

**TUITION AND FEE CHARGES AT
STATE-CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IN VIRGINIA**

**REPORT OF THE
VIRGINIA ADVISORY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
To
THE GOVERNOR
And
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HO 15, 1972

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1971

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

ROBERT C. FITZGERALD, *Chairman*
ARTHUR H. RICHARDSON, *Vice-Chairman*
M. CALDWELL BUTLER
RUSSELL M. CARNEAL
C. W. CLEATON
HENRY E. HOWELL, JR.
EDWARD E. LANE
LEWIS A. McMURRAN, JR.
WILLARD J. MOODY
GARNETT S. MOORE
SAM E. POPE
JAMES M. THOMSON
JAMES C. TURK
EDWARD E. WILLEY

STAFF

JOHN B. BOATWRIGHT, JR.
WILDMAN S. KINCHELOE, JR.

JOHN A. BANKS, JR.	LAURENS SARTORIS
ROBERT B. COUSINS, JR.	SALLY T. WARTHEN
KATHERINE L. GOOLSBY	G. WILLIAM WHITE, JR.
ARTHUR H. HORWITZ	ROGER C. WILEY, JR.
L. WILLIS ROBERTSON, JR.	

TUITION AND FEE CHARGES AT STATE-CONTROLLED
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Report of the
Virginia Advisory Legislative Council

Richmond, Virginia
December 16, 1971

To: THE HONORABLE LINWOOD HOLTON, *Governor of Virginia*
and

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

Recognizing the disparities and inequities in the existing charges levied by the State's colleges and universities, the 1970 General Assembly of Virginia adopted House Joint Resolution No. 10, directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to study the tuition and fee charges of all State-controlled institutions of higher education in Virginia. The text of this resolution is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 10

Directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council, with the State Council of Higher Education as Secretariat, to study the tuition and fee charges of all State-controlled institutions of higher education in Virginia.

Whereas, Virginia has taken significant steps to broaden the higher education opportunity available to the citizenry; and

Whereas, student costs are related to college attendance; and

Whereas, student tuition and fee charges vary among the four-year State colleges and universities; and

Whereas, student tuition and fee charges are uniform among the community colleges; and

Whereas, no comprehensive study of student charges in both the State four-year and two-year colleges has been conducted in recent years; and

Whereas, the State Council of Higher Education has recommended such a study; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council, with the assistance of the State Council of Higher Education as Secretariat, is directed to conduct during the 1970-72 Biennium a comprehensive study of student tuition, fees, and charges at all State-controlled institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth.

The study shall include, but shall not be limited to:

(a) An analysis of tuition and fee charges in the Virginia State-

controlled colleges and universities as compared with similar charges in private institutions in the Commonwealth and with public and private colleges in other states and nationwide;

(b) A review of current State and institutional policies guiding the determination of tuition and fee charges;

(c) The formulation of such recommendations as may be needed to insure appropriate student charges in future years.

All agencies of the State, educational and otherwise, shall cooperate with the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council and the State Council in this study. The Virginia Advisory Legislative Council shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and members of the General Assembly not later than September one, nineteen hundred seventy-one.

The Council selected Sam E. Pope of Drewryville, a member of the House of Delegates of Virginia and a member of the Council, as Chairman of a committee to make the study thus directed. Selected to serve with Mr. Pope were the following persons:

Lea Booth, Lynchburg; Dana B. Hamel, Richmond; Robert M. Hendrick, Jr., Petersburg; A. Burke Hertz, Falls Church; M. P. Lacy, Blacksburg; Paul W. Manns, Bowling Green, Roy E. McTarnaghan, Richmond; William P. Robinson, Sr., Norfolk; J. Warren White, Jr., Norfolk.

The Committee met and organized. Senator Manns was elected Vice-Chairman. The State Council of Higher Education served as the Secretariat, as directed by the study resolution. In addition to Dr. McTarnaghan, who served as a member of the Committee, the State Council was represented by Kenneth Schultz. Other research assistance and information was provided by the State Board for Community Colleges and the Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges—the offices of committee members Hamel and Booth, respectively.

The office of the secretary of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council and the Division of Statutory Research and Drafting made staff and facilities available to carry out this study; they initially assigned David T. Walker and subsequently Roger C. Wiley, Jr., to serve as counsel to the study group.

