



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

William Powers, Jr., President
University Distinguished Teaching Professor
Hines H. Baker and Thelma Kelley Baker Chair in Law
Main Building 400 • PO Box T • Austin, Texas 78713-8920

Direct Number (512) 471-1232
Facsimile Number (512) 471-8102
president@po.utexas.edu

January 19, 2012

Dr. David B. Prior
Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
The University of Texas System
OHH 304 (P4300)

Dear David:

Enclosed is a revision of the "Response to Questions from The University of Texas System Regarding Tuition Policy Recommendations for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014" that accompanied my letter of December 15, 2011, to you recommending tuition policy for The University of Texas at Austin for academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The revision incorporates the additional information for which you asked during our conversation on January 11, 2012, including the University's plans to measure the success of the various initiatives. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W Powers, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

William Powers, Jr.
President

WP/am

Enclosure

cc: Tuition Policy Advisory Committee
University Budget Council

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS
FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM
REGARDING TUITION POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR 2012-2013 AND 2013-2014

› Revised Version, January 19, 2012 ‹

Section 1: Describe the consultative process used to develop the tuition and fee proposal. Include information on advisory committee meetings and public hearings held on campus to discuss the tuition plan. Provide the names and affiliations of tuition advisory committee members.

This tuition proposal was prepared by the President of The University of Texas at Austin in consultation with its Vice Presidents, College Deans, Provost, and on advice of the University's Tuition Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC).

The TPAC is the principal working committee that interfaces with campus student leadership and with the campus at large for the purpose of advising the President on tuition policy. The TPAC is annually appointed by the President and has the following membership:

VOTING MEMBERS OF TPAC —

Kevin P. Hegarty, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Co-Chair
Steven W. Leslie, Executive Vice President and Provost, Co-Chair
Natalie E. Butler, Student Government Representative
Randy L. Diehl, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Manuel A. Gonzalez, Graduate Student Assembly Representative
Rosa I. Gutierrez, Student Representative at Large
Hillary Hart, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets
Carisa K. Nietzsche, Senate of College Councils Representative
Victoria E. Rodriguez, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

NON-VOTING ADVISORY MEMBERS OF TPAC —

John D. Dollard, Vice Provost
Mary E. Knight, Associate Vice President and Budget Director
Daniel T. Slesnick, Vice Provost

The TPAC had several meetings principally of an educational nature early in the fall, featuring discussions on the present state of the University budget and a review of the guidance from the Legislature, UT System, and the Board of Regents. In mid October, TPAC started meeting twice a week. At that time, the committee began the review of materials submitted by the various College Tuition and Budget Advisory Committees (CTBACS). The CTBACS are newly created permanent standing committees, one for each school or college, established principally for the purpose of advising the Dean on various critical matters, including annual budgets, resource allocations and budget reductions, tuition policy, and various other operational matters as needed. Each committee is specific to a particular college, and consists of student representatives selected from the college or school council. Each CTBAC submitted a report with an assessment of the financial circumstances of its college and a proposal for innovations the college could make to improve the education of its students, along with an estimate of the cost of the innovations. The members of TPAC studied these reports, which played an important role in the subsequent discussions of the committee.

TPAC hosted two public forums, one at the beginning of its work and one after it had decided to consider making recommendations to increase tuition, for the purpose of receiving input from campus constituents. The forums were held on October 12 and November 16. Each forum was attended by approximately 50 students. In developing its report, TPAC integrated what it had learned from all sources and produced recommendations it believed would best serve The University of Texas at Austin. On November 28, 2011 TPAC delivered its completed report to President Powers. The report contains its tuition recommendations. The recommendations are unanimously endorsed by the TPAC membership. TPAC hosted its third and final open forum to receive feedback from the campus on November 30, 2011. President Powers attended the forum to listen to the feedback.

In summary, in developing these tuition recommendations the campus employed a process that was transparent, open, and consultative with campus constituents.

Section II: Describe the financial aid available to students to mitigate the impact of any increase in tuition and fees. Discuss the additional aid that will be generated from increased designated tuition and how it will be spent.

