4% to the prior year's base for basic budget needs including salary increases, health benefits, maintenance, inflation, and other cost increases.

In order to help maintain quality and enhance academic and research programs, UC will continue to seek additional private resources and maximize other fund sources available to the University to support basic programs. CSU will do the same in order to enhance the quality of its academic programs.

Core Academic Support Needs: In 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11, the last three years of this Compact, the State will also provide an additional 1% increase to the prior year's base to address the annual budgetary shortfalls in State funding for other instruction and research support for core areas of the budget critical to maintaining the quality of the academic program—including instructional equipment, instructional technology and libraries—and for ongoing building maintenance.

Enrollment: UC and CSU enrollment plans project enrollment increases of approximately 2.5% per year through the end of the decade. This growth rate represents an increase of 5,000 students annually at UC and 8,000 students annually at CSU. The State will provide funding for this enrollment growth at the agreed-upon marginal cost of instruction as adjusted annually. This rate of growth will allow the segments to achieve enrollment levels consistent with earlier projections for this decade. A portion of the funding in the initial years will be used to implement State support for existing summer enrollment on campuses not currently receiving State support for summer instruction.

State funding will not be provided to support an undergraduate student whose credit units within the system exceed a specified threshold above the minimum necessary to complete the degree program, consistent with the policies established by the segments in 2004-05. Both UC and CSU will phase in fee policies to charge these students full cost for excess credit units.

The policy of providing no State funding for UC to support remedial courses will be continued.

Student Fees: Following significant student fee increases during the State's budget crisis of the early 1990s, student fees did not increase at UC or CSU for seven consecutive years during the 1990's and 2001-02, and fees were actually reduced by 10% for undergraduate students and by 5% for graduate students during that time period. As a result, student fees at both segments were significantly lower than those of comparable public institutions across the nation. The State's current fiscal crisis has led once again to significant increases in student fees over the 2002-03 and 2003-04 fiscal years.

The student fee policy contained in this Compact assumes that UC and CSU will retain student fee revenue without a corresponding reduction in State funds which, together with State funds provided each year, will be used to help meet their budgetary needs as well as help the segments recover from the current fiscal crisis.

- **Undergraduate Students.** The Administration and segments agree that it is important to implement a more stable fee policy that recognizes the desire to keep student fee increases reasonable, while also providing adequate funding for cost increases for student fee-funded programs and preserving the quality of the universities. The Administration has proposed a long-term student fee policy that calls for increases in student fees based on the rise in California per capita personal income. However, in years in which the UC and CSU governing boards determine, based on fee policies developed by their governing boards and in consultation with the Administration, that fiscal circumstances require increases that exceed the rate of growth in per capita personal income, consistent with the Governor's proposed student fee policy, UC and CSU may decide that fee increases of up to 10 percent are necessary to provide sufficient funding for programs and to preserve quality. However, in years that the UC and CSU governing boards believe fiscal circumstances may require increases that exceed the Administration's per-capita personal income policy, the segments shall consult with the Administration about those compelling circumstances. After consultation, UC and CSU may decide that fee increases of up to 10% are necessary to provide sufficient funding for programs and to preserve quality. UC and CSU will develop their annual budget plans based on the assumption that student fees will increase by 14 percent for 2004-05, and by 8 percent for 2005-06 and for 2006-07. Thus, undergraduate fees will have increased by 10 percent per year on average over the three-year period, consistent with the intent of the Governor's proposed student fee policy. This fee policy is contingent on the provision of resources for the basic budget at the level called for in this Compact. It also is contingent on no further erosion of the segments' base budget, and it assumes that revenue from student fees will remain with UC and CSU, and will not be used to offset reductions in State support.

It continues to be the priority of the State and of UC and CSU to provide financial aid to ensure students are not denied the opportunity for a higher education because of financial barriers. An amount equivalent to no less than 20 percent and no more than 33 percent of the revenue generated from student fee increases is to be used to provide aid to needy students who qualify for financial aid, based on the federal methodology for determining need.

- **Graduate Academic Students.** It is critical that UC and CSU maintain their ability to offer competitive support packages to recruit and retain the best graduate students. UC will increase graduate student fees by 20 percent for 2004-05, while CSU will increase graduate student fees for non-teacher credential candidates by 25 percent, and will increase graduate student fees for credential candidates by 20 percent. In view of these proposed increases, fee increases for graduate students will be no less than 10 percent in both 2005-06 and 2006-07. For future years, the segments will develop plans to achieve student fee levels in graduate academic programs that consider the following factors: average cost of instruction, average fees at other public comparison institutions, total cost of attendance, market factors, the need to preserve and enhance the quality of graduate academic programs, the State's need for more graduates in a particular discipline, and financial aid requirements of graduate academic students. Revenue from student fees will remain with the segments, and will not be used to offset reductions in State support. UC and CSU will commit to make progress toward the Administration's policy expectation that graduate fees be 50 percent higher than systemwide undergraduate fees to better reflect the higher cost of instruction and relative value of graduate education to the student.
- **Professional School Students.** UC will develop plans to achieve student fee levels in professional schools that consider the following factors: average fees at other public comparison institutions, average cost of instruction, total cost of attendance, market factors, the need to preserve and enhance the quality of the professional programs, the State's need for more graduates in a particular discipline, and financial aid requirements of professional school students. Revenue from student fees will remain with the University and will not be used to offset reductions in State support.

