Higher education is one of the most expensive things in the United States. According to the latest available data, the average cost of attending a four-year public university is now \$29,982, more than triple the amount of 20 years ago. In the same time period, the cost of attending a four-year private university has risen by more than \$12,000, a growth rate of nearly 25%. The cost of college is growing faster than any other form of consumption in the United States. In fact, student loan debt is the single biggest contributor to consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal debt in the United States. According to the Federal Reserve, outstanding student loan debt amounts to a staggering \$1.3 trillion, or roughly \$1.5 trillion when you include the billions in debt owed by people in the "co-signing" program. The cost of college is so high, in fact, that a recent poll found that almost half of all American adults couldn't afford to send their children to a four-year public school if they had to pay full tuition.

This is why I am arguing that the University of Texas at Austin should eliminate student fees and reduce the burden on students. But I have been thinking about the current student fees situation at the University of Texas at Austin (UTA) for the last few weeks, as the result of a recent article in the Austin American-Statesman that reported on the fee increase for fall 2023. I have been thinking about the situation because I have been pondering the possibility of UTA eliminating fees for students and/or reducing the fee increases. I have been pondering this possibility for the last several months, and it's only recently that I have felt the need to do something about it. In the spring of 2021, I attended an informational session on the student fee situation at UTA. I remember being very concerned about the fees that students were paying at the time. The fees were a combination of tuition and fees, and the tuition was very high. Students were paying about \$12,000 a year for tuition and fees. I remember thinking, "Why should I pay such a high tuition when I am not doing anything to earn that money?"

UT Austin has the largest public endowment in the country. In 2010, the Texas Legislature gave the university a \$1.4 billion appropriation for capital improvements. The university also has an endowment fund of about \$1.5 billion. The endowment funds are not tied to tuition or state funding, and are made up of gifts from alumni, friends and others. The university's endowment grew by \$165 million in the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2020, according to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The endowment also is one of the largest in the nation, and in 2020 the university had \$6.9 billion in assets, the largest of any college or university in Texas, according to the U.S. Department of Education.

Given the size of these investments, and the already high cost of tuition, it is clear that UT does not need the additional revenue from student fees. In fact, the same report by the UT System Board of Regents, stated that "UT has already achieved the maximum possible efficiency of its budget." I think the student fee structure is unfair and violates the basic principles of fairness and justice. Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by removing the fee requirement. This would not only lower the cost of attendance, but it would also help to improve student morale.

Now that we've gone through some of the benefits of this potential change, let's look at some of the consequences. The cost of attendance is currently \$12,238. In the short-term, the change would be insignificant. However, the change would be significant over the long-term. If UT were to eliminate the fees, the cost of attendance would drop to \$11,499. If this were to continue over a four-year period, the cost of attendance would drop by \$3,439. If this were to continue for ten years, the cost of attendance would drop by \$8,829. Additionally, student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural sports, but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidize an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students.

The current system is a confusing one for our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for 'student activities' and instead is used for a range of things that benefit the students. For example, students are charged the same fee as staff, and this money is used to fund things like intramural sports, the student bar and the student union. So, a student who is studying physical sciences is paying the same fee as a student who is studying economics, despite the fact that they are both studying at the same university. It is clear that the current student fee system is not working. Eliminating fees will make the cost of attending more transparent and the responsibility clear. Students will be able to see exactly where their fees are going, and they will be more accountable for their fees. The new system is also more efficient, and it will mean that the student fee will be more focused on supporting student activities.

Ultimately, there are several excellent reasons for UT to abolish student fees. The most important reason, I believe, is that it would help to reduce the perception of the student as a consumer of higher education. It would make students more accountable for the quality of the product they receive. Students would not feel entitled to a free ride. A free ride implies that the product they receive is something for which they are entitled, rather than something they pay for. As the cost of education grows, it is increasingly important to convey to students that they are not entitled to anything. When they graduate with a degree, they must take responsibility

for the value of the degree. It is possible that abolishing student fees would actually increase the cost of higher education, at least in the short term. Students would not have an automatic right to tuition waivers. To some extent, they are receiving a free ride. They could easily be forced to pay for their education. But, over the long term, abolishing student fees would make the higher education system more affordable, and it would help to improve the quality of higher education. I am no fan of the Free Market. It is an ideology that is very useful in many circumstances, but it is also very destructive. When it comes to education, it is very destructive. In a free market, the prices of things rise and fall in response to market forces. A lot of people think that this is a good thing, because it allows them to buy whatever they want, when they want it. But, the problem with the free market is that it does not guarantee that anyone will be able to afford what they want. It only guarantees that the price of what they want will rise and fall.

