

Bridging the University of California's Educational Benefits Gap:

A Comparative Study of Employee Educational Benefits Offerings in Higher Education

Sue Anderson (Vice-Chair), *University of California, Riverside*

Stephanie Coghlan, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Deborah Ellis, *University of California, Davis*

Brian Gresham (Chair), *University of California, Merced*

Kathryn Jackson, *University of California, San Francisco*

Richard LaClair-Zoehrer, *University of California, San Diego*

Gary Lowe, *University of California, Merced*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background.....	3
Why Educational Benefits Matter.....	5
Implementation of the Current Reduced Fee Enrollment Program	7
Recommendations for the Current Reduced Fee Enrollment Program	9
Expansion of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Program.....	11
RFEP for Spouses, Partners & Dependents: Closing the Gap Between CSU and UC Employees	11
National Trends on RFEP for Spouses, Partners or Dependents.....	13
<i>Table 1: ERFEP – UC Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Table 2: ERFEP – UC All-University Comparison Set</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Table 3: ERFEP - Comparator Set Summary.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Recommendations for RFEP Expansion for Spouses, Partners & Dependents	16
Tuition Reimbursement Program	17
<i>Table 4: Tuition Reimbursement – UC Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Table 5: Tuition Reimbursement – UC All-University Comparison Set</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Table 6: Tuition Reimbursement - Comparator Set Summary.....</i>	<i>19</i>
Recommendations for Tuition Reimbursement Program.....	19
Conclusion.....	21
Appendix	23
<i>Table 7: RFEP Survey Data.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Table 8: ERFEP – APLU Set</i>	<i>25</i>

Executive Summary

This report builds upon the work of the white paper issued by the 2007 – 08 Council of University of California Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) delegation, “*A Review of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy: Resolving Contradictions and Redefining the Program for the 21st Century.*” The conclusion reached in the previous work was that over the last several decades, in the absence of clear administrative direction, the University of California’s (UC) existing Reduced Fee Enrollment Program (RFEP) benefit has lost both utility and efficacy as the lack of clarity regarding the current RFEP benefit has the potential to result in significant benefit variance across locations.¹

The primary focus of this paper was to provide a substantive analysis of current data in order to clearly ascertain the current state of educational benefits provided to university employees, both within and outside the UC system. This paper focused on the following three educational benefits:

- **Implementation of the current UC RFEP benefit**

CUCSA analyzed this item via direct, survey-based, examination of local policies for implementation of the UC’s current RFEP benefit.

- **Potential provision of an Expanded Reduced Fee Enrollment Program (ERFEP) that provides RFEP equivalent benefits to the spouses, partners and dependents of UC employees**

CUCSA analyzed this item via comprehensive analysis of peer institutions that offer RFEP equivalent benefits to spouses, partners and dependents.

- **Potential provision of a tuition reimbursement program for UC employees to supplement and enhance existing RFEP benefits**

CUCSA analyzed this item via comprehensive analysis of peer institutions that offer tuition reimbursement benefits for university employees.

In each of these areas, CUCSA has provided summary analysis of the current benefit state, as well as substantive recommendations focused on improving educational benefit access and consistency for UC employees.²

¹ Council of University of California Staff Assemblies, “*A Review of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy: Resolving Contradictions and Redefining the Program for the 21st Century*”; available from http://www.ucop.edu/cucsa/documents/reduced_fee_enroll_policy_wrkgrp_rpt_07-08.pdf

² Though CUCSA’s core mission is to provide a vehicle for collaborative cooperation for policy-represented UC employees, CUCSA understands the issue of educational benefits is one in which the academic employees of the university are interested as well. As such, the term “employees” can generally be understood to include all classifications of UC employees – faculty, staff and administrators.

In broad terms, the research conducted by this workgroup confirmed that the administration as the current RFEP benefit does indeed vary significantly across locations, resulting in substantial differences in the provision of RFEP benefits by location.

Furthermore, the existing RFEP benefits offered by UC are of a much narrower scope than the majority of comparable institutions – including the California State University system. An examination of RFEP equivalent benefits offered by three sets of comparator institutions demonstrated that UC continues to lag significantly behind not only the CSU system, in terms of the scope of RFEP equivalent benefits, but also the majority of peer institutions that UC uses as the basis for a wide range of comparisons.

In order to close the gap between UC and its peer institutions, in terms of educational benefits provided to its faculty and staff, CUCSA recommends the following actions:

- Update the current RFEP guidelines to provide clear administrative direction to the campuses in order to increase accessibility to, and standardize implementation of, the existing RFEP benefit.
- Form a system-wide task force, composed of faculty, staff and administration, to begin the development of an implementation framework for an expansion of RFEP benefits to spouses, partners and dependents.
- Explore the creation of a tuition reimbursement program to allow UC faculty and staff to pursue educational opportunities not offered at UC locations within their geographic region.

Background

The Reduced Fee Enrollment Program was established in 1953 as a way to provide educational access for University of California staff on a reduced fee basis. While there has not been a thorough documentation of the revision history of the RFEP, the current language, approved by The Regents in 2008, states the following:

POLICY ON REDUCED FEE ENROLLMENT FOR UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES

Approved July 17, 1981;

Amended January 19, 1990, September 22, 2005 and November 2008

- 1. Employees who desire to register as students under rules established by the President are permitted to enroll in regular session courses not to exceed nine units or three courses per quarter, whichever is greater, upon payment of one-third of the University Registration Fee and one-third of the Educational Fee;*
- 2. Employees so registered are ineligible for services provided to students (such as the Counseling Center, recreational facilities, or the Student Health Services).*
- 3. Former University employees who have retired within four months of the date of separation from University service and who are annuitants of a retirement system to which the University contributes remain eligible for the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy for University Employees subject to all of the limitations applicable to employees.*
- 4. The President is authorized to approve reduced fee enrollment exceptions for up to twelve units or four regular session University courses per quarter, whichever is greater, for selected nursing employees. The President is authorized to delegate to Chancellors the authority to approve similar exceptions.³*

In the 2008 CUCSA white paper, “A Review of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy: Resolving Contradictions and Redefining the Program for the 21st Century,” CUCSA provided historical context for the RFEP, beginning with the implementation of the program in 1953, continuing through present day, and noted the inconsistencies that have arisen over the 56 years the program has been in place.⁴ Primary among the programmatic inconsistencies were:

- Fee Calculation: Some staff reported paying 1/3 of registration fees only, while other staff reported paying 1/3 of registration fees plus additional student fees (e.g. recreation fees, or sports complex fees).