UC Merced: The State will continue to provide one-time funds needed for initial development of the UC Merced campus. Such one-time funding will be phased out by 2010-11, when the campus is expected to reach a level of enrollment (5,000 FTES) sufficient to generate an adequate level of workload funding.

Other Budget Adjustments: The State will provide funding for other basic budget costs, such as annuitant health benefits, employer retirement contributions, and changes in debt service, in addition to the base budget support provided each year.

Capital Outlay: In addition to annual increases in State support cited above, the State will provide funding for debt service to support general obligation bonds of \$345 million per segment per year from Proposition 55 to be used to finance high priority capital outlay projects that address seismic and other life-safety needs, enrollment growth, modernization of out-of-date facilities that no longer serve the academic programs they support, and renewal or expansion of infrastructure and other facility systems that cannot accommodate ongoing needs. The

Administration will support additional General Obligation bond measures to provide funding of similar magnitude in future years of this agreement. If appropriate, the State may consider the use of lease-revenue bonds for approved projects to maintain a viable building program within prudent State debt levels. It is recognized that the annual level of funding proposed in this Compact does not meet all of the segments' capital needs. Therefore, UC and CSU will continue to use institutional resources to help meet other critical needs unmet by State funds.

One-Time Funds: As the State's fiscal situation permits, and one-time funds become available, the State may provide one-time funds to address high priority infrastructure needs, such as capital renewal of facilities and deferred maintenance needed to maintain the segments' capital assets. For UC, at least \$200 million per year is needed for systematic capital renewal of existing facilities and utilities, and the deferred maintenance backlog for high-priority projects exceeds \$500 million. For CSU, at least \$141 million per year is needed for systematic capital renewal of existing facilities and utilities, and the deferred maintenance backlog for high-priority projects exceeds \$365 million.

Initiatives: Depending on the State's fiscal situation, there may be initiatives mutually agreed upon by the segments, the Governor and the Legislature, either through legislation or through the budget process, that may be funded in addition to the basic budget funds provided to the segments as outlined above in order to meet high priority needs of the University and the State. In addition, if agreed upon by the Governor and the Legislature through the annual budget process, the State will fund the fixed cost needs of developing campuses and off-campus centers, that are not addressed in the basic funding provisions to the segments outlined above.

UC's and CSU's Commitments to Achieve Outcomes that are High Priorities for the State

It is recognized that, as a result of the significant budget reductions that have already occurred, the segments, of necessity, have introduced budgetary efficiencies and productivity measures. The outcome goals delineated in this Compact are focused on academic productivity measures needed to meet the State's highest priorities within higher education.

Because this Compact is developed in the context of several consecutive years of significant budget cuts, the segments will need some latitude in the initial years of this Compact in terms of accountability expectations. The following states the long-term goals for accountability that UC and CSU agree to achieve to the best of their ability.

Enrollment

The Master Plan specifies the mission of each public higher education segment, and defines the pool of high school graduates from which each segment is to admit its students. The Master Plan also calls for the State to provide adequate resources to accommodate enrollment.

Consistent with the Master Plan, enrollment levels at UC and CSU should match the resources provided. To the extent resources are provided consistent with this Compact, UC will maintain its commitment to the Master Plan to provide a space for the top 12.5 percent of graduating high

school seniors wishing to attend and will maintain its commitment to provide access to transfer students.

To the extent resources are provided consistent with this Compact, CSU will maintain its commitment to the Master Plan to provide a space for the top one-third of graduating high school seniors wishing to attend, and will maintain its commitment to provide access to transfer students.

The segments' highest priority for enrolled students will be to ensure they receive appropriate courses and services necessary for them to succeed in meeting their degree objective in a timely manner.

As funds are provided for normal enrollment growth, the UC and CSU will continue their efforts to achieve on all general campuses a goal of State-supported summer instruction and off-campus enrollment at least equal to 40% of the average of fall/winter/spring enrollment by 2010-11.

Course articulation for community college transfers for general education requirements has been achieved by each UC campus with all 108 community colleges. In addition, six campuses have major preparation articulation with all 108 community colleges and the remaining campuses have major preparation agreements with approximately 80 colleges and will achieve complete agreements with all 108 colleges by 2005.