The University of Texas at Austin has a long history of applying financial aid to mitigate the cost of attendance. The table below shows the average tuition and fees (after adjusting for inflation) over the fall and spring semesters of full-time resident undergraduates at the University as well as the average financial aid per student:

**AVERAGE ANNUAL TUITION AND FINANCIAL AID:
FULL-TIME RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATES¹**

ACADEMIC YEAR	AVERAGE ANNUAL TUITION & FEES (2010 dollars)	AVERAGE ANNUAL FINANCIAL AID PER STUDENT ² (2010 dollars)
2003-04	\$6,702	\$3,386
2004-05	\$7,937	\$3,887
2005-06	\$8,155	\$3,745
2006-07	\$8,695	\$4,119
2007-08	\$8,554	\$4,024
2008-09	\$8,646	\$3,917
2009-10	\$9,123	\$4,733
2010-11	\$9,461	\$5,259

In the 2010-11 academic year, the average annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates was \$9,461. Over the fall and spring semesters in the same year, over \$145 million in various forms of financial assistance was received by full-time undergraduate students. This corresponds to an average of \$5,259 per student, and is 56% of the average tuition and fees. This compares to 2003-04, during which students paid \$6,702 in tuition and fees (in constant 2010 dollars) and received an average of \$3,386 in financial aid, which is 51% of tuition and fees. The increased fraction of financial aid from multiple sources since 2003-04, the point of tuition deregulation, has clearly mitigated the total costs paid by students. The principal addition to financial aid after tuition deregulation arises from a Texas law (passed during the same session as the deregulation laws) that requires the University to set aside 20% of any tuition increase for need-based financial aid.

¹ Full-time undergraduate students are those who take at least 12 hours in both the fall and spring semesters as undergraduates during an academic year. It does not include students in special programs or those who were undergraduates in the fall and graduate students in the spring.

² Financial aid represents the sum of tuition exemptions, tuition waivers, scholarships and grants from multiple sources received during the fall and spring semesters. Loans and payments for work study are not included in financial aid. The annual average per student is calculated as the total financial aid allocated to full-time resident undergraduates over the two long semesters divided by the total number of these students. It should be noted that for some students, especially those with limited resources, financial aid could exceed the full cost of tuition and fees, while some students without financial need may not receive any financial assistance.

Financial aid has been allocated strategically so that those with the greatest need are able to attend the University. In 2010-11, over 20% of all full-time resident undergraduates received levels of financial aid that exceeded total tuition and fees. On average, these students were concentrated in households in which parental income was less than \$60,000. Overall, the provision of financial aid for full-time resident undergraduates has focused on those with the most need to mitigate the impact of any tuition increase.

Against this backdrop, the University will continue its efforts to support our students with financial aid in an effort to maintain affordability and access to the University. The entirety of the increase in costs to students is proposed as an increase in the designated tuition component of the total cost to attend The University of Texas at Austin. As required by law, 15% of the increase to residents will be set aside for need-based financial aid and made available to all undergraduate and graduate students. An additional 5% of the amount of the increase to resident undergraduates will be set aside to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to fund the Texas B-On-Time incentive.

The University estimates that the total incremental amount of set-aside for both purposes will total approximately \$2.1 million per year on approval of this proposal. The University anticipates that this increase in need-based financial aid will be sufficient to mitigate the impact of the increase in the total cost to attend The University of Texas at Austin for students from the most challenged socioeconomic segments. This increment of financial aid will be allocated by the University Office of Student Financial Services.

To assist students with financial planning, the Office of Student Financial Services has created a set of money management workshops called Bevonomics, and partnered with the Division of Student Affairs to create a publication called *UT 4 Less* that provides financial guidance to students.

Section III: Describe the proposed increase in designated tuition and/or specific fee(s) for each of the two academic years and provide details of how the additional revenue will be used to improve student time to degree and/or 4-year graduation rates for full-time undergraduate students. This plan should include specific initiatives and how success of these initiatives will be determined.

For the fall 2011 semester, the average tuition for an undergraduate resident taking 15 Semester Credit Hours is \$4,896. The proposed percentage increase, consisting entirely of designated tuition, is 2.6% for the academic year 2012-13 and an additional 2.6% for the academic year 2013-14. This corresponds to an increase of \$127 per semester in the first year and \$131 in the second academic year.