³ The Regents of the University of California, “Policy on Reduced Fee Enrollment for University Employee”; available from <http://www.ucop.edu/ucal/regents/policies/6145.html>

⁴ Council of University of California Staff Assemblies, “A Review of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy: Resolving Contradictions and Redefining the Program for the 21st Century”; available from http://www.ucop.edu/cucsa/documents/reduced_fee_enroll_policy_wrkgrp_rpt_07-08.pdf

- Facility Access: Among staff reporting to have paid some portion of student fees, in addition to regular registration fees, there were inconsistencies related to facility access for those facilities supported by student fees.
- Admission Policies: Some staff seeking access to undergraduate education programs reported that standard competitive admission policies were applied to those staff who sought access to the RFEP, while other staff seeking access to undergraduate programs reported no such admission requirement.
- Graduate Study: Many staff reported being informed that the RFEP was not applicable to graduate study programs, while other staff have reported no such restriction. Additionally, many staff reported that the graduate study programs to which they considered applying require full-time enrollments for all students in the program which, based on the timing of the courses offered, frequently precluded staff from being able to enroll at a full-time equivalent.
- Professional Programs: While staff have largely been excluded from utilizing the RFEP for graduate professional programs (e.g. Masters of Business Administration programs), some staff have been admitted to such programs and allowed to utilize the RFEP.⁵

The 2008 CUCSA white paper contained a number of suggestions related to each of the aforementioned items and these suggestions have largely been reincorporated into the “Recommendations” section of this paper. This report expands upon the previous work in three ways:

- a thorough examination of existing RFEP implementation policies at each of the campuses, medical centers, the Office of the President, and the lab,
- suggests ways in which the RFEP benefit might be expanded by including spouses, partners, and dependents of staff, and
- proposes a new benefit, tuition reimbursement, be considered as part of the total benefit package offered to staff.

⁵ It is noteworthy that the most recent revision to the Staff Personnel Policies, Item 51, is itself inconsistent with the most recent Regental language related to the RFEP; available from http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/policies_employee_labor_relations/personnel_policies/spp51.html

Why Educational Benefits Matter

Before proceeding to analysis of the specific educational benefits programs under examination, it is critical to consider the question of why educational benefits programs are important and how they align with the strategic institutional objectives of UC. CUCSA believes that bridging the educational benefits gap will be critical if UC is to achieve its institutional goals of workforce renewal and talent management.

The most recent UC 10 year workforce profile comparison continues to demonstrate the aging of the UC workforce, with the percentage of employees over the age of 50 rising from 19% to 28%, and the percentage of employees under the age of 40 decreasing from 51% to 39%.⁶ In the most recent single year workforce profile, the percentage of employees over 50 had risen yet again, to 31% of the total workforce.⁷ Effectively-structured educational benefits, whereby the benefit incentives are aligned with the employer's interests (in this case, presenting UC as an attractive career option, through the delivery of a competitive educational benefits package, for potential employees under 40), can be an effective tool in addressing the impending wave of UC retirees.

Beyond addressing the aging of UC's workforce, educational benefits are an important component in retaining and developing talented employees. Though an overwhelming number of academic studies on the issue of tuition benefits have concluded that such benefits are effective in attracting and retaining better quality employees, one of the more recent studies, by Dr. Peter Cappelli of The Wharton School, concludes that educational benefits not only attract higher-quality talent but that the provision of such benefits is itself a mechanism for the identification of high potential employees, stating:

*...poorer-quality applicants who lack the ability, discipline or motivation to succeed in post-secondary education will see no advantage from taking jobs with such a benefit...and unlike most other employee benefits, employees must share in the costs of [educational benefits] through an investment of their time and effort, typically outside of work hours, as well as some of the financial costs (few plans pay the entire cost of tuition, fees, books, etc). So the usual requirement of signaling models, that there be a "separating equilibrium" whereby it is easier or more desirable for high ability applicants to signal their ability, seems available [with educational benefits programs]...*⁸

In terms of the value of educational benefits in not only attracting, but retaining such employees, Capelli finds:

⁶ University of California Office of the President, Office of Human Resources and Benefits "Workforce Profile: 1990 to 2000"; available from http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/workforce_profile_1990_2000.pdf

⁷ University of California Office of the President, Human Resources and Benefits, "Workforce Profile: 2004"; available from http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/workforce_profile_2004.pdf

⁸ Cappelli, Peter. 2004. "Why Do Employers Pay for College?" Journal of Econometrics. 121, no. 1: 213.

*...the results [of the analysis of educational benefits] appear more consistent with the view that workers who use tuition assistance have productivity that is above market levels... Turnover is lower... and that result seems consistent with the view that workers stay with firms longer in order to make full use of [educational benefits] plans. The fact that turnover is lower helps the employer pay for tuition benefits by earning a margin longer. Lower turnover in itself is a source of cost savings for employers by reducing search and hiring costs..*⁹

In support of Capelli's analysis, even more recent research on the retention effects of educational benefits programs, published in 2007, found that educational benefits programs can reduce initial five-year employee attrition rates by up to 50%.¹⁰

It is important to note that it appears the majority of total compensation studies conducted by UC, or commissioned by UC, appear to ignore the value of educational benefits as a part of total compensation.¹¹ Given that primary competitors for UC employees are other regional higher-education institutions, the findings of this workgroup - that educational benefits offerings at UC considerably lag its peer institutions - would appear to indicate that UC's total compensation analysis might overstate its competitive position relative to peer institutions.

Additionally, recent research conducted by Dr. James Philpot, comparing educational benefits values between public and private institutions of varying sizes, finds that "private institutions generally provide more generous [educational] benefits than public institutions."¹² As the primary focus of CUCSA's study of educational benefits was the *provision* of such benefits, not the *value* of such benefits, Dr. Philpot's findings would appear to indicate that UC's total compensation package might significantly trail private institutions, particularly for younger employees, those for whom educational benefits are most likely to be of high importance.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Flaherty, Colleen N. *The Effect of Tuition Reimbursement on Turnover A Case Study Analysis*. Cambridge, Mass: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2007.

¹¹ Analysis of the value of educational benefits does not explicitly appear as part of total compensation analysis in studies undertaken by either the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) or the Mercer Human Resources Consulting Group - the sources of the most recent comprehensive examinations of UC compensation.

¹² Philpot, James. *Determinants of Tuition Benefits as Faculty Compensation*. Excerpt from discussion during the Southwestern Finance Association Program, February 26, 2009.