Course articulation for community college transfers for general education requirements has been achieved by each CSU campus with all 108 community colleges. CSU campuses will articulate a lower division major preparation pattern of a minimum of 6 units (two courses) for each high-demand major with all 108 community colleges, and achieve complete agreement by June 2006.

The funding provided in the 2004-05 budget results in a general campus reduction from planned levels for UC of 5,000 FTES related to Chapter 228, Statutes of 2003, and an additional 3,200 FTES reduction associated with the proposal to redirect 10 percent of new freshmen to the Community Colleges. The funding provided for CSU in 2004-05 results in a general campus reduction from planned levels of 13,000 FTES related to Chapter 228, Statutes of 2003, and an additional 3,800 FTES reduction associated with the proposal to redirect 10 percent of new freshmen to the Community Colleges. It is the Administration's expectation that otherwise eligible students who are redirected to the Community Colleges will, upon successful completion of their lower-division work, transfer to a UC or CSU, where they will complete their degree. The segments will target resources to assist participating students to enhance their chances for transfer, and the segments will carefully coordinate their efforts with the Community Colleges.

The UC and CSU will continue efforts to maintain progress and improve where possible both persistence and graduation rates, and time-to-degree

The State is experiencing a critical shortfall in the number and quality of K-12 teachers in science and math. This trend must be reversed if the State is to maintain its economic viability over the next several decades. As the State's premiere science and technology research institution, with highly regarded graduate and undergraduate science and math programs, UC is

uniquely positioned to work in partnership with the State, K-12, and the business community to help reverse this trend. The California State University prepares 60 percent of the state's elementary and secondary teachers with the support of all the state agencies involved in teacher development and preparation. Therefore, the University of California shall develop in collaboration with the California State University a major initiative to improve the supply and quality of science and math teachers in the State of California and thus help better position the State for economic recovery.

The state is challenged to improve the overall quality of K-12 instruction and to produce sufficient teachers in the public school system that meet the definition of Highly Qualified Teachers capable of improving student outcomes consistent with the state's content standards. The CSU is uniquely positioned to ensure that the majority of new teachers will have the skills necessary, particularly in the areas of special education and English and language arts, to meet the demands of rigorous state standards and will continue to improve the quality and efficiency of teacher training sufficient to meet demand.

The UC and CSU have been engaged in outreach programs to improve the academic preparation of K-12 and community college transfer students for three decades and remain committed to working with K-12 schools and all higher education segments to continue their efforts. UC agrees to provide no less than \$12 million and CSU agrees to provide no less than \$45 million to support the continuation of the most effective programs. Any additional funding provided by the State would be subject to the annual budget act. The resources will be supplemented by matching private sector funds to the extent possible.

The State continues to place considerable value on high school coursework that is intended to prepare California youth for careers that will bolster the state's economy. To the extent that such courses contain appropriate academic content, such courses should be recognized by both the UC and the CSU as meeting 'a-g' subject requirements. CSU and UC have in the past and will continue to review and approve college preparatory courses that adequately integrate academic and career-technical course content.

Increasing public service to help meet community needs and fostering a citizenry that is oriented toward performing community service are high priorities for the State. The CSU and UC will strengthen programs to encourage students to participate in community service programs while they are enrolled at their campuses.

Student Fees/Financial Aid

Student fee increases will be approved by the respective governing boards as they carry out their responsibility to serve the State's students and maintain educational quality.

Any student fee policy adopted by UC and CSU governing boards should include the following considerations:

- Both the State and students must share in funding the cost of providing an education and related support services.

- To the extent the State provides the resources called for under this Compact for basic budget needs, increases in student fees should be gradual, moderate, and predictable, and should be considered in the context of total cost of attendance.
- Financial aid should be provided to ensure that needy students, as defined by federal program requirements, can afford to attend UC and CSU.

Maintaining Quality

The ability of the CSU and UC to return to a fiscally healthy position while maintaining quality will greatly enhance the State's ability to produce jobs and help the economy recover. A high priority will be given to restoring funding for competitive salaries for faculty, staff and for graduate students, and for other core areas of the budget that are critical to the instructional program and that have been significantly underfunded, such as libraries, instructional technology, instructional equipment, and building maintenance.

The UC and CSU will continue to maintain faculty workload policies that are comparable to those at other institutions. The highest priority for the UC and CSU should be to ensure that students have access to the classes they need to graduate in a timely manner.

In the interest of ensuring priority for instruction, the segments will not increase the proportion of the budget designated for administration above their current levels, assuming no significant additional administrative mandates are imposed on them.

In order to help maintain quality and enhance academic and research programs, UC will continue efforts to seek additional private resources and maximize Federal and other fund sources available to the University to support basic programs. Similarly, the CSU will continue to seek additional funds from other sources to support basic programs.