The average tuition for an undergraduate paying nonresident tuition and taking 15 Semester Credit Hours is \$16,190. The proposed percentage increase, consisting entirely of designated tuition, is 3.6% for the academic year 2012-13 and an additional 3.6% for the academic year 2013-14. This is a per semester increase of \$583 for the first year and \$604 for the second academic year.

The total new funding from these recommendations will depend on the exact composition of the classes during the subsequent two years, but after the required 20% set-aside for financial aid (applied only to residents), it is anticipated that the proposed increases for undergraduates will generate approximately \$12.7 million in the first year and an additional \$13.0 million in the second year.

Each year, the University faces rising health-care costs as well as general inflation associated with the basic operation of the infrastructure of its facilities. We estimate that the increase in these costs alone will be approximately \$20 million. In addition to these “status quo” uses, the colleges, CTBACS, and the central administration have developed a number of plans that are designed to improve the time-to-degree as well as the overall graduation rates. In total, the cost of implementing these proposals is estimated to be approximately \$30 million. This suggests that the initiatives described below will need to be prioritized by the University Budget Council and funded, to the extent possible, using the resources made available from the tuition increases.

(1) Expansion of course offerings in “bottleneck” courses:

A number of courses are required for graduation but are over-subscribed because of budget cuts and shifts in course demands across colleges and majors. Students who are unable to take these courses early in their academic careers are delayed in their progress toward timely graduation.

An important example of this phenomenon is the College of Natural Sciences. Between 2005 and 2010, the number of majors in this college increased by over 1,000 students. Most of this growth occurred in the Biological Sciences, and the enrollment surge has been accommodated using almost \$2 million of non-recurring “bridge” funds to hire non-tenure track faculty. It is evident that this increase in majors is permanent and that recurring resources will need to be identified and allocated to Natural Sciences. Similar but less severe “bottleneck” problems can be found in the Math and Chemistry/Biochemistry departments as well as in the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Engineering, and Education. As mentioned below, assessment indicators from the revised degree audit system, as well as the new universal tracking structure, will support the development of better course planning and scheduling tools, allowing us to identify and address problems with bottleneck courses more readily.

(2) Increased funding for student services to enhance student outcomes:

- A. Freshman Orientation Advising — Due to incomplete information or misunderstanding, many students enter the University without a clear understanding of the preparation required to successfully complete certain majors. In some cases, the first choice of a major does not match either the interest or the aptitude of the student. Following the lead of other universities (such as the University of Michigan and Penn State), we will pilot a program of mandatory academic advising for incoming freshmen prior to registration for their first semester. The experience of other universities is that this increases the likelihood of improved matches between the students and their choice of major, which, in turn, improves graduation rates and the average time-to-degree. The success of this effort should be assessed in terms of improved rates of early major declaration, declining rates of changes in major, and declining rates of internal transfer.

- B. Universal Tracking and E-Advising — There are advising activities that do not require interpersonal contact between an academic advisor and the student. For example, students may need to know the set of courses that can fulfill graduation requirements in a chosen major or whether the classes they have taken satisfy existing degree requirements. Answers to these and similar types of questions can be obtained programmatically through an online advising system. This system can also be used for high volume but largely routine activities related to registration, declaration of majors, and add/drop activity. Moving away from appointment-based advising for these routine questions would certainly streamline these activities and enhance advising efficiency, allowing advisors to focus on developmental work with students. Progress in this area will be measured in the completion of the revised Interactive Degree Audit system (which will have interfaces with MyEdu), the development of a new Universal Tracking System (which allows students to see whether they are on track to graduate in four years), and the centralization of advisor support structures, such as Advisor's Toolkit and the Early Academic Warning System. All of this should support more effective early interventions with students in academic difficulty (which should reduce academic dismissal and drop-out rates), allow students to track their progress toward their degrees more effectively, and reduce the time to degree overall.

- C. Career Services — The difficult economic environment necessitates that the University redouble its efforts to support the job placements of our undergraduate students. This is particularly true of career services that are provided by our largest colleges. We will examine the efficacy of outsourcing placement services to private vendors compared to expanded staffing of existing offices so that we can provide the highest quality support at the lowest cost. The success of this initiative will be measured in satisfaction surveys of students using these services.