Implementation of the Current Reduced Fee Enrollment Program

As previously-noted, the work of the 2007-08 CUCSA delegation revealed several potential inconsistencies in the implementation of the current RFEP benefit. CUCSA understood that implementation data regarding the RFEP had not been collected in a formal manner and, therefore, CUCSA's examination of the implementation of the current RFEP benefit began with a survey of the locations in order to confirm that inconsistencies in the application of the policy do indeed exist.

A 22 item survey was created and disseminated electronically to the Chief Human Resources Officers group. Of the 17 locations surveyed, 13 responded resulting in a 76% participation rate. The results of the survey confirmed that the policy is not consistently applied in the areas previously noted in the 2008 CUCSA white paper. These areas include:

- Fee calculation
- Admission policies
- Graduate studies
- Professional programs

Survey results are detailed below. A complete summary of the survey results can be found in the appendix.

General highlights of the results include:

- 85% administer the program out of Human Resources with the exception of University Extension courses. University Extension courses are administered by the Extension.
- 85% of the locations **do not** track the retention rate of individuals who participate in the program.
- 92% of the locations **do not** track the career advancement of individuals who participate in the program.

Specific survey results:

Application of policy for Undergraduate Programs

- 10 of 13 locations (77%) reported that a two-thirds reduction in educational and registration fees is applied.
- 1 of 13 locations (8%) reported that they waive all student fees.
- 3 of 13 locations (23%) did not respond to this item.

Application of policy for Graduate Programs

- 9 of 13 locations (69%) reported that a two-thirds reduction in educational fees and registration fees is applied.
- 1 of 13 locations (8%) reported that only educational fees are reduced by two-thirds
- 1 of 13 locations (8%) reported that they waive all student fees.
- 3 of 13 locations (23%) either did not have any applicants or did not respond to this item.

Application of policy for Professional Schools

- 3 of 13 locations (23%) reported that fee reductions were not applied to professional programs.
- 4 of 13 locations (31%) reported that both educational and registration fees are reduced by two-thirds
- 1 of 13 locations (8%) reported that only registration fees are reduced by two-thirds

Application of policy for Summer Session

- 2 of 13 locations (16%) reported that a two-thirds reduction in educational fees and registration fees is applied.
- 4 of 13 locations (31%) reported that fee reductions were not applied to summer session.
- 3 of 13 locations (23%) utilize a fee reduction formula other than the two-thirds
- 4 of 13 locations (31%) did not respond or the item was not applicable

Application of policy for University Extension

- 8 of 13 locations (62%) reported that a fee reduction is offered for Extension courses.
- 5 of 13 locations (38%) reported that a fee reduction is not offered for Extension courses.
- The majority of the reductions ranged from 10% - 50%.

Required to meet University's admission requirements for Undergraduate Programs

- 11 of 13 locations (85%) require staff to meet the University's admission requirements.
- 2 of 13 locations (15%) do not require staff to meet the University's admission requirements.

Required to meet University's admission requirements for Graduate Programs

- 12 of 13 locations (92%) require staff to meet the University's admission requirements.
- 1 of 13 locations (8%) do not require staff to meet the University's admission requirements.

Requirement that graduate students be full-time waived for staff using the fee reduction program.

- 7 of 13 locations (54%) waive the full time requirement.
- 6 of 13 locations (46%) were unable to respond to this item.

Requirement that professional school students be full-time waived for staff using the fee reduction program.

- 6 of 13 locations (46%) waive the full time requirement.
- 5 of 13 locations (38%) were unable to respond to this item.
- 2 of 13 locations (16%) do not waive the requirement

In summary, the survey data has confirmed that the application of the RFEP is not applied consistently across UC locations. Variations in the implementation of the policy are, in all likelihood, a result of the policy itself being silent in many of the areas of inconsistencies in the policy and lack of clarity in the policy language.

Recommendations for the Current Reduced Fee Enrollment Program

CUCSA's primary recommendation regarding the current RFEP is that UCOP initiate the formation of a system-wide working group tasked with developing revisions to Policy 51, Reduced Fee Enrollment. Such a working group should include staff, faculty and administrative representation, as well as include representatives from each UC location.

Based on the data from the CUCSA survey of the RFEP implementation throughout the system, there are several areas of inconsistency that should be addressed by the working group. Key questions to be address by the working group include:

- *Should staff member participating in the RFEP be treated as students in the traditional sense?*

CUCSA recommends that staff participating in the RFEP be treated as a special class of student. Exceptions to the applicability of admission requirements, payment of student fees, and full-time enrollment in graduate and professional programs for this special student classification should be made.

- *Should all campuses, medical center, Office of the President and the lab provide the same level of RFEP benefit?*

CUCSA recommends that the revised policy be applied equitably across all facets of the organization. Special consideration will need to be given for those locations that do not have proximate access to a UC instructional location.

- *Should the RFEP be applied uniformly across undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs?*

CUCSA recommends that the revised policy provide for uniform application of the fee reduction amount with the exception of self-supporting programs for which a fee reduction may not be possible. The excepted programs should be clearly identified and updated at regular intervals.

- *How can the RFEP be better communicated to staff?*

CUCSA recommends that promotion of this benefit be widespread in all Benefits communications. A central web-based informational page devoted to the RFEP should be created and hosted on UCOP's Benefits website.

- *How can the administration of the policy be supported and streamlined?*

One standard, online RFEP application should be developed for use by the entire system. Regular informational meetings should be held for policy administrators to share best practices and discuss issues of concern.

- *How can the benefits of the RFEP be communicated to senior administrators?*

Tools should be developed to track RFEP participation and retention rates.

It is not intended that this list of considerations be comprehensive. CUCSA would welcome the opportunity to participate in such a working group should such a group be convened to study and clarify the current RFEP benefit.

Expansion of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Program

Beyond the implementation issues associated with the existing UC RFEP, CUCSA strongly recommends that UC begin developing the framework that would allow for the expansion of the current RFEP. The main focus of such an expansion would be to allow for the expansion of RFEP benefits to spouses, partners and dependents in order to deliver similar educational benefits to not only UC's chosen comparator institutions but also the majority of higher-education institutions across the nation – including our counterparts in the California State University system. An additional important educational benefit would be the creation of a tuition reimbursement program that would allow UC employees to pursue educational opportunities from institutions outside the UC system on a reduced cost basis.