Finally, the Committee received advice and counsel, particularly with respect to the issue of student residency, from the Office of the Attorney General of Virginia, represented by William G. Broaddus.

The Committee initially examined the current charges for tuition and fees levied by the various colleges and universities, public and private, and the relationship of these charges to the institutions' operational costs. It also sought and obtained similar data relative to institutions in other states, particularly those having geographic proximity to Virginia. Further information studied included the effects of tuition and fee structures on overall levels of enrollment in institutions of higher learning within the State, existing and proposed student financial aid programs, student migration patterns, residency requirements for varying tuition charges, and economic benefits afforded the State by graduates of its educational institutions.

These examinations brought to light the fact that, for the 1970-71 academic year, Virginia's four-year State colleges and universities had the highest mean charges for tuition and fees within the states of the Southern Regional

Education Board, some 43 percent higher than the SREB mean figure.¹ Among the twenty-six major state universities in the SREB, three of the five highest 1970-71 in-state undergraduate charges were levied by Virginia schools; and of one hundred six SREB state-controlled liberal arts colleges, five of the six most expensive for in-state students were in Virginia.² Tables comparing charges at State-controlled institutions with those at private colleges and in other states are included in Appendix B.

The Council sees strong indications that the relatively high expense of tuition and fees at the State-controlled schools is having a detrimental effect on the overall educational level among Virginia's young people. The SREB reported in 1970 that only 36.8 percent of Virginia's college-age population was enrolled in college. Only two southern states had lower percentages, the SREB mean being 43.5 percent; the national mean was 57.6 percent.

From its initial investigations the Committee was able to isolate five major areas of concern. It was therefore decided to form five subcommittees, each of which would concentrate on one of these areas and make recommendations to the full Committee. One of these subcommittees studied the tuition and fee structure at the State-controlled four year colleges. Another examined the charges of institutions in the community college system. The third subcommittee considered the problem of defining student residency for tuition purposes. The fourth studied student financial aid programs, and the final subcommittee examined institutional management practices and their relationship to tuition and fee charges.

Based upon the report of the Committee, the Council makes the following recommendations in these five areas:

-
1. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey; *Student Expense Budgets of Colleges and Universities for the 1970-71 Academic Year*.
 2. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, *Tuition and/or Required Fees, Room Rates, and Board Rates at member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, by State: 1970-71*. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *Tuition, Required Fees, Room, and Board at Member Institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities by State, for the Year 1970-1971*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. *Four-year institutions. Clear definitions should be established for tuition charges and fee charges respectively. The Boards of Visitors of the State-controlled four-year colleges and universities should then establish in-state undergraduate tuition as a fixed proportion (not to exceed one-third) of the undergraduate educational cost, with out-of-state and graduate tuition charges related thereto on a proportionally higher scale.*
- II. *Community colleges. The State Board for Community Colleges should evaluate tuition charges on a regular basis in an effort to keep them as low as is commensurate with the need to provide educational opportunities for all Virginians.*
- III. *In order to foster uniform application of residency requirements, administrators at State-controlled colleges and universities should be provided with adequate guidelines for making the residency determination for tuition purposes.*
- IV. *The State should establish a statewide program of student financial aid, administered by a central agency, which would make awards to students on the basis of financial need, for use at any accredited two-year or four-year degree granting institution in the State, public or private.*
- V. *The State-controlled institutions of higher education should undertake a continuing program of analysis to insure that sound management practices are employed and instructional costs are minimized.*

REASONS FOR AND INTENDED EFFECT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Tuition and Fees at Four Year Colleges.

It appears that no uniform policy on the establishment of tuition charges exists among the State-controlled institutions, and that the distinction between tuition charges and fee charges also varies widely.

The Council recommends that the definition for tuition and fees be made clear for those in the legislature, in the higher education community and among the public. Specifically, tuition should be defined as those payments made by a student for educational and general expenses of the institution. Fees should be defined as those charges for specific and separately identifiable expenditures which support specific activities and services. An example would be an application fee, athletic fee, laundry fee, student activity fee, parking fee, or other similar charge.

It is further recommended that a student pay a reasonable part of the educational cost of attending a public institution in Virginia. At the same time, payments by the students, as part of the cost of the educational program in an institution of higher education, should be an amount (not to exceed one-third of the total costs) which would compare reasonably with tuition charges at other public institutions around the country and provide the opportunity for all citizens who wish to participate in higher education.