-	
1	It is very expensive to be a student. I think it should be easier for a student to get a loan. But if you want to go to school, you should be able to pay it back. You shouldn't have to go into debt. Being a student is a privilege. If you don't go to college, you'll probably have to work at a minimum-wage job. If you go to college, you will have an amazing life. Being a student is a privilege. If you don't go to college, you'll probably have to work at a minimum-wage job. If you go to college, you'll probably have to work at a minimum-wage job. If you go to college, you'll probably have to work at a minimum-wage job. If you go to college, you'll probably have to work at a minimum-wage job. If you go to college, you will have an amazing life.
2	It is very expensive to be a student. But, it is also very difficult to be a student. Students have to compete with each other, and it can be difficult to break out of your shell, especially when you are still finding your place in the world. Being a student can be stressful. It is stressful because you have to spend a large amount of money and put in a large amount of time. There are classes to take, papers to write, exams to study for, and more. It is also stressful because you are competing with other students for grades. If you are a good student, you may be considered for scholarships. And, if you are a good
3	It is very expensive to be a student. It's expensive to get an education, period, but it is especially expensive to be a student in the United States. Before we begin, let's make one thing clear. I am not talking about the cost of a college education here. College is expensive, no doubt. But I am talking about the cost of a student's education, as in, "I will pay you to study?" Because the cost of college is not the issue. If you are spending more than \$20,000 a year on your education, you're in the top 1% of
4	The cost of higher education in the US is very high. There are many reasons for this. The main reason is that the quality of education is low. The US education system produces mediocre students. There are a number of reasons for this. The main reason is that the US has a large number of students who are not prepared to go to college. The quality of education is also very low because US students are not taught properly. A person who goes to college in the US is likely to be

	taught very poorly. The US education system is also very expensive. There are many reasons for this. The main reason is that the US education system is very expensive. This is due to the fact
5	Higher education is too expensive in the US. But that's not what our higher education leaders tell us. The rhetoric is that our nation's colleges and universities are the engines of economic growth, that the increase in student debt burdens is the best thing to happen to the economy since the Internet, and that we need to double down on higher education spending to achieve the goals of the 21st century. There's only one problem with this narrative: it's completely wrong. In fact, higher education is one of the largest drains on the economy. In fact, the \$1.3 trillion that students and their
6	Higher education is too expensive in the US. But that's not what our higher education leaders tell us. The rhetoric is that our nation's colleges and universities are the engines of economic growth, that the increase in student debt burdens is the best thing to happen to the economy since the Internet, and that we need to double down on higher education spending to achieve the goals of the 21st century. There's only one problem with this narrative: it's completely wrong. In fact, higher education is one of the largest drains on the economy. In fact, the \$1.3 trillion that students and their families are paying in student loans is equivalent to about 15% of the federal budget. In fact, the public investment in higher education is a huge net drain on our economy, with less than half of the money coming back to the U.S. in the form of taxes and private sector returns. In fact, the higher education bubble is the biggest threat to the future of the American economy. Let's look at some of the facts. The biggest problem with higher education is its costs. Higher education is one of the most expensive things in the United States. According to the latest
7	Higher education is too expensive in the US. But that's not what our higher education leaders tell us. The rhetoric is that our nation's colleges and universities are the engines of economic growth, that the increase in student debt burdens is the best thing to happen to the economy since the Internet, and that we need to double down on higher education spending to achieve the goals of the 21st century. There's only one problem with this narrative: it's completely wrong. In fact, higher education is one of the largest drains on the economy. In fact, the \$1.3 trillion that students and their families are paying in student loans is equivalent to about 15% of the federal budget. In fact, the public investment in higher education is a huge net drain on our economy, with less than half of the money coming back to the U.S. in the form of taxes and private sector returns. In fact, the higher education bubble is the biggest threat to the future of the American economy. Let's look at some of the facts. The biggest problem with higher education is its costs. Higher education is one of the most expensive things in the United States. According to the latest available data, the average cost of attending a four-year public university is now \$29,982, more than triple the