D. Financial Aid Management — The reduction of federal and state funding for student financial aid increases the need for the strategic application of limited funds. Every student makes a series of decisions over the course of his or her career that ultimately influences educational outcomes. Without exaggeration, all of these decisions depend on the financial aid provided centrally by Student Financial Services as well as the funds administered by the colleges and schools. UT Austin is developing the administrative infrastructure required to manage financial aid in a way that increases the likelihood of favorable enrollment outcomes such as reduced rates of attrition and higher overall graduation rates. Success in this area will also be measured in improved yield rates in core recruitment areas.

(3) Expansion of summer course offerings:

The University has instructional capacity during both summer sessions. Colleges have proposed using the summer session to expand bridge programs to ease the transition from high school to college, particularly for under-prepared students. These programs are designed to provide the skills necessary to succeed in their chosen disciplines, reduce attrition, and advance to graduation in a timely way. In the science fields, the College of Natural Sciences has proposed a “Summer Academy” that is designed specifically to improve academic achievement in chemistry and math. The College of Liberal Arts plans to expand its “SummerStart” program that is targeted to at-risk students.

The University has also created incentives for the colleges to expand their more traditional course offerings during the summer. Increasing summer enrollment is in the best interests of students, given that it can speed time to degree and help fill the large amount of unused instructional capacity available in the summer. This allows students to take critical courses at non-peak times, which mitigates bottlenecks during the long semesters and reduces the time-to-degree. The initial implementation of this program resulted in an increase in summer enrollment of approximately 600 students. Success in this area will be measured in both an expansion in summer course offerings and increased enrollments.

(4) Educational Innovation Funding:

A. Course Transformation Program — In an effort to improve instructional quality, lower-division gateway courses are being redesigned to identify effective strategies to enhance learning and improve academic success for students in their first two years. The Center for Teaching and Learning is developing the infrastructure to track learning outcomes to identify

empirically the innovations that are particularly effective for students at UT Austin. Success of this effort will be measured in improved learning outcomes, lower DFW rates, and enhanced performance in subsequent courses.

- B. Curriculum Enhancement — Expanding on the Course Transformation initiative, the University will support broader efforts to redesign instructional methods and approaches within the core curriculum. To be successful, it will be necessary to integrate the latest technology with innovative teaching methods that enhance the learning and success of students who are early in their academic careers. In addition, the University plans to develop a learning platform and academic analytics system to support education innovation, and to track better the impact of these curriculum redesign efforts across cohorts of students.
- C. College Readiness — The On-ramps project is an initiative designed to upgrade the skills of incoming freshmen in key areas to increase the probability of success in their chosen disciplines. This initiative, coupled with efforts in the College of Natural Sciences to expand the use of ALEKS testing for incoming freshmen, will increase the likelihood that students will understand the preparation in science and math that is necessary to succeed in college.

(5) Classroom Enhancement:

Many of the proposals to enhance instructional methods require the integration of technology in the classroom. This will require a significant upgrade and expansion of classroom facilities at UT Austin. It will also increase the need for technical staff to maintain technology-based classrooms. As one of many examples, we will need to expand our wireless capability for the vast majority of auditoria that will be used as part of the Course Transformation Program. The success of this initiative will be measured in the expansion of wireless capability across all of our large classrooms, as well as the development and adoption of a classroom technology plan for the campus.

Section IV: Describe any current or proposed innovative tuition and fee policies that are included in the tuition and fee proposal, such as flat rate tuition, tuition rebates, tuition discounts or guaranteed tuition loans. If any of the strategies are currently being used, discuss the impact that they are having on student behavior.

(1) Flat Rate Tuition:

The University of Texas implemented a policy of flat rate tuition for all undergraduates in the fall 2005 semester and extended the policy to graduate

students in the fall 2008 semester. The move to flat rate tuition was motivated partly to achieve transparency by reporting the total cost of education rather than charging separately for tuition, required fees, and other miscellaneous charges. For undergraduates, flat rate tuition also creates incentives to register for a full menu of courses (15 or more Semester Credit Hours) rather than the all-too-common practice of taking 12 hours or less. To date, the impact of flat rate tuition on undergraduate course loads has been modest: the average SCH have increased 1.4%, from 13.52 to 13.71. Reports from advisors indicate students have not taken advantage of this opportunity because they are both working and going to school, and they fear that taking more than 12 hours will hurt them academically.