Student and Institutional Outcomes

UC will continue its efforts to achieve improved student and institutional outcomes and will place a high priority on providing needed classes so that students are able to graduate in four years or less. Similarly, the CSU will continue efforts to improve outcomes and will place a high priority on providing needed classes to reduce the time to degree.

The Administration places a high priority on student success as well as other mission related measures and seeks to foster greater student and institutional accountability through the inclusion of performance-based outcomes. In order to accomplish this, the Administration, in consultation with UC and CSU, will seek to remove barriers to these goals

As with the K-12 system, accountability for these outcomes should be highly visible and public. This will require that timely and reliable data be collected to provide a strong foundation for sound decision-making in these matters. Therefore, the UC and CSU each agree to provide a comprehensive single report to the Governor, Secretary of Education, the fiscal committees of

the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office and the Department of Finance by October of each year on the following measures that compare performance for each item for three prior years and the most recently completed academic year:

Efficiency in graduating students

- Number of undergraduate degrees awarded;
- Number of graduate and professional degrees awarded, including detail on degrees awarded in fields that are high priorities for meeting state workforce needs (mathematics, engineering, computer science and other science fields);
- Average time-to-degree for undergraduates;
- Total number and percent of graduating undergraduates who have accumulated excess units required for their degree, as determined by the segments, and the average number of excess units accumulated by these students;
- Persistence and graduation rates for freshmen and California Community College (CCC) transfer students;
- Number of undergraduates admitted as freshmen who leave in academic difficulty;
- Number of undergraduates admitted as (CCC) transfer students who leave in academic difficulty.

Utilization of systemwide resources

- Student-to-faculty ratio;
- Instructional activities per faculty member;
- Percent of total State-funded salary and benefit expenditures dedicated to direct teaching staff;
- Rate of change in total State-funded staff salary and benefit expenditures for instructional staff, administrative staff, and other student and public service staff;
- Faculty honors and awards;
- Information on technology transfer, including progress in achieving industry-university partnerships, number of patents, total annual income generated by UC-held patents, the proportionate split of those revenues between the University and third parties, and UC's annual patent-related legal costs (UC only);
- Federal, private, and other support for research (UC only);
- Total State-funded expenditures and staff levels for the President's and Chancellor's Office, together with rates of change from the previous year.

Student-level information

- Total enrollment (both headcount and FTE), by class level;
- Number of new CCC transfer students enrolled (headcount and FTE);
- Number of new freshmen enrolled (headcount and FTE);
- Number and percent of new freshmen and CCC transfer students who were admitted by exception;
- Progress on achieving course articulation agreements with CCCs;
- Number and percent of undergraduates who did not meet the UC entry level writing requirement for reading comprehension before entering UC.

- Number and percent of undergraduates who did not meet the math and English placement exam requirements before entering CSU.

Capital Outlay

The UC and CSU will continue to provide five-year capital outlay plans outlining the capital priorities for each campus. The plans should include projects that provide safe and accessible learning environments for students and the faculty and staff that serve them.

Return to: [U of M Home](#)

One Stop | Directories | Search U of M

 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

[What's Inside](#)

[Home](#) > [Policies](#)

[Regents](#)

University of Minnesota Charter

[Board Meetings](#)

Territorial Laws 1851, Chapter 3

Perpetuated by the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article 8, Section 4.

[Committees](#)

Chap. III. -- An act to incorporate the University of Minnesota, at the Falls of St. Anthony.

[Student Representatives](#)

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE TERRITORY OF MINNESOTA, That there shall be established in this Territory an Institution, under the name and style of the University of Minnesota:

[Policies](#)

Sec. 2. The proceeds of all land that may hereafter be granted by the United States to the Territory for the support of a University, shall be and remain a perpetual fund, to be called the "University Fund," the interest of which shall be appropriated to the support of a University, and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in such a University.

[Board Office](#)

[Board Operations](#)

[Contact the Board](#)

Sec. 3. The object of the University shall be to provide the inhabitants of this Territory with the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of Literature, Science and the Arts.

[Board of Regents Home](#)

Sec. 4. The government of this University shall be vested in a Board of twelve Regents, who shall be elected by the Legislature as hereinafter provided.

Search the Board of Regents Website

Sec. 5. The members of the Board of Regents shall be elected at the present session of the Legislature, and shall be divided into classes, numbered one, two, and three; class numbered one shall hold their offices for two years; class numbered two, for four years, and class numbered three, for six years, from the first Monday of February, one thousand, eight hundred and fifty one; biennially thereafter there shall be elected in Joint Convention of both branches of the Legislature, four members to supply the vacancies made by the provisions of this section, and who shall hold their offices for six years respectively.