RFEP for Spouses, Partners & Dependents: Closing the Gap Between CSU and UC Employees

An expansion of the RFEP benefit would represent a significant step toward closing the educational benefits gap between University of California staff and their staff counterparts in the California State University (CSU) system. CSU employees have, for years, enjoyed a significantly greater educational benefit than UC employees, as CSU employees have the ability to transfer their educational benefit to spouses or dependents when they are not utilizing their educational benefit for themselves.

An example of the CSU equivalent of the RFEP, is as follows:¹³

Fee Waiver

Fee waiver (or tuition assistance) entitles eligible Chancellor's Office employees (and in some cases their spouse, domestic partner or dependent child) to enroll in courses at any CSU campus and have fees waived or reduced to \$1. Here is a description of the fee waiver program:

Employees

- *Eligible Chancellor's Office employees can enroll in up to two courses or six units (whichever is greater) per term at any CSU campus.*
- *Certain fees will be fully waived (e.g., application fee, ID card fee, instructionally related activity fee, health services fee, state university fee).*
- *Other fees will be reduced to \$1 (e.g., student body association fee, student body center fee and health facilities fee).*

¹³ California State University, Chancellor's Office, Human Resource Services, "Fee Waiver"; available from http://www.calstate.edu/hrs/benefits/programs/programs_fee_waiver.shtml

All employees are covered by Executive Order 712. Represented employees are covered by applicable collective bargaining agreement provisions. When Executive Order 712 is in conflict with a collective bargaining agreement, the latter shall govern[...]

Courses taken by [Chancellor's Office] employees must be approved by the employee's supervisor and HR Services as job-related (directly related to the requirements of the employee's current position), or as part of an individual career development plan approved by the supervisor and HR Services[...]

Dependents

[Chancellor's Office] employees eligible for the CSU fee waiver program may transfer their existing fee-waiver benefit of two courses or six units, whichever is greater, per term, to a spouse, domestic partner or dependent child.

The following general conditions apply for Dependent Fee Waiver:

- Dependent child is defined as child or stepchild under age 23 who has never been married.*
- The dependent must be enrolled in a degree or teaching credential program in the CSU, and fee-waiver course(s) must be taken for credit toward completion of that degree or teaching credential.*
- Fee-waiver eligibility may be transferred to only one dependent at a time, regardless of whether that individual uses the full entitlement of two courses or six units.*
- Eligible dependents may enroll using fee waiver at any CSU campus. The campus administration determines if space is available in the selected courses.*
- The dependent must maintain normal academic standards to continue participating in the fee-waiver program.*

Though this example comes from the California State University's Office of the Chancellor, it is representative of similar language describing the same policy that applies to all 47,000 employees at each of the CSU system's 23 campuses.

It is clear that the CSU system has a demonstrated commitment to educational access and opportunity for their staff, and has developed an implementation framework that allows them to deliver educational benefits in a sustainable manner. It is somewhat anachronistic then that UC, as the highest-tier of institutions created under the Master Plan, continues to deliver a much narrower set of educational benefits for its employees, than its other state-funded partners within California's higher-education system.

National Trends on RFEP for Spouses, Partners or Dependents

In order to provide informed perspective on the current state of expanded RFEP (ERFEP) equivalent benefits nationally, an analysis of ERFEP benefits was undertaken using three sets of comparator institutions - two comparator sets selected and utilized by UC for various compensation and benefits comparisons (the “Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set” of institutions and the “All-University” set of institutions) with the third set composed of the members of the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU).¹⁴ The results of this analysis are summarized in the tables below.

Table 1: ERFEP – UC Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set

Institution	ERFEP Benefit
Harvard University	No
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes
Stanford University	Yes
State University of New York, Buffalo	No
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Yes
University of Michigan	Yes
University of Virginia	Yes
Yale University	Yes
Percentage of Institutions Offering ERFEP Benefit:	
	75%

Table 2: ERFEP – UC All-University Comparison Set

Institution¹⁵	ERFEP Benefit
Brown University	Yes
California Institute of Technology	No
Columbia University	Yes
Cornell University	Yes
Harvard University	No
Johns Hopkins University	Yes
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes

¹⁴ ERFEP equivalence is defined to be any institutional program that provides for reduced fee enrollment for spouses, partners or dependents of university staff or faculty.

¹⁵ The 26 university set is reduced to 23 institutions here, allowing for the redundancy in inclusion of two university systems (Colorado and Minnesota) where representative institutions (University of Colorado, Boulder and University of Minnesota, Duluth as well as University of Minnesota Twin Cities) are already included. The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities has also been omitted as University of Minnesota policies are covered by University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Northwestern University	Yes
Stanford University	Yes
State University of New York, Buffalo	No
State University of New York, Stony Brook	No
University of Chicago	Yes
University of Colorado, Boulder	No ¹⁶
University of Illinois, Chicago	Yes
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Yes
University of Michigan	Yes
University of Minnesota, Duluth	No
University of Pennsylvania	Yes
University of Texas, Austin	No
University of Virginia	Yes
University of Washington	No
University of Wisconsin, Madison	No
Yale University	Yes
Percentage of Institutions Offering ERFEP Benefit: 61%	

The analysis of the member institutions of the APLU is too lengthy for summary within the main body of this document, as analysis of the APLU institution comparator set was completed with two subsets of the APLU membership rosters, one totaling 296 institutions and one totaling 179 institutions with positive ERFEP results of 61% and 67% respectively.¹⁷ A complete summary of APLU institutional analysis is found in the appendices. Overall, the results of the analysis of all three comparator sets are as follows:

Table 3: ERFEP - Comparator Set Summary

Comparator Set Summary	ERFEP Benefit %
UC Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set	75%
UC All-University Comparison Set	61%
APLU Membership Set ¹⁸	64%

¹⁶ University of Colorado, Boulder does not currently have an ERFEP benefit, however, the University of Colorado System launched a pilot ERFEP program in 2008 at University of Colorado, Colorado Springs with the aim of providing an ERFEP benefit to the University of Colorado system in the future.

¹⁷ The discrepancy in institution count for APLU analysis derives from the inclusion or exclusion of the complete set of “system” institutions where the APLU membership list indicates an entire university system as a participating member. In all instances, community colleges were excluded from analysis.

¹⁸ Percentage is the unweighted average of the two sets.

It is important to note that, beyond the fact that the majority of higher-education institutions within the nation offer significantly greater educational benefits for their staff and faculty than does UC (again, including the CSU system), the trend is clearly moving toward an expansion of ERFEP equivalent benefits.