Considering the differences in expenditures at the various senior colleges and universities in Virginia based on types of programs, salary average standards and the other factors which, in large measure, make up the differences in cost, it is recommended that Boards of Visitors establish the undergraduate tuition charge each year as one-third of the estimated educational and general cost of undergraduate education per full-time equivalent student at that institution.

To use a hypothetical example: If the undergraduate cost for education and general expenses per student were projected to be \$1,200 for an academic year, the basic undergraduate tuition would be \$400 for a Virginia resident. The proposed model would suggest that in-state tuition for undergraduate students be established as the first order of priority. Subsequently, in-state graduate charges are recommended to be one and a half times in-state undergraduate charges. First professional tuition would be recommended at twice basic undergraduate in-state charges. In each of the three basic tuition categories above, out-of-state charges are recommended to be double that of in-state charges. This model is recommended because it represents dollar figures in current terms which are not out of line with the national range and would provide more equitable distribution of costs to students than is the case currently in many of the Virginia institutions of higher education.

If more accurate projections of income differentials for special funds are needed at this time, each institution should be encouraged to apply this formula to its projected enrollment in view of the fact that large numbers of part-time students are enrolled in most State colleges and universities and the data now available at the State level do not accurately reflect how an institution would calculate its special fund revenues.

Boards of Visitors should establish per credit hour charges for part-time students on a scale prorated to charges for full-time students. It is recommended that a uniform definition of full-time students for tuition purposes be adopted at 12 credit hours for full terms. Currently, such

definitions vary from seven credit hours to twelve credit hours. It must be emphasized that this type of tuition charge principle based on the beginning assumption of one-third of the undergraduate educational general cost to be borne by the student can work only if the legislature is willing to support the funding of the remainder of the education cost not derived from student tuition payments. This principle suggests that there is a specific ratio between State funding and the student tuition level and that there is a joint partnership between the institutions and the State government in the planning and budgeting process. Certainly the major criterion would be the student enrollment level at each of the colleges, which is a predictable event in that it is the initial and most crucial element of the budget planning cycle.

The State Council should be required to furnish annually to the General Assembly financial data on tuition and fees at the State-controlled institutions of higher education. Included in such data shall be the analysis of tuition charges by level of instruction and the ratio of tuition charges to educational and general expenses. Additionally a listing of special fees shall be presented including the purpose for which they are assessed.

Data on tuition and fee charges at private colleges and universities should also be collected and presented annually to the General Assembly in a format as closely related to the public institutions as is possible.

II. *Community College Charges.*

The people of Virginia and the General Assembly founded the community college system to assure that all Virginians would have post-high school educational opportunities within commuting distance to help them develop to the maximum level of their abilities.

It was also determined that tuition would be kept as low as possible in order not to deny any Virginian this opportunity because of finances.

The Council recognizes the need to keep tuition as low as possible at these institutions and recommends that the State Board for Community Colleges evaluate its tuition charges on a regular basis, taking into consideration the economic growth of the Commonwealth and her citizens, and the need to provide these educational opportunities for as many Virginians as possible.

We further recommend that the State Board for Community Colleges, recognizing the above statement, will keep its tuition as low as is commensurate with the clear need to provide educational opportunities for all Virginians and will try to assure that no Virginian is denied an educational opportunity because of finances.

III. *Residency.*

The Council has found that various State educational institutions may be giving conflicting interpretations of Section 23-7 of the Code of Virginia, the statute establishing in-state tuition requirements. Primary problems focus on military personnel and their dependents, diplomatic personnel and their dependents, and those students who originally enrolled as out-of-state students but now seek to qualify as in-state students. In an attempt to insure some uniformity in the application of the statute, the following guidelines should be issued to administrators at the institutions, preferably through the Office of the Attorney General:

To the Registrar or Admissions Office Addressed:

Section 23-7 of the Code requires both one year's residency and domicile before a student is eligible for in-state status.