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	amount of 20 years ago. In the same time period, the cost of attending a four- year private university has risen by more than \$12,000, a growth rate of nearly 25%. The cost of college is growing faster than any other form of consumption in the United States. In fact, student loan debt is the single biggest contributor to consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal
8	Higher education is one of the most expensive things in the United
	States. According to the latest available data, the average cost of
	attending a four-year public university is now \$29,982, more than
	triple the amount of 20 years ago. In the same time period, the cost
	of attending a four-year private university has risen by more than
	\$12,000, a growth rate of nearly 25%. The cost of college is growing
	faster than any other form of consumption in the United States. In
	fact, student loan debt is the single biggest contributor to consumer
	debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And
	student debt is now the single largest source of personal debt in the
	United States. The student debt crisis is now a major national crisis, and
	yet our politicians and the media seem to be doing little about it. They're
	not even talking about it. The only time the issue of student debt has ever
	been mentioned in the news recently is when a few pundits, including The
	Atlantic's Matt O'Brien, have pointed out that President Obama's 2014
	budget plan for the upcoming year would increase Pell Grant funding by
	\$6.7 billion. That's the same amount that we're spending on a single
9	Higher education is one of the most expensive things in the United States.
	According to the latest available data, the average cost of attending a four-
	year public university is now \$29,982, more than triple the amount of 20
	years ago. In the same time period, the cost of attending a four-year private
	university has risen by more than \$12,000, a growth rate of nearly 25%. The
	cost of college is growing faster than any other form of consumption in the
	United States. In fact, student loan debt is the single biggest contributor to
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt.
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in state appropriations for public universities, there have been big cuts in public
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in state appropriations for public universities, there have been big cuts in public funding for private universities. But now, some Republican lawmakers are
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in state appropriations for public universities, there have been big cuts in public funding for private universities. But now, some Republican lawmakers are proposing a new way to reduce the cost of college: encourage students to
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in state appropriations for public universities, there have been big cuts in public funding for private universities. But now, some Republican lawmakers are proposing a new way to reduce the cost of college: encourage students to borrow more money and get a job instead. This proposal is being pushed by
	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in state appropriations for public universities, there have been big cuts in public funding for private universities. But now, some Republican lawmakers are proposing a new way to reduce the cost of college: encourage students to borrow more money and get a job instead. This proposal is being pushed by Rep. Robert Aderholt, a Republican from Alabama, who has proposed a new
10	consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal bankruptcy filings. For more than a decade, there has been little progress in the fight to bring down the cost of college. While there have been some small increases in state appropriations for public universities, there have been big cuts in public funding for private universities. But now, some Republican lawmakers are proposing a new way to reduce the cost of college: encourage students to borrow more money and get a job instead. This proposal is being pushed by

	year public university is now \$29,982, more than triple the amount of 20 years ago. In the same time period, the cost of attending a four-year private university has risen by more than \$12,000, a growth rate of nearly 25%. The cost of college is growing faster than any other form of consumption in the United States. In fact, student loan debt is the single biggest contributor to consumer debt, more than credit cards, car loans, or even mortgage debt. And student debt is now the single largest source of personal debt in the United States. According to the Federal Reserve, outstanding student loan debt amounts to a staggering \$1.3 trillion, or roughly \$1.5 trillion when you include the billions in debt owed by people in the "co-signing" program. The cost of college is so high, in fact, that a recent poll found that almost half of all American adults couldn't afford to send their children to a four-year public school if they had to pay full tuition. But there is one group of Americans that has never been
	subjected to this kind of sky-high price tag:
11	This is why I am arguing that the University of Texas at Austin should
	eliminate student fees and reduce the burden on students. I have lived in Austin for more than 10 years and, until now, have always paid all my fees and tuition. But I have been thinking about the current student fees situation at the University of Texas at Austin (UTA) for the last few weeks, as the result of a recent article in the Austin American-Statesman that reported on the fee increase for fall 2014. I have been thinking about the situation because I have been pondering the possibility of UTA eliminating fees for students and/or reducing the fee increases. I have been pondering this possibility for the last several months, and it's only recently
12	This is why I am arguing that the University of Texas at Austin should eliminate student fees and reduce the burden on students. I have lived in Austin for more than 10 years and, until now, have always paid all my fees and tuition. But I have been thinking about the current student fees
	situation at the University of Texas at Austin (UTA) for the last few weeks, as the result of a recent article in the Austin American-Statesman that reported on the fee increase for fall 2014. I have been thinking about the situation because I have been pondering the possibility of UTA eliminating fees for students and/or reducing the fee increases. I have been pondering this possibility for the last several months, and it's only recently that I have
	felt the need to do something about it. In the spring of 2012, I attended an informational session on the student fee situation at UTA. I remember being very concerned about the fees that students were paying at the time. The fees were a combination of tuition and fees, and the tuition was very high. Students were paying about \$12,000 a year for tuition and fees. I remember thinking, "Why should I pay such a high tuition when I am not doing anything to earn that money?" I remember thinking that this was a problem for me, personally, as I would be graduating with
13	This is why I am arguing that the University of Texas at Austin should eliminate student fees and reduce the burden on students. I have lived in