In many states where all or the majority of institutions do not offer ERFEP benefits, such benefits are not offered due to the fact that they are prohibited by state statute. In many of these states, universities provide supplemental educational benefits in the form of widely-available university-funded scholarships for dependents of university employees; had such benefits been included as formal ERFEP equivalent benefits, the positive ERFEP benefits offerings percentages would have increased significantly.

Moreover, in several states where statutes prevent the provision of RFEP/ERFEP benefits, states appear to be making significant progress toward amending their state laws specifically to allow for the provision of expanded educational benefits for their university employees. Most recently, in 2008, West Virginia passed Senate Bill 564 for the express purpose of allowing for ERFEP benefits for state university employees, as the bill's stated intent was to:

...[clarify] eligibility requirements for certain applicants; changing method of calculating limits on waivers of tuition and fees; and exempting tuition and fee waivers granted to higher education employees, spouses and dependents and all tuition and fee waivers authorized by statute from calculation of limits on percentage of tuition and fee waivers granted by state institutions of higher education...An institution may grant fee waivers to its employees, their spouses, and dependents...¹⁹

Finally, it is important to point out that, in nearly all instances where a university was not currently offering an ERFEP equivalent, the issue of educational benefits for spouses and dependents was an item that not only attracted significant attention by the institution's various staff organizations, but was an item that was high on the priority list for faculty welfare committees as well.

It was noted that, in the review of UC's usage of the Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set as well as the All-University set, total UC faculty compensation equity analysis appeared to overlook the issue of ERFEP equivalent programs – a benefit that is not insignificant in UC's ability to attract and retain outstanding faculty. The issue of expansion of the RFEP program to include spouses and dependent may present an opportunity for CUCSA to partner with the system-wide Academic Senate in a collaborative effort to reduce the educational benefits gap between UC and comparable institutions.

¹⁹ Senators Edgell, Plymale, Kessler and Stollings, "Senate Bill 564"; available from http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2008_SESSIONS/RS/BILLS/SB564%20SUB1.htm

Recommendations for RFEP Expansion for Spouses, Partners & Dependents

CUCSA's primary recommendation regarding ERFEP is that UCOP initiate the formation of a system-wide working group tasked with developing an implementation framework for the expansion of the RFEP for spouses, partners and dependents. Such a working group should include staff, faculty and administrative representation, as well as include representatives from each UC location.

While CUCSA is realistic about the likelihood of expanded benefits, of any kind, during this period of unprecedented fiscal instability within California, CUCSA believes that work should be undertaken in the near term to lay the groundwork for a sustainable ERFEP benefit once the budgetary crisis within the state has passed and UC's funding stabilizes.

Through the process of researching ERFEP equivalent programs throughout the nation, it is clear that there exists much variety in the implementation of ERFEP equivalencies. Key questions to be address by the working group include:

- *How many service years, if any, should employees have before they have access to ERFEP benefits? If service years are to be a consideration, should there be a sliding scale, or should full ERFEP benefits be offered at the service year threshold?*

CUCSA recommends that the ERFEP benefit be offered at some minimum service threshold, to prevent potential employees from seeking employment with UC for the sole purpose of providing reduced fee enrollment for spouses, partners and dependents. CUCSA would support a phasing-in of the full RFEP benefit over a period of years beyond the minimum service threshold.

- *At what level will the ERFEP benefit be offered?*

CUCSA recommends that, when fully-realized (allowing for a phased-in maximum benefit period), the ERFEP benefit be the same as the RFEP benefit – a two-thirds fee reduction.

- *To which programs of study will the ERFEP benefit be applicable?*

CUCSA recommends the ERFEP benefit be applicable to all state-supported programs of study.

- *What will the registration process be for spouses, partners and dependents who utilize the RFEP benefit? Will registration be limited to space-available, or will ERFEP-based enrollments register in the same manner as all other students?*

CUCSA recommends ERFEP enrollments be limited to space-available registrations. While such a process would add complexity for ERFEP beneficiaries, such a process

greatly minimizes the real costs to UC, as no ERFEP enrollment would take the place of a non-ERFEP enrollment.

- *Will there be a limit as the number of instances of ERFEP beneficiaries per employee for a given period?*

CUCSA recommends, as in the case of our colleagues in the CSU system, only one instance of the ERFEP benefit be allotted during any academic term.

While the above set of implementation items, and associated recommendations, is not to be considered comprehensive, they do cover much of the basic structure of an ERFEP benefit system. CUCSA would be eager to work with UCOP and/or the recommended working group in continuing to develop an effective framework for ERFEP implementation.

Tuition Reimbursement Program

Having noted that it is critical to the success of UC that it attracts and retains the most qualified candidates for the myriad of staff positions required to conduct the business of the university, the ability to offer a total remuneration package that is competitive and comprehensive is a key component in the “attract and retain” equation. While UC’s benefit package is replete with a variety of products that are valued by its employees and the retirement benefits are superior to many organizations, the benefit package is notable for its omission of a tuition reimbursement provision.

While UC offers multiple degree programs, staff, faculty, and their spouses and dependents often find it necessary to pursue educational programs outside of their local UC campus. Providing a means by which a portion of these educational endeavors can be reimbursed may increase retention and improve morale as cited in two recent studies.

Recent research indicates that the tuition reimbursement benefit is strongly linked to employee retention. In general, tuition reimbursement is seen as voluntary benefit that signals an organization’s willingness to invest in employees and thus creates the perception that the organization is supportive. In a study of 322 employed graduate students conducted by Pattie, et al, employees receiving tuition reimbursement had increased perceptions of organizational support which led to a significant reduction in turnover intentions.²⁰

In another study conducted by Manchester, the effects of a tuition reimbursement benefit on employee retention were analyzed in a non-profit organization.²¹ The analysis found that employees participating in the program were 22% less likely to leave the organization within five years than employees who were not participating. Further analysis of a cross-section of organizations revealed that on average, turnover is reduced by 7.6% in organizations offering tuition reimbursement benefits.

²⁰ Pattie, M., Benson, G. & Baruch, Y. (2006) Tuition Reimbursement, Perceived Organizational Support, and Turnover Intention Among Graduate Business School Students. *Human Resources Development Quarterly*, (17) 423-442.

²¹ Manchester, C. (2008) Using General Training to Retain Employees: Examination of Tuition Reimbursement Programs. Dissertation.

As in the case of the ERFEP benefit analysis, CUCSA examined comparison intuitions in order to accurately assess the current state of staff tuition reimbursement benefits in higher-education. The results of this analysis are summarized in the tables below.