(2) Discounting Summer Tuition:

UT Austin has a tuition discount program in place for those who enroll in the summer: summer tuition is 15% less expensive than tuition during the long terms. UT Austin has also been taking steps to enrich its summer offerings in the hope of tempting students to take summer coursework, potentially shortening time-to-degree. The various Colleges were offered financial incentives to provide interesting and useful coursework in the summer. This program began in summer 2010. Summer 2009 undergraduate enrollment was 9,418, summer 2010 enrollment was 10,094, and summer 2011 enrollment was 10,030.

Section V: In this section, discuss how increased designated tuition will allow the university to sustain institutional quality, make much-needed improvements and achieve strategic goals, such as increased enrollment and graduation rates, increased financial aid resources, more efficient use of facilities, and higher quality of academic programs and student services. If additional faculty and/or staff will be hired, provide information on the number of additional faculty and/or staff and how they will be employed on campus.

The legislation that created the University of Texas stipulated that it be a university of the first class. The overall strategic goal of The University of Texas at Austin has been to achieve and maintain this status. Not long after taking office, President William Powers stated his belief that The University of Texas at Austin can be and should be the best public university in America, and this has become our new overall strategic goal.

At present, the University faces strong new pressures to improve undergraduate education, to educate more students, and to restrain tuition increases. A crucial strategic goal in responding to these pressures is to ensure that the University maintains its character as an institution that honors research as well as teaching,

and offers students an education that helps cultivate their minds as well as preparing them for the work force.

The University endorses the strategic goals mentioned in the instructions above, with the understanding that the goal of increased enrollment will be addressed by lessening time to degree and the consequent ability to accept more new students in the fall. Many of the specific uses of increased designated tuition have been described in Section III on student success. UT has undertaken the Summer Enhancement Program to increase summer enrollment and utilize existing facilities more efficiently. This helps the University make better use of its physical plant. Higher quality of educational programs and greater efficiency in their delivery will be addressed by the Course Transformation Program and many other initiatives proposed by individual Colleges—expanding the offerings of bottleneck courses, increased TA/AI support for supplemental instruction and project-based learning, hiring of additional faculty to address curricular needs, etc. These have been mentioned in Section III. The exact numbers of additional faculty and/or staff to be hired are not known at present.

Section VI: Summary of proposal's impact on total academic costs.

The total academic cost for a resident undergraduate student taking 15 semester credit hours is used as a benchmark in evaluating the tuition and fee proposal.³ Below are the data for estimated total academic costs in fall 2011 at your institution as reported to the House Higher Education Committee Board in July. Please verify and correct, if needed, the figures below and enter the actual information for fall 2011 and estimated total academic costs for fall 2012 and fall 2013 based on the tuition and fee proposal. Total estimated academic costs for fall 2012 and fall 2013 should reflect the sum of all tuition and mandatory fee charges (including average course and program fees) listed in Section IV.

Because some institutions charge different rates to resident undergraduate students or offer guaranteed tuition plans where undergraduates pay different rates depending upon whether or not they participate in the plan, a weighted average total academic cost figure must be provided below in order to evaluate the overall impact of the proposal on resident undergraduate students.

The University of Texas at Austin has established a flat rate charge that varies by college. The table below reflects the per semester weighted average Total Academic Costs for a full time Texas resident undergraduate student taking 15 semester credit hours before financial aid:

³ Total academic costs are averages based on actual fee bills before any aid or waivers are applied.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

	Estimated Fall 2011	Actual Fall 2011	Estimated Fall 2012	Estimated Fall 2013
Statutory Tuition:	\$750	\$750	\$750	\$750
Designated Tuition:	\$2,635	\$2,634	\$2,761	\$2,892
Mandatory Fees:	\$1,512	\$1,512	\$1,512	\$1,512
Ave. College/Course Fees:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Academic Cost:	\$4,897	\$4,896	\$5,023	\$5,154

Section VII: Additional Information

The following tables provide information about state funding and the levels of tuition and required fees for the twelve public universities in our national comparison group:

- Total State Funding and Tuition Revenue per FTE Student (Including AUF)
- Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions — Undergraduate, Resident, Academic Year 2011-12
- Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions — Undergraduate, Non-resident, Academic Year 2011-12
- Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions — Graduate, Resident, Academic Year 2011-12
- Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions — Graduate, Non-resident, Academic Year 2011-12

As indicated in the first table, The University of Texas at Austin is last among the twelve schools of its national comparison group in total state funding and tuition revenue (including the Available University Fund) per full-time-equivalent student. Despite this, tuition and required fees charged by the University to resident undergraduate and graduate students and nonresident graduate students are in the bottom half of the comparison group. Through strategic and diligent use of resources, The University of Texas at Austin continues to compete successfully with these leading public universities, even as we hold tuition and required fees below the median of the group.