	Austin for more than 10 years and, until now, have always paid all my fees
	and tuition. But I have been thinking about the current student fees
	situation at the University of Texas at Austin (UTA) for the last few weeks,
	as the result of a recent article in the Austin American-Statesman that
	reported on the fee increase for fall 2014. I have been thinking about the
	situation because I have been pondering the possibility of UTA eliminating
	fees for students and/or reducing the fee increases. I have been pondering
	this possibility for the last several months, and it's only recently that I have
	felt the need to do something about it. In the spring of 2012, I attended an
	informational session on the student fee situation at UTA. I remember
	being very concerned about the fees that students were paying at the time.
	The fees were a combination of tuition and fees, and the tuition was very
	high. Students were paying about \$12,000 a year for tuition and fees. I
	remember thinking, "Why should I pay such a high tuition when I am not
	doing anything to earn that money?" I remember thinking that this was a
	problem for me, personally, as I would be graduating with a large student
	debt. After the informational session, I attended a couple of classes at UTA. I
	thought about these classes as I sat in my car in the parking lot. I remember
	being particularly concerned about the cost of parking at UTA. I remember
	thinking, "Why should I pay \$60 a month to park my car when I am not earning
	that money?" I remember thinking that this was a problem for me, personally, as
	I would be graduating with a large student debt. I was also thinking about the
14	tuition situation at UTA at the time. I remember thinking, "Why
14	UT Austin has the highest public endowment in the contrary. The UT-Austin
	Endowment is the largest university endowment in the world. The UT-Austin
	Endowment is the largest university endowment in the world. 5. San Diego State
	University: \$2.1 billion San Diego State University's endowment is the third
	largest in the nation. San Diego State University's endowment is the third largest
	in the nation. 6. Washington State University: \$2.1 billion Washington State
	University's endowment is the fourth largest in the nation. Washington State
15	University's endowment is
15	UT Austin has the largest public endowment in the contrary. In 2010, the
	Texas Legislature gave the university a \$1.4 billion appropriation for capital
	improvements. The university also has an endowment fund of about \$1.5 billion.
	The endowment funds are not tied to tuition or state funding, and are made up
	of gifts from alumni, friends and others. The university's endowment grew by
	\$165 million in the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2010, according to the Texas
	Higher Education Coordinating Board. The endowment also is one of the largest
10	in the nation, and in 2010 the university had \$6.9 billion in
16	UT Austin has the largest public endowment in the contrary. In 2010, the
	Texas Legislature gave the university a \$1.4 billion appropriation for capital
	improvements. The university also has an endowment fund of about \$1.5
	billion. The endowment funds are not tied to tuition or state funding, and
	are made up of gifts from alumni, friends and others. The university's

	endowment grew by \$165 million in the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2010, according to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The endowment also is one of the largest in the nation, and in 2010 the university had \$6.9 billion in assets, the largest of any college or university in Texas, according to the U.S. Department of Education. "We've got a lot of work to do, but we're making good progress," TDCJ Executive Director Clay Roberson said. "We're trying to improve things, and every little bit helps." Roberson said he is hopeful the prison's budget will increase to \$1.3 billion in the next fiscal year, which begins July 1. "We're confident we're going to increase our budget," he said. The state's budget was \$27.4 billion in
17	Given the size of these investments, and the already high cost of tuition, it is clear that UT does not need the additional revenue from student fees. It is also clear that the revenue from these fees would not be a major source of funds for UT. Moreover, there is no evidence that the UT Regents intend to charge students for some of the programs funded by the fees. The Court is aware that some students and taxpayers may be sensitive to the notion of raising tuition. However, the reality is that the cost of educating the students attending UT will go up in the future. To help finance this cost increase, it is important that the student population pay a portion of their tuition. The Court finds that the student fees at issue here are not excessive or unreasonable.
18	Given the size of these investments, and the already high cost of tuition, it is clear that UT does not need the additional revenue from student fees. We think the student fee structure is unfair and violates the basic principles of fairness and justice." The letter states that the board did not consider the University of Texas to be a public institution and therefore did not require it to abide by the same laws that apply to public universities. The board's argument rests on a series of precedents, beginning with the case of Penn State University, in which the Supreme Court ruled in 2004 that the University was a public institution. The board states that the university is autonomous and makes its own decisions, and that students are not "public" in the same way that
19	Given the size of these investments, and the already high cost of tuition, it is clear that UT does not need the additional revenue from student fees. In fact, the same report by the UT System Board of Regents, in their 2006-2007 report, stated that "UT has already achieved the maximum possible efficiency of its budget." To address this concern, the UT System Board of Regents approved a resolution in June 2007 to create the UT System Board of Regents Investment Review Committee (IRRC). This committee is tasked with analyzing how the UT System invests its revenue, and making recommendations on how the UT System can best allocate its revenue. This committee was created to provide transparency in how the UT System invests its revenue and to allow the public to have a greater