Table 4: Tuition Reimbursement – UC Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set

Institution	Tuition Reimbursement
Harvard University	Yes
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes
Stanford University	Yes
State University of New York, Buffalo	Yes
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Yes
University of Michigan	Yes
University of Virginia	Yes
Yale University	Yes
Percentage of Institutions Offering Tuition Reimbursement:	
	100%

Table 5: Tuition Reimbursement – UC All-University Comparison Set

Institution²²	Tuition Reimbursement
Brown University	Yes
California Institute of Technology	Yes
Columbia University	Yes
Cornell University	Yes
Harvard University	Yes
Johns Hopkins University	Yes
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes
Northwestern University	Yes
Stanford University	Yes
State University of New York, Buffalo	Yes
State University of New York, Stony Brook	Yes
University of Chicago	Yes

²² The 26 university set is reduced to 23 institutions here, allowing for the redundancy in inclusion of two university systems (Colorado and Minnesota) where representative institutions (University of Colorado, Boulder and University of Minnesota, Duluth as well as University of Minnesota Twin Cities) are already included. The University of Minnesota, Twin Cities has also been omitted as University of Minnesota policies are covered by University of Minnesota, Duluth.

University of Colorado, Boulder	No
University of Illinois, Chicago	Yes
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Yes
University of Michigan	Yes
University of Minnesota, Duluth	No
University of Pennsylvania	No
University of Texas, Austin	Yes
University of Virginia	Yes
University of Washington	No
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Yes
Yale University	Yes
Percentage of Institutions Offering Tuition Reimbursement: 83%	

Table 6: Tuition Reimbursement - Comparator Set Summary

Comparator Set Summary	Tuition Reimbursement
UC Comparison Eight Faculty Salary Set	100%
UC All-University Comparison Set	83%
APLU Membership Set ²³	N/A

Recommendations for Tuition Reimbursement Program

CUCSA’s primary recommendation regarding the Tuition Reimbursement Program is that UCOP initiate the formation of a system-wide working group tasked with developing an implementation framework for a Tuition Reimbursement Program. Such a working group should include staff, faculty and administrative representation, as well as include representatives from each UC location.

While CUCSA is realistic about the likelihood of expanded benefits, of any kind, during this period of unprecedented fiscal instability within California, CUCSA believes that work should be undertaken in the near term to lay the groundwork for a sustainable Tuition Reimbursement Program benefit once the budgetary crisis within the state has passed and UC’s funding stabilizes.

²³ This project’s scope did not allow for APLU institution tuition reimbursement program review due to the size of the data set.

Key questions to be address by the working group include:

- *How many service years, if any, should employees have before they have access to tuition reimbursement benefits?*

CUCSA recommends that the tuition reimbursement benefit be offered at some minimum service threshold, in order to discourage individuals from seeking employment with UC solely for educational benefits.

- *At what level will the RFEF benefit be offered?*

CUCSA recommends that the tuition reimbursement benefit be equal in value to the amount of the two-thirds reduction in fees for up to 9 course units per term provided via the existing RFEF benefit.

- *Should employees receiving RFEF benefits be required to maintain minimum academic standards?*

CUCSA recommends that, in order to receive tuition reimbursement, participating employees must provide documentation of acceptable academic progress (CUCSA would recommend a minimum course grade of “B” or higher as the standard) in the form of official grades submitted at the conclusion of the term in order to receive reimbursement.

- *What policy provisions might be employed to retain staff who have utilized the tuition reimbursement program?*

CUCSA recommends that the tuition reimbursement policy include a pay back provision by which a certain percentage of the tuition reimbursement funds be returned if the staff member leaves the organization subsequent to receiving tuition reimbursement benefits but prior to the completion of a minimum additional service period required to obtain the tuition reimbursement benefit at no cost to the employee. It is not intended that this list of considerations be comprehensive. CUCSA would welcome the opportunity to participate in the working group tasked with developing implementation recommendations for a Tuition Reimbursement Program.

Conclusion

CUCSA believes the data clearly and irrefutably demonstrates that UC significantly lags its peer institutions in terms of educational benefits. It is particularly disturbing that UC employees have lesser access to educational benefits than their counterparts within the CSU system. CUCSA believes this benefits gap has, and will continue to be, a not insignificant source of employee turnover, as high-value and high-potential employees leave UC in favor of other higher education institutions that offer much more attractive educational benefits packages. The loss of such employees is both regrettable and preventable, as and CUCSA believes that the adoption of many of the recommendations suggested herein could offer immediate returns as concerns retention of such high-value, high-potential employees.

The first step in reducing to the educational benefits gap should be a review of the current RFEP benefit with the goal of providing a clear, easily-understood and broadly accessible educational benefit for UC employees. The current RFEP language results in inconsistencies, misapplication and denial of educational benefits for UC employees and such errors need not, and should not, persist. In relatively short order, UC would be able to provide the clarity the current policy lacks, thereby delivering to staff the educational benefit originally envisioned by The Regents in 1953.

Next, UC should begin preparing a framework for delivery of RFEP equivalent benefits to the spouses, partners and dependents of UC employees. In the same way that UC is urging California's elected officials to provide equitable retirement funding for UC employees relative to other state employees, CUCSA believes UC employees should have equal access to educational benefits as their CSU counterparts – as both sets of institutions work together to benefit the State of California, representing two-thirds of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. The fact that UC staff, employed in the preeminent branch of the Master Plan for Higher Education, continue to have educational benefits that are far inferior to their colleagues in the CSU system is shameful, and addressing this inequity should be a high priority for UC's senior leadership.

Finally, UC should undertake preliminary planning for the implementation of a formal tuition reimbursement program with consistent guidelines for standardized implementation throughout the system. As the data showed, tuition reimbursement programs are a standard component of educational benefits packages for nearly all of UC's peer institutions and planning and analysis efforts related to the provision of this benefit should be given the highest consideration.

It is important to note that CUCSA is keenly aware of the current fiscal hardships facing the UC system, and believes substantial progress can be made to address the educational benefits inequities present with minimal real cost to UC. At a time where dollar compensation for UC employees is likely to be reduced, despite numerous findings that UC continues to trail the market in terms of dollar compensation, the provision of more a competitive and comprehensive benefits package, particularly via the delivery of benefits with minimal real costs, is ever more important.