Board of Regents
University of Minnesota
600 McNamara Alumni Center
200 Oak Street SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455-2020
Phone: 612-625-6300
Fax: 612-624-3318

Sec. 6. Whenever there shall be a vacancy in the office of Regents of the University, from any cause whatever, it shall be the duty of the Governor to fill such office by appointment, and the person or persons so appointed, shall continue in office until the close of the session of the Legislature, then next thereafter, and until others are elected in their stead.

Sec. 7. The Regents of the University and their successors in office, shall constitute a body corporate, with the name and style of the "Regents of the University of Minnesota," with the right as such, of suing and being sued, of contracting and being contracted with, of making and using a common seal, and altering the same at pleasure.

Sec. 8. The Regents shall appoint a Secretary, a Treasurer, and a Librarian, who shall hold their respective offices during the pleasure of the Board. It shall be the duty of the Secretary to record all the proceedings of the Board and carefully to preserve all its books and papers; the Treasurer shall keep a true and faithful account of all moneys received and paid out by him, and shall give such bonds for the faithful performance of the duties of his office as the Regents may require.

Sec. 9. The Regents shall have power, and it shall be their duty to enact laws for the government of the University; to elect a Chancellor, who shall be ex-officio, President of the Board of Regents, or when absent, or previous to the election of such Chancellor, the Board may appoint one of their own number President pro tem. They may also appoint the requisite number of professors and tutors and such other officers as they may deem expedient- also to determine the amount of their respective salaries: Provided, That the salaries thus determined, shall be submitted to the Legislature for their approval or dissent.

Sec. 10. The University shall consist of five Departments: The Department of Science, Literature and the Arts: The Department of Law: The Department of Medicine: The Department of the theory and practice of Elementary Instruction: The Department of Agriculture. The immediate government of the several Departments shall be entrusted to their respective Faculties; but the Regents shall have power to regulate the course of

EXHIBIT D-1

Instruction, and prescribe under the advice of the Professorships, the books and authorities to be used in the several Departments, and also to confer such degrees and grant such diplomas as are usually conferred by other Universities.

Sec. 11. The Regents shall have power to remove any officer connected with the Institution, when in their judgment the interest of the University requires it.

Sec. 12. The admission fee to the University and the charges for tuition in the several Departments thereof, shall be regulated and prescribed by the Board of Regents; and as soon as in their opinion, the income of the University fund will permit, tuition in all of the Departments shall be without charge to all students in the same, who are residents of the Territory.

Sec. 13. The University of Minnesota, shall be located at or near the Falls of Saint Anthony, and the Regents as soon as they may deem expedient, shall procure a suitable site for the erection of the University buildings, and they may proceed to the erection of the same as soon as funds may be provided for that purpose, after such plan or plans as may be approved by a majority of said Board.

Sec. 14. The Regents shall have the power, and it shall be their duty, as soon as the requisite funds shall have been secured for that purpose, to establish a Preparatory Department of said University, and employ teachers for the same, who shall be qualified to give instruction in all the branches of learning usually taught in Academies; which Preparatory Department may be discontinued whenever the Regents may think proper, after the other Departments of said University shall have been established.

Sec. 15. The Regents are authorized to expend such portions of the fund, which by the provisions of this act, may come under their control, as they may deem expedient for the erection of suitable buildings, and the purchase of apparatus, a Library, and a Cabinet of Natural History; and the selection, management and control of all lands, which may hereafter be granted by Congress for the endowment of said University, is hereby vested in the Board of Regents.

Sec. 16. The Regents shall make a report annually, to the Legislature at its regular session, exhibiting the state and progress of the University in its several Departments, the course of study, the number of professors and students, the amount of expenditures and such other information as they may deem proper, or may from time to time be required of them.

Sec. 17. Meetings of the Board may be called by any seven members thereof at such time and place as they may deem expedient, and a majority of the said Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may adjourn from time to time.

Sec. 18. The Regents, if they shall deem it expedient, may receive into connection with the University, any college within the Territory, upon application of the Board of Trustees; and such college so received, shall become a branch of the University, and be subject to the visitation of the Regents.

Sec. 19. No religious tenets or opinions shall be required to entitle any person to be admitted as a student in said University; and no such tenets or opinions shall be required as a qualification for any professor, tutor or officer of said University.

Sec. 20. The Legislative Assembly may at any time, alter, amend, modify or repeal this act.

Historical Note--See State v. Chase, 175 M. 259, 220 N. W. 951; State v. Quinlivan, 198 M. 65, 268 N. W. 858.

[BACK TO TOP](#)

The Minnesota Constitution

Article VIII

School Funds, Education and Science

University of Minnesota -- location confirmed. SEC. 4. The location of the University of Minnesota, as established by existing laws, is hereby confirmed, and said institution is

EXHIBIT D-2

hereby declared to be the University of the State of Minnesota. All the rights, immunities, franchises and endowments heretofore granted or conferred are hereby perpetuated unto the said university; and all lands which may be granted hereafter by Congress, or other donations for said university purposes, shall vest in the institution referred to in this section.