Military Personnel

Customarily, military personnel retain on their records the location of their domicile when they entered the military service and they pay taxes to that state. It is possible, however, for them to change their domicile for income tax purposes and many do claim some other state if they have found a more favorable state. The mere stationing of a military person in Virginia does not make him liable for Virginia income taxes nor does it qualify him for in-state tuition rates. If a military person elects to file his income tax return in some state other than Virginia, then there is a strong presumption that the person is not a Virginia domiciliary and, of course, his dependents will take his domicile. This is true even though the person may pay real property and State taxes in Virginia.

Diplomatic Personnel

The mere fact that a person is an alien does not disqualify him from the privilege of paying in-state tuition. However, persons who are in this country on a visa which contemplates their returning to their native country within a certain number of years should be presumed to be out-of-state residents. The mere payment of Virginia income taxes will not qualify them as Virginia domiciliaries. They must also intend to remain in the State indefinitely.

Certain persons are permitted to enter the country with visas which have the effect of exempting them from paying state income taxes. They may intend to remain in Virginia for an indefinite period of time while possessing one of these visas. It is possible for these people to be Virginia residents and domiciliaries within the scope of Section 23-7.

Out-of-State Students

An increasing number of students who enter Virginia institutions as out-of-state students are requesting that their status be changed to that of in-state students. There is a rebuttable presumption that they are not entitled to in-state status and the burden is upon them to prove that they do qualify. If a student is not emancipated, then the student retains the same domicile as his father. If his father lives out of the State, then an unemancipated student cannot qualify as an in-state student unless other circumstances, such as divorce, are relevant.

Emancipation means that the student has severed all ties with his parents which enabled them to control his activities as well as a severing of the parents' support of the student financially. Incidental financial contributions by parents to their student children may not necessarily defeat a claim of emancipation, but, certainly, material financial support would defeat a claim of emancipation. Older students are more likely to claim emancipation successfully; however, there is no magic age of emancipation. Parental control and support are the keys.

If a student claims emancipation, then you may decide to request that he support his claim by having his parents file notarized affidavits affirming that they did not claim him as a dependent on their income tax return, federal or state, and that they did not contribute materially to his support.

If a student can show emancipation, then determine whether he filed a Virginia income tax return. If he had income and did not file a Virginia income tax return, then probably he is not a Virginia domiciliary. A second important criterion is whether the emancipated student habitually returns to his parental home, located out of the State, during vacations, especially summer, or, in any

event, whether he leaves the State for the duration of such time. If he does, then probably he is not a Virginia domiciliary.

In addition to the foregoing, the following are set forth as items which may furnish some indication of whether a student who originally enrolled as an out-of-state student is now a Virginia domiciliary. None of the following is intended to be regarded as controlling, but only as an indication of the student's intent to be a Virginia domiciliary.

- a. The student's plans upon graduation—whether residency is for an indefinite period or for the limited purpose of obtaining his education.
- b. Voter registration in Virginia.
- c. Voter registration in another jurisdiction.
- d. Address on driver's license.
- e. Jurisdiction in which student's motor vehicles are licensed and registered.
- f. Location of bank accounts.
- g. Purchase of insurance policies from local broker.
- h. Home ownership as opposed to rental.
- i. Identification with the community, such as club memberships, etc.
- j. Economic self-dependence in the community.
- k. Age of student.
- l. If the student is married, the location of his spouse.
- m. If the student is married and has children, the children's vacation customs and other practices should be analyzed.
- n. Subscription to former community's newspapers, etc.
- o. Retention of ties with former community, such as club memberships.
- p. Potential for permanent employment of present employment, if any.
- q. Reason for attending institution.

IV. *Financial aid.*

The Council, recognizing that any study of tuition and fees cannot be divorced from the availability of student financial aid for those who will be paying the tuition and fees, has given careful consideration to the type of student financial aid program necessary to make higher education accessible to as many of Virginia's youth as might benefit therefrom.

Of grave concern has been the large net loss of Virginia youth to other states in student migration.³ Virginia, of course, wants to keep within the State more of its talented youth; and a truly student-oriented program of student financial aid can influence a student to remain in the State for his education rather than have him migrate to another state to study, perhaps never to return to serve Virginia.

3. The latest available figures show an annual outward migration of Virginia students of nearly 40,000. The net loss was 9,489 undergraduates and 5,281 graduate and professional students.