Clarifying the current RFEP benefit should result in no significant cost increase, and has the added value of reducing employee dissatisfaction with what might be the most misunderstood UC employee benefit. As regards the expansion of UC's educational benefits offerings, nearly all of CUCSA's recommendations proposed herein were arrived at with an eye toward offering equitable benefits at the lowest possible dollar cost. CUCSA believes the current RFEP benefit, if structured properly, can be extended to spouses, partners and dependents in a manner whereby such enrollments incur only minimal marginal costs. With respect to tuition reimbursement programs, CUCSA has a pragmatic view and does not expect such a program to be enacted until such time as the state's fiscal house returns to order, and the state's investment in higher-education returns to appropriate levels.

As always, CUCSA's approach to the issue of educational benefits is based on a spirit of collaboration between staff and UC's senior leadership, and CUCSA would welcome the continued opportunity to contribute to the discussion of these important issues.

Appendix

Table 7: RFEP Survey Data

Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy Survey

Undergraduate Programs - reductions applied		
Two-thirds reduction in education fees	10	77%
Two-thirds reduction in registration fees	10	77%
Two-thirds reduction in student fees	0	0%
Waiver of all student fees	1	8%
No waiver of student fees	2	15%
No fee reduction applied to any undergraduate programs	0	0%
Other, please describe.	3	23%
Graduate Programs - reductions applied (Other than part-time, self-supporting programs.)		
Two-thirds reduction in education fees	10	77%
Two-thirds reduction in registration fees	9	69%
Two-thirds reduction in student fees	0	0%
Waiver of all student fees	1	8%
No waiver of student fees	2	15%
No fee reduction applied to any graduate programs	0	0%
Other, please describe.	3	23%
Professional Schools - reductions applied		
Two-thirds reduction in education fees	5	38%
Two-thirds reduction in registration fees	4	31%
Two-thirds reduction in student fees	0	0%
Waiver of all student fees	0	0%
No waiver of student fees	2	15%
No fee reduction applied to any professional programs	3	23%
Other, please describe.	7	54%
Summer Session - reductions applied		
Two-thirds reduction in education fees	3	23%
Two-thirds reduction in registration fees	2	15%
Two-thirds reduction in student fees	0	0%
Waiver of all student fees	0	0%
No waiver of student fees	0	0%
No fee reduction applied to any summer session courses	4	31%
Other, please describe.	7	54%

Reduced fees at University Extension

Yes	8	62%
No	5	38%

Amount of fee reduction allowed for University Extension courses.

10%	1	10%
20%	2	20%
30%	0	0%
40%	0	0%
50%	2	20%
Other, please specify	5	50%

Staff are required to meet the University's admission requirements for undergraduate programs.

Yes	11	85%
No	2	15%

Staff are required to meet the University's admission requirements for graduate programs.

Yes	12	92%
No	1	8%

Full-time requirement for graduate students waived for staff using the fee reduction program?

Yes	7	54%
No	6	46%

Full-time requirement for professional school students waived for staff using the fee reduction program?

Yes	6	46%
No	7	54%

Table 8: ERFEP – APLU Set

	ERFEP Benefit ²⁴
ALABAMA	
Alabama A&M University	Yes
Auburn University	Yes
Tuskegee University	Yes
University of Alabama	Yes
University of Alabama, Birmingham	Yes
University of Alabama, Huntsville	Yes
ALASKA	
University of Alaska, Fairbanks	Yes
ARIZONA	
Arizona State University	Yes
Northern Arizona University	Yes
University of Arizona	Yes
ARKANSAS	
Arkansas State University Beebe	Yes
Arkansas State University Heber Springs	Yes
Arkansas State University Searcy	Yes
Arkansas State University Jonesboro	Yes
Arkansas State University Little Rock	Yes
Arkansas State University Mountain Home	Yes
Arkansas State University Newport	Yes
Arkansas State University Paragould	Yes
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	Yes
University of Arkansas, Fort Smith	Yes
University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Yes
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	Yes
University of Arkansas, Monticello	Yes
University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	Yes
CALIFORNIA	
California Maritime Academy	
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Yes
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Yes
California State University, Bakersfield	Yes
California State University, Channel Islands	Yes
California State University, Chico	Yes
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Yes
California State University, East Bay	Yes

²⁴ Shaded rows indicate those institutions not specifically listed in the APLU membership listing, but are included as part of “systems” that are indicated as APLU members.

California State University, Fresno	Yes
California State University, Fullerton	Yes
California State University, Long Beach	Yes
California State University, Los Angeles	Yes
California State University, Monterey Bay	Yes
California State University, Northridge	Yes
California State University, San Marcos	Yes
California State University, Sacramento	Yes
California State University, San Bernardino	Yes
California State University, Stanislaus	Yes
Humboldt State University	Yes
San Diego State University	Yes
San Francisco State University	Yes
San Jose State University	Yes
Sonoma State University	Yes
COLORADO	
Colorado State University	Yes
University of Colorado, Boulder	No
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs	Yes
University of Colorado, Denver	No
CONNECTICUT	
University of Connecticut	Yes
DELAWARE	
Delaware State University	Yes
University of Delaware	Yes
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
University of the District of Columbia	Yes
FLORIDA	
Florida A&M University	Undetermined
Florida, Atlantic University	Undetermined
Florida Gulf Coast University	Undetermined
Florida International University	Yes
New College of Florida	Undetermined
Florida State University	No
University of Central Florida	Undetermined
University of Florida	Undetermined
University of North Florida	Undetermined
University of South Florida	Undetermined
University of West Florida	Undetermined
GEORGIA	
Albany State University	No
Armstrong, Atlantic State University	No

Augusta State University	No
Clayton State University	No
College of Coastal Georgia	No
Columbus State University	No
Dalton State College	No
Fort Valley State University	No
Gainesville State College	No
Georgia College and State University	No
Georgia Gwinnett College	No
Georgia Institute of Technology	No
Georgia Southern University	No
Georgia Southwestern State University	No
Georgia State University	No
Gordon College	No
Kennesaw State University	No
Macon State College	No
Medical College of Georgia	No
Middle Georgia College	No
North Georgia College and State University	No
Savannah State University	No
Southern Polytechnic State University	No
University of Georgia	No
University of West Georgia	No
Valdosta State University	No
GUAM	
University of Guam	Yes
HAWAII	
University of Hawaii	Yes
University of Hawaii, Manoa	Yes
University of Hawaii, Hilo	Yes
University of Hawaii, West Oahu	Yes
IDAHO	
Boise State University	Yes
Idaho State University	Yes
University of Idaho	Yes
ILLINOIS	
Illinois State University	Yes
Northern Illinois University	Yes
Southern Illinois University	Yes
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Yes
University of Illinois	Yes
University of Illinois, Chicago	Yes
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	Yes