The Minnesota Constitution was last amended in 1974. The language to incorporate Chapter 3 of the Territorial Laws of 1851 into the Constitution is as follows:

Article XIII, Section 3

SEC. 3. All the rights, immunities, franchises and endowments heretofore granted or conferred upon the University of Minnesota are perpetuated unto the university.

[BACK TO TOP](#)

Act of Admission into the Union

An Act for the admission of Minnesota into the Union.
[Passed May 11, 1858.]

Whereas, An act of Congress was passed February twenty-sixth, eighteen hundred and fifty-seven, entitled "An act to authorize the people of the Territory of Minnesota to form a constitution and state government preparatory to their admission into the Union on an equal footing with the original states" and, whereas, the people of said Territory did, on the twenty-ninth day of August eighteen hundred and fifty-seven, by delegates elected for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and state government, which is republican in form, and was ratified and adopted by the people at an election held on the thirteenth day of October, eighteen hundred and fifty-seven, for that purpose; therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That the State of Minnesota shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original states in all respects whatever.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That said State shall be entitled to two representatives in Congress, until the next apportionment of representatives among the several states.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, That from and after the admission of the State of Minnesota, as hereinbefore provided, all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within that State as in other States of the Union; and the said State is hereby constituted a judicial district of the United States, within which a district court, with like powers and jurisdiction as the district court of the United States for the district of Iowa shall be established; the judge, attorney and marshal of the United States of the said district of Minnesota shall reside within the same, and shall be entitled to the same compensation as the judge, attorney and marshal of the district of Iowa; and in all cases of appeal or writ of error heretofore prosecuted and now pending in the supreme court of the United States, upon any record from the supreme court of Minnesota Territory, the mandate of execution or order of further proceedings shall be directed by the supreme court of the United States to the district court of the United States for the district of Minnesota, or to the supreme court of the State of Minnesota, as the nature of such appeal or writ of error may require- and each of those courts shall be the successor of the supreme court of Minnesota Territory, as to all such cases, with full power to hear and determine the same, and to award mesne or final process therein.

[BACK TO TOP](#)

©2003 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.

Trouble seeing the text? | [Contact U of M](#) | [Privacy](#)

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

Last modified on February 7, 2006

EXHIBIT D-3

September 5, 2002

Richard W. Briggs, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Senate
University of Florida
9029 NW 18th Place
Gainesville, FL 32606

Amendment 11
Responses to Ms. Pelaez's Opposing Views

Dear Dr. Briggs:

Thank you for sending me a copy of the email from Martha Pelaez, Ph.D., Chair of Legislative Liaison Committee of Advisory Council of Faculty Senates. Please encourage those hesitant to support Amendment 11 to come forward with their concerns. They perform a service for all of us. We need these opportunities to demonstrate the advantages of the amendment. For example, with regard to Ms. Pelaez's concerns:

1. **“. . . this new board will add another level of bureaucracy to our university system.”**

Not so. Amendment 11 will remove three levels of bureaucracy from the management of universities in exchange for installing one new level. The three present levels are: 1) the legislature which makes education policy and is the ultimate control for universities. §1000.02(2)(a), Fla. Stat. (2000); 2) State Board of Education with the responsibility for enforcement of legislative acts and the obligation to force accountability for results. §1000.02(2)(b), Fla. Stat. (2000); and 3) Florida Board of Education where all of the powers, duties, records, personnel, property, and contracts of the universities have been transferred. §1000.01(5)(a)2, Fla. Stat. (2000). Amendment 11 would remove management of universities from these three levels and install the statewide Board of Governors in their place. Boards of Trustees would remain in either case. Thus, we propose a two-tier system in place of the present four-tier system.

2. **“All 7 members [of the Florida Board of Education] spoke against the Amendment 11.”**

The Florida Board of Education will be one of the three levels of bureaucracy to lose university responsibility. Their opposition to the loss is understandable.

EXHIBIT E-1

3. **“ . . . the influence of the legislature would not change . . . The legislation would still be setting policy through education laws. The so-called ‘political meddling’ would not be over.”**

This concern recognizes the fact that “political meddling” is ongoing and also reveals an astounding willingness to condone these practices for the future. Amendment 11 gives the people of Florida the opportunity to divest the legislature of its present power to establish academic policy and to control the management of the state’s universities. No great universities are run by governments or budget analysts or legislators. Amendment 11 reflects the venerable American tradition of the people entrusting control of their academic institutions to citizen boards rather than their elected legislators, governors, or bureaucracies.¹

The legal principles drawing the line between the executive branch’s management of a constitutionally autonomous university system and the legislative branch’s responsibility to appropriate funds and enact laws have been well established by the courts of California, Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, and Utah – states having constitutionally autonomous governance systems. Once Amendment 11 is in place, a legislative attempt to direct academic policy or manage the universities through legislation will be rejected by the courts as an abuse of legislative power encroaching upon the executive power to manage and administer. This is just a simple application of the doctrine of separation of powers taught in high school civics and at the university level in Political Science 101.

