

## MEMORANDUM

TO: David E. Shulenburg, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  
FR: Steven K. Hedden, Dean  
DA: January 13, 2004  
RE: Differential Tuition

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal on behalf of the students of the School of Fine Arts. There has been a remarkable outpouring of support from SFA students for some sort of differential tuition, and this memorandum communicates my formal request for approval of differential tuition for the School of Fine Arts. Let me sketch out the sorts of needs that we could address if we were to gain approval for differential tuition, then describe the sorts of meetings we've held with students from across the School.

In the meetings with students I have referred to differential tuition as a "learning enhancement fee"; this nomenclature seems appropriate, for the students have identified several examples of technology and non-technology needs. What they have in common is the enhancement of the learning situation that students will have. For example, Music and Dance students [see Appendix A—Tuition Differential Proposal for the Department of Music and Dance] endorsed the concept that the learning enhancement fee be used for personnel (instructors for guitar, harp and jazz piano; additional staffing for dance, for the choral program and the orchestral program and for computer support; an instrument technician) as well as equipment (replacement of pianos). They also indicated their willingness for the learning enhancement money to be used for renovation of spaces (practice rooms, choral rehearsal room, dance studio). Students from the Department of Art and from the Department of Design identified several technology needs as well as "traditional" ones. They included computers and peripherals for the Art and Design Building laboratories and classrooms as a high priority, and they also mentioned items such as a vacuum forming machine for the Common Shop that supports students from both departments. They also included "low tech" items such as drawing benches and model stands.

My meetings with students included a "Town Hall" to which all undergraduate and graduate students from across the School of Fine Arts were invited. A couple of students among the sixty or so in attendance mentioned their concern of being able to pay more money, but no attendee expressed opposition to the notion of differential tuition.

This lack of opposition to the notion of differential tuition also was the situation at subsequent meetings with a wide cross-section of Art and Design students, with a group of Art students, and with a group of Ceramics students. Underscoring the support from students from either Art or Design is the petition that appears as Appendix B; the reader will notice there are 203 signatures from Design students and 49 from Art students. A cover letter from John Wilson, sophomore in graphic design and illustration, precedes the petition. As his letter indicates, John is representing himself and the 250+ students who signed the petition. Indeed, his volunteer effort as "point person" was critical.

The letter from Judith McCrea, Chair of the Department of Art, describes the support from students in that department. Support also is provided in the letters (see Appendix C) from the:

- \* President of the Serigraphy Club and Lithography Club
- \* President of the Industrial Design Student Association
- \* Co-President of Prototype, the student American Institute for Graphic Arts
- \* Chair of the Fine Arts Student Association
- \* Treasurer of the Student Music Educators National Conference on behalf of the chapter
- \* President of Sigma Alpha Iota, Music Sorority
- \* Student representative on the Music and Dance Advisory Council from Dance

Dr. Larry Mallett led several discussions with students in the Department of Music and Dance. As summarized in Appendix A, he met three times with his Student Advisory Council to discuss the proposal, met with the student body and responded to questions, sought feedback from students through their elected representatives, met again with the Student Advisory Council and gained their endorsement for differential tuition. The proposal appearing in Appendix A now has gained the endorsement of the Department's students and its faculty. Also included in Appendix A is information from institutions such as U Oklahoma, U Iowa, U New Mexico and others, documenting that most schools have some sort of applied lesson fee for music, and that many of them have some form of differential tuition. These applied lesson fees range from \$35 per credit hour (U Oklahoma) to \$75 for a 30-minute lesson each week (U New Mexico) to \$150 (U Iowa); our Department of Music and Dance lacks such a fee, or the ensemble fee charged by some schools (\$50 at U Oklahoma).

(Interesting comparisons for Art and Design are apparent as one examines [http://secure.wichita.edu/registrar/pdf\\_schedule/SP04/14MoneyMattersTuitionSP04.pdf](http://secure.wichita.edu/registrar/pdf_schedule/SP04/14MoneyMattersTuitionSP04.pdf)) This website documents the huge number of courses in Art and Design at Wichita State University that carry fees ranging from \$12 to \$27 to \$52 to \$72. Our Department of Art and Department of Design lack this revenue source.)

Our proposal seeks to establish differential tuition of \$12 per credit hour for courses in the Department of Music and Dance, and \$15 per credit hour for courses in either the Department of Art or the Department of Design. Please let me know how I can be of assistance as you make plans to take our proposal forward to the Kansas Board of Regents.