INDIANA	
Ball State University	Yes
Indiana University	Yes
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis	Yes
Purdue University	Yes
IOWA	
Iowa State University	
University of Iowa	
KANSAS	
Kansas State University	No
University of Kansas	Yes
Wichita State University	No
KENTUCKY	
Kentucky State University	
University of Kentucky	Yes
University of Louisville	Yes
LOUISIANA	
Grambling State University	Yes
Louisiana State University	No
LSU Shreveport	No
LSU Alexandria	No
LSU Eunice	No
Louisiana Tech University	Yes
McNeese State University	Yes
Nicholls State University	Yes
Northwestern State University	Yes
Southeastern Louisiana University	Yes
Southern University and A&M, Baton Rouge	Yes
Southern University, New Orleans	Yes
Southern University, Shreveport	Yes
University of Louisiana, Lafayette	Yes
University of Louisiana, Monroe	Yes
University of New Orleans	No
MAINE	
University of Maine	Yes
MARYLAND	
United States Naval Academy	
Bowie State University	Yes
Coppin State University	Yes
Frostburg State University	Yes
Salisbury University	Yes
Towson University	Yes

University of Baltimore	Yes
University of Maryland, Baltimore	Yes
University of Maryland, Baltimore County	Yes
University of Maryland, College Park	Yes
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Yes
University of Maryland University College	Yes
	Yes
MASSACHUSETTS	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes
University of Massachusetts	Yes
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Yes
University of Massachusetts, Boston	Yes
MICHIGAN	
Central Michigan University	Yes
Michigan State University	Yes
Michigan Technological University	Yes
Oakland University	Yes
University of Michigan	
Wayne State University	Yes
Western Michigan University	Yes
MINNESOTA	
University of Minnesota	No
University of Minnesota Duluth	No
MISSISSIPPI	
Alcorn State University	Yes
Mississippi State University	Yes
University of Mississippi	Yes
University of Southern Mississippi	Yes
MISSOURI	
Lincoln University	Yes
Missouri University of Science and Technology	Yes
University of Missouri-Columbia	Yes
University of Missouri-Kansas City	Yes
University of Missouri-Rolla	Yes
University of Missouri-St. Louis	Yes
MONTANA	
Montana State University	Yes
University of Montana	Yes
NEBRASKA	
University of Nebraska, Kearney	Yes
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Yes
University of Nebraska, Omaha	Yes

NEVADA	
College of Southern Nevada	Yes
Great Basin College	Yes
Nevada State College	Yes
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Yes
University of Nevada, Reno	Yes
Western Nevada College	Yes
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Granite State College	Yes
Plymouth State University	Yes
Keene State College	Yes
University of New Hampshire	Yes
NEW JERSEY	
Montclair State University	No
New Jersey Institute of Technology	Yes
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	Yes
NEW MEXICO	
New Mexico State University	
University of New Mexico	Yes
	Yes
NEW YORK	
City College of New York, CUNY	No
The City University of New York	No
Cornell University	No
Hunter College, CUNY	No
State University of New York	No
University, Albany, SUNY	No
Binghamton University, SUNY	No
University, Buffalo, SUNY	No
Stony Brook University, SUNY	No
NORTH CAROLINA	
Appalachian State University	No
East Carolina University	No
Elizabeth City State University	No
Fayetteville State University	No
North Carolina A&T State University	No
North Carolina Central University	No
North Carolina School of Science and Math	No
North Carolina State University, Raleigh	No
University of North Carolina, Asheville	No
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Yes
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	No
University of North Carolina, Greensboro	No

University of North Carolina, Pembroke	No
University of North Carolina, Wilmington	No
University of North Carolina School of the Arts	No
Western Carolina University	No
Winston-Salem State University	No
NORTH DAKOTA	
North Dakota State University	
University of North Dakota	Yes
	Yes
OHIO	
Bowling Green State University	Yes
Cleveland State University	Yes
Kent State University	Yes
Miami University	Yes
The Ohio State University	Yes
Ohio University	Yes
University of Akron	Yes
University of Cincinnati	Yes
University of Toledo	Yes
Wright State University	Yes
OKLAHOMA	
Langston University	No
Oklahoma State University	No
University of Oklahoma	No
OREGON	
Eastern Oregon University	Yes
Oregon Institute of Technology	Yes
Oregon State University	Yes
Oregon University System	Yes
Southern Oregon University	Yes
Portland State University	Yes
University of Oregon	Yes
Western Oregon University	Yes
PENNSYLVANIA	
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Yes
The Pennsylvania State University	Yes
Temple University	Yes
University of Pittsburgh	Yes
PUERTO RICO	
University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez	Yes
RHODE ISLAND	
University of Rhode Island	Yes

SOUTH CAROLINA	
Clemson University	No
College of Charleston	No
South Carolina State University	Yes
University of South Carolina	No
SOUTH DAKOTA	
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	No
South Dakota State University	No
University of South Dakota	No
TENNESSEE	
Middle Tennessee State University	Yes
Tennessee State University	Yes
University of Memphis	Yes
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Yes
TEXAS	
Prairie View A&M University	No
Tarleton State University	No
Texas A&M International University	No
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	No
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	No
Texas A&M University-Commerce	No
Texas A&M University-Texarkana	No
Texas A&M University-Central Texas	No
Texas A&M University-San Antonio	No
Texas State University, San Marcos	No
Texas Tech University	No
University of Houston	Undetermined
University of North Texas	Undetermined
University of Texas, Arlington	Yes
University of Texas, Austin	Yes
The University of Texas, San Antonio	No
West Texas A&M University	No
UTAH	
University of Utah	Yes
Utah State University	Yes
VERMONT	
University of Vermont	Yes
VIRGIN ISLANDS	
University of the Virgin Islands	Yes
Virginia	

George Mason University	No
University of Virginia	No
Virginia Commonwealth University	No
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University (Virginia Tech)	No
Virginia State University	No
WASHINGTON	
University of Washington	No
Washington State University	No
WEST VIRGINIA	
West Virginia State University	Yes
West Virginia University	Yes
WISCONSIN	
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	No
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay	No
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse	No
University of Wisconsin-Madison	No
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	No
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	No
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	No
University of Wisconsin-Platteville	No
University of Wisconsin-River Falls	No
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point	No
University of Wisconsin-Stout	No
University of Wisconsin-Superior	No
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater	No
WYOMING	
University of Wyoming	Yes