4. **“ . . . many of the powerful trustees would not remain as members of our local boards if this amendment passes.”**

This concern is misguided. Both the constitutional system in Amendment 11 and the present seamless Kindergarten-Graduate System provide for Boards of Trustees for each campus. The continuing membership of those boards has little to do with the amendment and everything to do with the identity of the next governor. Any supporter of the present Kindergarten-Graduate System who fears trustee turnover just hasn’t read the provisions of the Kindergarten-Graduate law. The present law allows the removal of every member of every Board of Trustees every time a new governor takes office. This is the first time a governor’s race has occurred since the adoption of the seamless Kindergarten-Graduate System. The realization of potential turnover is just now setting in and some are starting to panic. This is an unforgivable breach of fundamental good government practice.

Amendment 11 would insulate the universities from the worst aspects of the political spoils system to which we are presently subjected. Trustees would serve staggered terms, their terms of office would be lengthened to five years, and each would be insulated from removal by a political officer. Board members would be free to discharge their fiduciary duties to their universities without fear of reprisal.

¹ ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, GOVERNING IN THE PUBLIC TRUST: EXTERNAL INFLUENCES ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 2, 4 (2001).

5. **“Each of our universities would lose the power [to] hire and fire our own presidents.”**

The universities do not have that power now. The Board of Trustees can only select a candidate from a presidential search committee “for ratification by the State Board of Education.” §1001.74(21), Fla. Stat. (2000).

6. **“We would lose the power of setting tuition.”**

In reality, the situation is the reverse of what Ms. Pelaez suggests. The seamless Kindergarten-Graduate System allows the Boards of Trustees to set tuition – as long as they set it for the amount established by the legislature in the General Appropriations Act. §1009.24(3), Fla. Stat. (2000). The legislature goes on to tell the Boards of Trustees what to do with all university fees by setting exact amounts, placing caps, or giving allowable ranges. See §1009.24, Fla. Stat. (2000).

The reverse would be true under Amendment 11. Since tuition and fees are funds raised from private sources by universities, they do not come under the control of the legislature whose power of appropriation will extend only to funds it generates for the public treasury. Universities will have the power to set tuition and establish fees. Tuition could vary by amount in each university. This power has proven to be an effective balance for the legislature’s power of appropriation. Universities can raise tuition in the face of an inadequate appropriation. In reverse, legislators can secure a lower tuition by providing an adequate appropriation. Since most Floridians have never experienced this equitable balance, they cannot fully appreciate the opportunity this could provide for the enhancement of the quality of university education in our state.

7. **“. . . we would not be approving our own graduate academic programs.”**

The universities do not have that power now. “Approval of new programs must be pursuant to criteria established by the State Board of Education.” §1001.74(7), Fla. Stat. (2000). The legislature feels free to override the State Board of Education and be the ultimate authority for academic programs. For example, see legislation creating: Master of Science Program in Speech-Language Pathology for FIU, §1004.38, Fla. Stat. (2000); Nursing Program at UWF, §1004.381, Fla. Stat. (2000); and Masters in Social Work at FAU, §1004.382, Fla. Stat. (2000).

Amendment 11 would take the control of academic programs from the hands of political officials and place that control with the universities.

8. **“. . . we would lose eminent domain. . .”**

Amendment 11 has no effect on eminent domain. Eminent domain remains the power of the sovereign (Art. X, Sec. 6, Fla. Const) and stays with the legislative branch of government.

9. **“. . . our local boards of trustees would merely be relegated to advisory boards with no authority. . .”**

Amendment 11 mandates authority for the Board of Trustees to administer a constituent university. The statewide board is not designed or authorized to administer any of the local campuses. The power of a Board of Trustees to administer its local constituent university is secure in the constitution. The delegation of additional powers to the Board of Trustees (beyond the constitutional power to administer a constituent university) rests with the statewide board. The extent of that delegation will depend—not upon the language of the amendment—but upon the judgment of the statewide board members. Those board members are appointed by the Governor. The Governor’s philosophy about decentralization and the adherence of his appointees to that philosophy could result in greater devolution than we have now.

10. **“All 11 university presidents are unanimously against this amendment.”**

The positions espoused by the presidents in public have always been in support of those who controlled the finances of their institutions. When the Regents were in control, the presidents passed a formal resolution supporting the Regents. Now that the legislature is in control, the presidents are in support of political control of their universities. Upon passage of Amendment 11, the presidents will predictably support constitutional autonomy for their universities.