Total State Funding and Tuition Revenue per FTE Student (Including AUF)

	Total State Appropriations plus Tuition	Total FTE Students Fall 2009	Combined State Appropriations and Tuition per FTE Student	Rank
University of California-Berkeley	\$900,576,000	34,749	\$25,917	4
University of California-Los Angeles	\$1,069,173,000	37,710	\$28,353	2
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	\$795,511,107	41,360	\$19,234	11
Indiana University-Bloomington	\$805,456,403	39,295	\$20,498	8
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	\$1,069,383,000	39,922	\$26,787	3
Michigan State University	\$897,926,957	43,579	\$20,605	7
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	\$1,065,747,299	43,197	\$24,672	5
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	\$758,773,506	25,901	\$29,295	1
Ohio State University-Main Campus	\$1,039,386,664	50,127	\$20,735	6
University of Washington-Seattle Campus	\$831,411,682	41,432	\$20,067	9
University of Wisconsin-Madison	\$752,816,386	38,822	\$19,391	10
The University of Texas at Austin	\$923,531,674	48,283	\$19,127	12

* State Appropriations for UT Austin includes the Available University Fund amount of \$160,690,000 for 2009-10.

Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions – Undergraduate, Resident, Academic Year 2011-12

Institution	Rank	Total Academic Cost: Resident
University of California-Berkeley	1	\$14,461
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign	2	\$14,276
University of California-Los Angeles	3	\$13,911
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	4	\$13,437
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	5	\$13,022
Michigan State University	6	\$12,769
University of Washington	7	\$10,574
The University of Texas at Austin	8	\$9,792
Ohio State University-Main Campus	9	\$9,735
University of Wisconsin-Madison	10	\$9,671
Indiana University-Bloomington	11	\$9,523
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	12	\$7,009

Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions – Undergraduate, Non-Resident, Academic Year 2011-12

Institution	Rank	Total Academic Cost: Non-Resident
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	1	\$39,109
University of California-Berkeley	2	\$37,339
University of California-Los Angeles	3	\$36,789
University of Texas at Austin	4	\$32,380
Michigan State University	5	\$31,639
Indiana University-Bloomington	6	\$29,540
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign	7	\$28,418
University of Washington	8	\$28,058
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	9	\$26,834
University of Wisconsin-Madison	10	\$25,421
Ohio State University-Main Campus	11	\$24,630
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	12	\$18,022

Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions – Graduate, Resident, Academic Year 2011-12

Institution	Rank	Total Academic Cost: Graduate, Resident
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	1	\$18,860
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	2	\$15,240
University of California-Berkeley	3	\$14,985
University of California-Los Angeles	4	\$14,618
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign	5	\$14,262
University of Washington	6	\$13,968
Michigan State University	7	\$13,656
Ohio State University-Main Campus	8	\$11,823
University of Wisconsin-Madison	9	\$11,375
University of Texas at Austin	10	\$10,534
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	11	\$8,646
Indiana University-Bloomington	12	\$8,519

NOTE: Data is for graduate students taking 24 semester credit hours for the year.

Tuition and Required Fees at National Comparison Group Institutions – Graduate, Non-Resident, Academic Year 2011-12

Institution	Rank	Total Academic Cost: Graduate, Non-Resident
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	1	\$37,920
University of California-Berkeley	2	\$30,087
University of California-Los Angeles	3	\$29,720
Ohio State University-Main Campus	4	\$28,548
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign	5	\$27,528
Michigan State University	6	\$26,820
University of Washington	7	\$25,768
University of Wisconsin-Madison	8	\$25,133
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	9	\$24,333
Indiana University-Bloomington	10	\$22,739
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	11	\$22,694
University of Texas at Austin	12	\$20,040

NOTE: Data is for graduate students taking 24 semester credit hours for the year