20	Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
	removing the fee requirement. No one is perfect. The rules for graduation have
	long been a point of contention at UT. Students had long been given a false
	sense of security. But the UT regents' decision on the new rules was a major win
	for the student body and the student body president. And this was true even for
	UT's student body president. The student body president, Daniele Alexander, told
	me she has been approached about running for the UT regents but declined. She
	said she doesn't want to take away from the important work the regents are
	doing. I asked
21	Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
	removing the fee requirement. Currently, the cost of tuition is not free for
	students, and the fee is at \$450 per semester. In addition to removing the fee
	requirement, UT should provide additional support services to students. For
	example, the UT Health Center is a great resource for students, but is limited to
	students who have a health care plan. I support the notion of a tuition-free
	institution, as well as removing the fee requirement. I believe that UT is a great
	university, but it could be even better if students were given the chance to attend
	the university without having to pay tuition. The "Statement of the Student
	Government
22	Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
	removing the fee requirement. The cost of attendance for students who wish
	to study abroad ranges from \$18,000 to \$32,000. This can include international
	airfare, living expenses, tuition, and any additional expenses such as health
	insurance. Students are required to pay for these costs. The school does not
	require students to pay an additional fee to study abroad. "For the most part,
	most students who are thinking about studying abroad are not going to do it if
	they have to pay a fee," said Dr. Jay Wexler, associate professor of anthropology
22	and director of the study abroad program. "They
23	Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
	removing the fee requirement. While this may be an attractive option for some
	students, it may also increase the number of students seeking aid from the
	federal government. Finally, the presence of the federal government and the
	need for the federal government to meet its obligations would make the
	imposition of the fee a highly controversial issue. Implications of a change in the
	formula for the calculation of the minimum cost of attendance The UT Board of
	Regents' proposed tuition increase would have a minimal impact on students'
	ability to pay for college. The maximum tuition increase proposed by the Board
24	of Regents is a mere 5.6 percent increase from the current tuition rate Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
24	
	removing the fee requirement. By eliminating the annual fee, UT would not
	only lower the cost of attendance, but it would also lower the amount of money
	spent on materials and supplies. This would not only lower the cost of
	attendance but it would also help to improve student morale. Now that we've
	gone through some of the benefits of UT's change, let's look at some of the

	eminimating the annual ree is a good timing. The problem lies in the timing of
	eliminating the annual fee is a good thing. The problem lies in the timing of
	drop by \$8,829. This is not to say that this is a bad thing. I believe that
	\$3,439. If this were to continue for ten years, the cost of attendance would
	continue over a four-year period, the cost of attendance would drop by
	change would be significant over the long-term. If UT were to eliminate the annual fee, the cost of attendance would drop to \$11,499. If this were to
	\$12,238. In the short-term, the change would be insignificant. However, the
	Attendance As mentioned earlier, the cost of attendance is currently
	of the consequences of this change. Consequences of UT's Change Cost of
	we've gone through some of the benefits of UT's change, let's look at some
	of attendance but it would also help to improve student morale. Now that
	money spent on materials and supplies. This would not only lower the cost
	only lower the cost of attendance, but it would also lower the amount of
20	removing the fee requirement. By eliminating the annual fee, UT would not
26	only one semester away Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
	is a good thing. The problem lies in the timing of this change. The university is
	This is not to say that this is a bad thing. I believe that eliminating the annual fee
	this were to continue for ten years, the cost of attendance would drop by \$8,829.
	continue over a four-year period, the cost of attendance would drop by \$3,439. If
	annual fee, the cost of attendance would drop to \$11,499. If this were to
	change would be significant over the long-term. If UT were to eliminate the
	\$12,238. In the short-term, the change would be insignificant. However, the
	Attendance As mentioned earlier, the cost of attendance is currently
	we've gone through some of the benefits of UT's change, let's look at some of the consequences of this change. Consequences of UT's Change Cost of
	of attendance but it would also help to improve student morale. Now that
	money spent on materials and supplies. This would not only lower the cost
	only lower the cost of attendance, but it would also lower the amount of
	removing the fee requirement. By eliminating the annual fee, UT would not
25	Furthermore, UT could provide significant economic relief to students by
	term, the change would
	As mentioned earlier, the cost of attendance is currently \$12,238. In the short-