The Council recommends the establishment of a statewide program of student financial aid. The characteristics of a program which would serve not only the students in need of financial assistance but would serve also the needs of the institutions of higher education and society are:

1. Student aid awards should be related to the demonstrated financial need of the students. The student and his family should contribute (within their capability) to the payment of the costs of the education of the student.
2. The program should be centrally administered so that all public institutions might have the benefit of one source of communications, application, and financial need interpretation.
3. Awards should be made to students so that they may have free choice in the selection of the institutions of higher education in which they seek to enroll. Consideration should be given to the use of these awards at any accredited two-year or four-year degree granting institution of higher education in Virginia, public or private, with the exception that they may not be used for theological training or religious education.

A bill to establish such a program is included in Appendix A to this report.

V. *Institutional Management.*

Tuition and fee charges are related to costs. It follows that management of the institutions plays a significant role in these costs.

Management practices undoubtedly vary among the public institutions of higher education in Virginia. The Council suspects that poor management practices can be found; and, convinced that better management methods are available, the Council recommends that the legislature and/or the Governor assign to the State Council of Higher Education the responsibility, through the use of impartial, qualified, outside consultants, for establishing a set of management standards and to evaluate the management of each senior institution and the system of community colleges against these standards.

Citizens, who provide the taxes, and members of the General Assembly, who appropriate the funds for the institutions of higher education, are asking questions about the management of these institutions. More and more they want to know what is being done with the dollars invested; whether economies are being effected; and whether there is an attempt on the part of the administrations to review the costs seriously to achieve a maximum return on the investment being made.

Each institution should be developing a space utilization plan for the facilities it has available. Such items as twelve-month operations, night school offerings, and other related full utilization programs need to be examined very carefully. Great demands are being made for capital funds, and a more careful analysis of space utilization must be made by each institution.

Faculty-student ratios and staffing patterns are other areas which are coming under scrutiny in many states. Careful analysis is recommended in these high cost areas.

Management information systems should be explored to provide the Presidents and the Boards with objective data upon which future planning can be developed and sound judgments made.

The Council recommends that the Boards of Visitors, the State Board for

Community Colleges, the Presidents and the Chancellor, develop cooperative ventures between and among existing institutions, both public and private, for the use of faculty, staff, facilities, and equipment.

Following good management practices, the Council recommends that a re-evaluation and review of existing programs, goals, objectives, and purposes of the institutions be undertaken. Included would be an in-depth study of the graduates, their preparation upon entering employment and their progress, based on that preparation.

The Council also recommends that master planning be done and that the master plan be put in written form, spelling out the overall needs of the institution. This plan should be supportive of the State Council of Higher Education's master plan for higher education.

The State Council should report biennially to the General Assembly before February one of each odd-numbered year on the extent to which the institutions are cooperatively achieving the recommendations made herein with respect to institutional management.

Finally, the Council commends the State Council of Higher Education for the studies it has been conducting which, if used by the institutions of higher education, can be of inestimable value in planning and developing their programs through the next decade.

The evaluation of tuition and fees and the related costs cannot be divorced from the need for sound management which, when properly implemented, will assure that neither the student nor the taxpayer is bearing more than his fair share of the cost of higher education.

CONCLUSION

The Council earnestly believes that, if these recommendations are carried out by the State and the educational institutions concerned, a more rational and equitable pattern of tuition and fees will result.

We desire to thank the members of the Committee for the time and effort given by them in carefully and thoroughly studying this crucial problem. We also express our appreciation to the many individuals, officials and organizations who afforded the Committee the benefit of their experience, research and suggestions.

Bills and resolutions to carry out the recommendations made herein are attached.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT C. FITZGERALD, *Chairman*

ARTHUR H. RICHARDSON, *Vice-Chairman*

M. CALDWELL BUTLER

RUSSELL M. CARNEAL

C. W. CLEATON

HENRY E. HOWELL, JR.

EDWARD E. LANE

LEWIS A. McMURRAN, JR.