TUITION DIFFERENTIAL PROPOSAL  
For  
The Department of Music and Dance

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Music and Dance at the University of Kansas has a reputation for excellence. As a Charter Member of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) in 1928, the Department and the institution have produced outstanding students, faculty and programs for decades. The recent addition to Murphy Hall and the increased permanent funding for the BFA degree in dance demonstrate the commitment of the institution to the students in the School of Fine Arts and the Department of Music and Dance. However, major challenges to enhance the learning environment continue to be reported by students and faculty. NASM agreed with this assessment.

The Department conducted its ten-year review for music re-accreditation by NASM in April 2000. Strengths and weaknesses were identified in the Visitors Report (June 2000). The Department addressed the major weaknesses and received re-accreditation in 2001. The purpose of this proposal is to address the remaining challenges. To quote the NASM Visitors Report (page 19), "The Department of Music and Dance at KU is at a crossroads."

NEEDS AND BENEFITS

There are challenges in the Department that were not addressed by the addition to Murphy Hall. By no means do we intend to minimize the significance of the addition to Murphy Hall or the additional permanent funding for the dance program. These are substantial commitments to students by the institution and deserve the Department's expressions of gratitude. However, other concerns were identified by the NASM Visitors Report. Two of the largest were:

1. "There remain...spaces that need attention in the future. There are 78 practice rooms on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of Murphy Hall where students spend most of their individual time practicing and where a number of graduate students are assigned space to teach...These small rooms are in need of acoustical treatment, improved lighting, and fresh paint." (Page 7, NASM Visitors Report)
2. "There appears to be a need for long-term planning in order to address annual needs for ongoing replacement of instruments including pianos." (Page 8, NASM Visitors Report)

In addition to the NASM Visitors Report, other challenges have been identified internally. These concerns impacting students include the following:

1. The choral rehearsal room needs renovation. This rehearsal area (vintage the 5<sup>th</sup> floor practice rooms/original 1956 construction) needs (a) to have the risers removed, (b)

acoustical treatment, (c) a new floor, (d) new wall treatment, and (e) paint. A renovated choral rehearsal room will provide students a flexible area with acoustical and physical properties more conducive to learning.

2. The stage of Swarthout Recital Hall (SRH) needs renovation. Since the removal of the Swarthout organ, the back one-third of the SRH stage is behind permanent latticework and has been vacant for five years. Opening the SRH stage to its full capacity will provide students, faculty and ensembles more and better options for performances, lectures, etc.

3. Students need financial assistance for off campus performances/competitions and research. Currently students receive minimal or no support for off campus performances/competitions and research. Financial support (travel grants) should be available to students performing and conducting research at significant off campus venues.

4. Space is a critical need for the Dance Division. When additional space in Robinson is allocated, students will benefit not only from the space but also from new flooring and equipment.

5. Specific instructional needs cannot be addressed. The Department lacks instruction in guitar, harp, and jazz piano. Therefore, prospective music majors in these areas cannot be admitted. The orchestra and jazz programs are especially impacted by these circumstances.

6. Staffing needs cannot be addressed.

(a) Additional support for technology. Current half-time support is not adequate for the size and scope of the Department.

(b) Instrument technician. An instrument technician is needed to maintain university instruments, equipment and lockers. There is no schedule of regular or preventive maintenance and lockers are poorly maintained. In addition, the instrument technician would be available for individual assistance to all instrumentalists.

(c) Staff support for the choral program and the orchestral program. Currently there is no staff support for the choral and orchestral programs. Students would benefit from staff support to address the ongoing organization, daily maintenance and promotional activities of these comprehensive programs.

(d) Additional staff support is needed in the Dance Division. The BFA in dance was added to the curriculum two years ago. The size and scope of the Dance Division is changing accordingly. Students would benefit from additional staff support to address these changes.

An enhanced learning environment would be available to students if the Department could address these concerns.

## ADDRESSING THE NEEDS

The Department of Music and Dance must increase its income to remain competitive. To reiterate an earlier point, the NASM Visitors Report said “The Department of Music and Dance at KU is at a crossroads.” The Department is positioned to improve its quality substantially, but it needs additional income to do so. To put it directly, the Department of Music and Dance cannot provide the basic operational services and an environment conducive to learning provided by our peers.

Funding sources for the Department of Music and Dance come from three areas: (1) state dollars (includes tuition), (2) private funding (through KUEA), and (3) income generated by the Department.