Perhaps more revealing is the support for Amendment 11 from former presidents of Florida’s universities who are now out from under the legislature’s control. Dr. Cecil Mackey, former president of the University of South Florida, Dr. Greg Wolfe, former president of Florida International University, Dr. Roy McTarnaghan, former president of Florida Gulf Coast University, Dr. Walter Smith, former president of Florida A&M University, and Drs. Tom Carpenter and Curtis McCray, former presidents of the University of North Florida, are all in support of Amendment 11. Even more revealing is the support from Florida’s former Chancellors: Dr. E.T. York, Dr. Barbara Newell, and Dr. Charlie Reed. Dr. Reed’s experience is particularly illuminating. He has served extensively in Florida’s legislative governance system and now serves in California’s constitutionally autonomous system as the head of the largest university system in the country. After having in depth experience with both, he has become an active and vocal advocate for Amendment 11 for Florida. We know of no former presidents or chancellors who support the present system, now that they are out from under it.

11. **“It is important to identify if there are any benefits in supporting the proposed amendment that merit our support (a cost-benefit analysis), and hopefully our group would achieve consensus.”**

The cost-benefit approach is a principle criterion of Amendment 11. Adoption of the amendment would make the avoidance of “wasteful duplication of facilities or programs” in universities a part of the state’s constitution. This mandate would work against recent politically motivated decisions that have resulted in:

- \$46 million for an outgoing President of the Senate to use Ringling Circus Museum nestled in the appropriation for a university in order to avoid gubernatorial veto.
- \$23 million commitment for each of two political coalitions to create and build new law schools when there was no demonstrated need for either law school in a state that is admittedly over-populated with lawyers.
- \$60 million for an outgoing Speaker of the House to create and build a medical school that was opposed by the now-abolished Board of Regents on the basis of no demonstrated need.
- \$40 million for a powerful legislator to create a new Alzheimer's Center that bypassed the University of Miami's publicly funded Project to Cure Paralysis devoted to brain and spinal cord injuries, and the Florida system's already established and nationally renowned Brain Institute. Interestingly, the Brain Institute held a grant that was in urgent need of matching funds from the state.
- \$2.5 million expended for university lobbyists in Tallahassee during the last legislative session to fuel the competition among universities for the legislature's funding priorities.
- Non-monetary shenanigans have also occurred. For example, there was the well-publicized discovery of an eleventh-hour law change designed to grant admission to the University of Florida Medical School for the son of a powerful, well-heeled lobbyist.

The constitutional mandate to avoid wasteful duplication would also take advantage of a documented saving of \$2,530,000 achieved by utilizing collective bargaining on a statewide basis rather than with eleven separate bargaining units as currently called for in the Kindergarten-Graduate System. In addition, John Augustine, managing director at Lehman Brothers in New York and the California State University's consultant on bond issues, reports that a centralized financing vehicle for universities offers a more highly rated credit to the debt capital markets, resulting in market access for universities on more reasonable terms. A similar practice for the California State University System resulted in a savings in interest costs of 20% and eliminated a costly 10% debt service reserve fund requirement. The result was a more cost effective debt coverage for the benefit of the citizens of the state.

Universities have a distinct advantage when they are managed by citizen boards whose members are judged solely by how well those universities perform. Universities are not well served by political figures who have a wide range of different motives, incentives, and priorities. For a political figure, universities have on occasion become a means for achieving a personal priority. This is among the reasons why every other state in the union has a citizen board devoted to universities – except Florida.

* * *

The Kindergarten-Graduate system is a gargantuan monolith that begins with each kindergarten from Pensacola to Key West and extends to the highest reaches of every graduate program in each of our 11 public universities. Its requirements are laid down in 1,786 pages

of legislation that includes an unprecedented level of regulatory bureaucratic restrictions and dictates. All of this from folks who claim to distrust government.

Amendment 11 is a straightforward non-bureaucratic four-paragraph statement of constitutional principles advancing academic freedom in the form of teaching, research, and public service. The amendment is devoted only to universities and would help decentralize Florida's education monolith.

Most Floridians have little or no experience with the benefits of constitutional autonomy for university governance. More than a year ago, our four focus groups in two cities and our comprehensive statewide survey showed us that the more people knew about Amendment 11, the better they liked it. Stated concerns such as Ms. Pelaez's provide us with welcome opportunities to compare the relative merits of Amendment 11's constitutional two-tier system with the deficiencies of the present statutory Kindergarten-Graduate four-tier system. We expect opposition, but it's our job to see to it that opposition is not based upon bad information.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Robin Gibson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Robin Gibson
Law and Drafting Committee
Education Excellence for Florida

RG/dc