WILLARD J. MOODY

GARNETT S. MOORE

SAM E. POPE

JAMES M. THOMSON

JAMES C. TURK

EDWARD E. WILLEY

A B I L L

To amend the Code of Virginia by adding in Title 23 a chapter numbered 4.1, containing sections numbered 23-38.11 through 23-38.19, creating the Virginia Scholarship and Grant Commission; assigning powers and duties thereto; and to appropriate funds.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia be amended by adding in Title 23 a chapter numbered 4.1, containing sections numbered 23-38.11 through 23-38.19, as follows:

Chapter 4.1

Virginia Scholarship and Grant Commission

§ 23-38.11. There is hereby created the Virginia Scholarship and Grant Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission. The Commission shall be composed of seven members from the State at large, appointed by the Governor as follows: of the members first appointed, two shall be appointed for terms of two years, two for terms of three years, and three for terms of four years; subsequent appointments shall be for terms of four years, except appointments to fill vacancies, which shall be for the unexpired terms. No member shall be eligible to serve more than two successive four-year terms. Members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be paid their necessary expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. The Commission shall annually elect its own Chairman from among its membership.

§ 23-38.12. The Commission is authorized, subject to the provisions of Chapter 10 of Title 2.1 of the Code of Virginia, to employ a director and such other staff members as it may deem necessary, and is further authorized to accept and expend gifts and donations from public and private sources to enable it better to carry out its programs and objectives.

§ 23-38.13. The Commission shall develop and administer a Statewide program of financial aid to undergraduate students at the institutions of higher education in Virginia. Such aid shall be made in the form of grants or scholarships to students who wish to enroll, or are enrolled, at any accredited degree-granting institution of higher education in Virginia, whether public or private, excepting those institutions whose primary purpose is religious or theological education. Only students who are bona fide residents of Virginia as defined by § 23-7 shall be eligible to receive such scholarships or grants. Awards shall be made for one year, but may be renewed annually by the Commission for no more than three subsequent years of study in an undergraduate degree program. The initial awards shall be made to students for the 1973-74 academic year.

§ 23-38.14. (a) The Commission shall promulgate rules and regulations covering applications for scholarships and grants, and shall determine and publish annually the criteria upon which such awards will be based. Such criteria shall be applied on a Statewide basis, without regard to the geographic area of the State in which the applicant resides or to the institution at which he has chosen to enroll, and shall include a consideration of the applicant's academic ability and financial need, and the cost of attendance at the institution of his choice

(b) The Commission may by regulation require applicants to furnish such reasonable evidence of academic ability and financial need as is deemed necessary to facilitate a determination thereof.

(c) The rules and regulations of the Commission and the annually published criteria for making awards shall be distributed to each accredited degree-granting institution of higher education and secondary school in the State.

§ 23-38.15. (a) The Commission shall determine the amount of scholarship or grant to be awarded to each qualified applicant in accordance with the criteria established under subsection (a) of § 23-38.14, but no award shall exceed one thousand dollars per fulltime academic year.

(b) The amount awarded to each applicant shall be deposited by the Commission, to the account of the applicant, with the Treasurer or other fiscal officer at the approved institution of the applicant's choice, to be drawn upon for payment of charges for tuition, fees, room, board or other educational expenditures approved by the Commission.

§ 23-38.16. In planning the distribution of awards of scholarships or grants for an academic year, the Commission shall project the average award to be one-half of the maximum award allowable under § 23-38.15.

§ 23-38.17. The Commission shall publish annually a list of educational institutions approved for the enrollment of students receiving scholarships or grants pursuant to this chapter. Such list shall be distributed to each accredited secondary school in the State.

§ 23-38.18. Not less than thirty days before the convening of each regular session of the General Assembly held in an even-numbered year, the Commission shall make a report to the Governor and the General Assembly setting forth the number and amount of grants or scholarships awarded, the criteria used in making awards, information on the academic progress of students aided by the Commission, and such other matters as the Commission deems relevant.

§ 23-38.19. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be deemed to limit the authority of any other agency of the State to administer existing programs of financial aid to students as provided by law.

2. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the State treasury the sum of three million dollars to be awarded in scholarships or grants pursuant to this chapter.

3. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the State treasury the sum of one hundred seventy thousand dollars for the 1972-74 biennium, to be expended by the Commission for operating costs in administering this program.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. —

Directing the governing bodies of State-controlled institutions of higher education to adopt the recommendations of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council's study of tuition and fee charges.