1. Over 96% of the state dollars allocated to the Department is committed to personnel.
2. Private fundraising is a priority for the School of Fine Arts, especially the past three years. Aggressively seeking private financial support will continue with the highest priority given to scholarships for our students.
3. Income generated by the Department through tickets, sales, etc., is at the 75%ile of our peer institutions/programs. The Department will continue to seek opportunities to increase its income through this venue.

## THE PROPOSAL

The purpose of this proposal is to consider a fourth source of funding – a source that is available for other programs on the KU campus and at our peer institutions. For example, students at the University of Oklahoma, the University of Colorado, the University of Missouri, the University of Missouri-Kansas City, the University of Iowa, and the University of Minnesota pay additional fees for the music major. In each case these fees are returned to the department. Our peers have additional resources to address operational needs. The deficit in our operational needs will continue to increase without this income.

The Department of Music and Dance recommends (1) a \$15 per credit hour tuition differential for all music major courses, (2) a \$9 per credit hour tuition differential on specific non-music major courses, and (3) a \$9 per credit hour tuition differential for all dance courses. The impact for a music major taking 12 credits of music would be approximately \$180 for the semester. The impact for a dance major taking 12 credits of dance would be approximately \$108 for the semester. The impact for a non-music major taking one of the specified non-music major courses would be \$27 for a three-credit course. An estimated \$150,000 per year would be returned to the Department to address its needs.

Bringing this proposal forward is not without substantial apprehension. Asking our students to shoulder this burden is not easy. If approved, the administration and faculty of the Department are committed to working with students through the Student Advisory Council to ensure the tuition differential funds are used appropriately. Students will be consulted and will have significant input on decisions regarding the use of these funds.

To quote the NASM evaluation team a third time, “The Department of Music and Dance at KU is at a crossroads.” This proposal will substantially enhance the Department’s learning environment and provide the ability to navigate and maintain a direction of quality – a vision of which you can be proud as a graduate of KU.

January 6, 2004

Dean Steven Hedden  
School of Fine Arts  
Lawrence Campus

Dear Dean Hedden,

I write to summarize student support in the art department for a tuition differential or “lab fee” attached to enrollment in The School of Fine Arts, and to describe our situation in comparison to art schools throughout the country. In my informal conversations with students and during our meeting with both undergraduate and graduate art students, I have been impressed with a positive, even enthusiastic response to this student-led initiative.

Students in the art department have asked good questions about the process of choosing priorities, funding parameters, and specific needs in studio art, but in the end students were highly receptive to two facts:

1) We are currently unable to provide updated equipment, technology, and support staff with state dollars, and 2) We do not have other funding options to meet these needs.

Although a few students in sculpture have expressed opposition to a fee because of the recent increase in enrollment cost, the preponderance of students in art expressed surprise that The School of Fine Arts did not assess a lab fee now, since many other schools already have this type of fee. Graduate students and transfer students in attendance at our December meeting stated that they paid lab fees as undergraduates in art at other institutions.

Before the last cut to the state budget, the art department was not able to meet equipment needs. Now, as a program struggling to remain competitive, we are in a perilous position. Our mission to provide a comprehensive studio art curriculum, that is to embrace training in both traditional disciplines and new genre media, is becoming impossible to realize. We must find significant financial resources and soon.

At the December meeting with the Dean and Chair, art students had an opportunity to ask questions about the decision-making process once the money from a lab fee was assessed. They also had specific questions about what could and could not be provided by these funds, and they were concerned how expenditures would be reported back to the student body.

After a good discussion with you and a statement of departmental needs by me, students had a better understanding of their representation in the funding process, needs across the entire art curriculum, and the immediate, positive impact of a lab fee to their learning environment. Although a few students were concerned about personal financial challenges,

they were, nevertheless, enthusiastic. Some ideas for program support that students were excited about are:

Students in printmaking and sculpture look forward to hiring a technician to help free their professors from maintenance responsibilities and teaching basic use of equipment.

Print students are concerned about a small and under-equipped computer lab.

Students in drawing and painting are excited about the prospect of greater availability of models, better availability and variety of props, and replacement of old equipment in fourth floor studios.

All students are aware of the need to provide better instructional materials in the building, particularly to establish pocket libraries.

New genre students realize that this new concentration cannot succeed without significant financial support for technology.

In conclusion, I am confident that adding a tuition-based lab fee to enrollment in The School of Fine Arts has the overwhelming support of students in the art department.

Sincerely,

Judith Burns McCrea  
Chairperson