Whereas, the Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council relating to tuition and fee charges at the State-controlled institutions of higher education indicates that certain inequities exist in the present structure of such charges; and

Whereas, such Report recommends several measures to place such charges on a more rational basis, including the adoption by the boards of visitors of a system of establishing such charges as a fixed proportion of instructional costs, and including also the continued analysis by such institutions of management practices to hold such costs to the lowest possible level; and

Whereas, it is appropriate that the sense of the General Assembly in regard to such recommendations be communicated to the institutions in order that they may act accordingly; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia, the Senate concurring, That the governing bodies of the State-controlled colleges and universities are directed to act favorably and expeditiously upon the recommendations in the Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council on Tuition and Fee Charges; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates is directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the governing body of each such institution.

Appendix B

TUITION AND FEES, AND OTHER COSTS, FOR NINE-MONTHS SESSION

T&F = Tuition & Fees R&B = Room & Board Tot = Total

	1951-52			1968-69			1969-70			1970-71			% Incr. 1951- 1970
	T&F	R&B	Tot	T&F	R&B	Tot	T&F	R&B	Tot	T&F	R&B	Tot	
Bridgewater	390	390	780	1350	750	2100	1425	775	2200	1600	775	2375	205%
Emory & Henry	345	380	725	1050	750	1800	1110	795	1905	1200	900	2100	190
Hampden-Syd.	420	430	850	1500	750	2250	1800	700	2500	1800	750	2550	200
Hollins	700	800	1500	2100	1100	3200	2250	1100	3350	2350	1000	3350	123
Lynchburg	402	270	672	1400	800	2200	1450	900	2350	1550	1050	2600	287
Mary Baldwin	840	560	1400	1850	1072	2922	2100	1025	3125	2300	1026	3326	138
Rand-Macon	520	480	1000	1614	736	2360	1800	775	2575	1900	775	2675	168
R. M. W. C.	660	590	1250	1900	1200	3100	1900	1225	3125	2150	1275	3425	174
U. of Richmond	330	490	820	1000	775	1775	1150	800	1950	1200	950	2150	162
Roanoke	384	460	844	1500	850	2350	1700	900	2600	1700	900	2600	208
Sweet Briar	700	800	1500	2200	900	3100	2470	930	3400	2670	930	3600	140
Wash. & Lee	470	595	1065	1800	875	2675	1900	875	2775	2000	925	2925	175
Longwood	180	375	555	400	745	1145	401	799	1200	544	830	1374	148
Madison	198	357	555	544	545	1089	580	740	1320	616	964	1580	185
M. Washington	180	452	632	627	708	1335	627	783	1410	685	783	1468	132
Old Dominion				400		400	400		400	470	1160	1630	
Norfolk State				400		400	400		400	420	810	1230	
Radford	165	360	525	345	831	1176	360	855	1215	366	1005	1371	161
Univ. of Va.	225	720	945	452	1006	1458	509	921	1430	532	930	1462	55
VCU (R.P.I.)	200	520	720	424	824	1248	400	820	1220	430	875	1305	81
V. M. I.	140	575	715	545	600	1145	615	615	1230	690	615	1305	83
V. P. I.	180	450	630	495	768	1263	495	846	1341	561	825	1386	120
Va. State	210	362	572	334	562	896	534	568	1102	690	550	1240	117
Wm. & Mary	260	600	860	500	845	1345	528	845	1373	660	870	1530	78
Christopher Newport (W&M)				350		350	350		350	400		400	
Clinch Valley (UVa.)				340		340	350		350	370		370	
George Mason										590		590	
Richard Bland (W&M)				370		370	370		370	400		400	
Community 2-Yr. Colleges				135		135	135		135	180		180	

NOTES: 1. T&F figures for State-supported colleges are for students whose home residences are in the State. Additional tuition is charged to students from outside the State, ranging from \$60 at Clinch Valley, \$300 at Radford, \$510 at V.P.I. to \$675 at University of Virginia (College of Arts and Sciences; undergraduates), and \$934 at William and Mary and \$1,000 at V.M.I. 2. R&B figures above are the average when charges are scaled.

COMPARISON WITH SEVERAL OUT-OF-STATE PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Tuition & Fees (T&F) ONLY; for last year's (1969-70) session.

Princeton Univ.	\$2350	Rice Univ.	\$1800
Johns Hopkins Univ.	2250	Tufts Univ.	2475
Lafayette College	2050	Emory Univ.	1980
Brown Univ.	2300	Williams College	2000
Stanford Univ.	2145	Univ. of Md. (State Inst.)	506