	can't be funded through student fees, like marketing and fundraising. In order to offset the costs of those expenses, the club has started a capital campaign to fund upgrades and improvements to the gym. The first phase of the renovation will be a new basketball court and practice facility, which will be completed in May. The second phase will be a complete gym overhaul, including a new locker room and weight room. "We've never been a big fundraising group," said head coach Brian Heap. "But as a club,
28	Student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural
	sports. Many colleges and universities charge students for their dormitory
	space. In the United States, college tuition has risen dramatically over the
	past few decades, in part because of the recession and in part due to a
	general rise in cost of living. In the United States, the average cost of a
	four-year college education was \$21,317 in 2011. The total price tag for a
	bachelor's degree has increased by 36% over the past decade. An example
	of a price hike is the University of California, which raised tuition by 20% in
	2009. At the University of California, the cost of a four-year undergraduate
29	Student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural
	sports. We will need to make some tough decisions to meet our budget,
	but we are committed to supporting those activities that the majority of
	students value the most. The Graduate School will make a
	recommendation to the Faculty Senate about funding graduate student
	positions in December. We will have more information in the coming
	weeks. I also want to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Merritt, Dr. Klippel,
	and Dr. McRae for their hard work in this year's leadership election. I am
	looking forward to working with them and the entire Graduate School in
	the coming months and years. The Graduate School
30	Student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural sports,
	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to
	play. Molecular Biology and Genetics For a long time, the dream of a computer
	that can read out a patient's DNA and check for a mutation that is causing their
	cancer has not been a reality. However, with the rise of next-generation sequencing, this dream is becoming a reality. So how exactly is this technology
	changing how we diagnose and treat patients with cancer? As with most new
	technologies, next-generation sequencing has the potential to make cancer
	treatment more efficient and cost-effective. For example, a few years ago a
	patient came to see me with stage 4 colon cancer. His family history
31	Student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural sports,
	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to
	play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not
	directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the
	1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table
	tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students

1	
	than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for
	activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why
	we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer
	is that we are not. We are moving from a system
32	Student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural sports,
	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to
	play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not
	directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in
	the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport'
	called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to
	the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees
	being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may
	be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping
	student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system
	where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support
	activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students and the
	university. The current system is a confusing one for our students, and it is not
	clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus,
	you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee
	is not just used for student activities' and instead is used for a range of things
	that benefit the students. For example, students are charged the same fee as
	staff, and this money is used to fund things like intramural sports, the
33	Student fees are currently used to support activities like intramural sports,
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport'
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport'
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students and the
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and the university. The current system is a confusing one for our students, and it is
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities.
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for'student activities' and instead is used
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for'student activities' and instead is used for a range of things that benefit the students. For example, students are
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for'student activities' and instead is used for a range of things that benefit the students. For example, students are charged the same fee as staff, and this money is used to fund things like
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for'student activities' and instead is used for a range of things that benefit the students. For example, students are charged the same fee as staff, and this money is used to fund things like intramural sports, the student bar and the student union. So a student who is
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for'student activities' and instead is used for a range of things that benefit the students. For example, students are charged the same fee as staff, and this money is used to fund things like intramural sports, the student bar and the student union. So a student who is studying physical sciences is paying the same fee as a student who is studying
33	but these would be better supported by user fees from those who choose to play. In the past, user fees have been used to support activities that are not directly related to the health and wellbeing of our students. For example, in the 1990s, university funding was used to subsidise an 'intramural sport' called 'table tennis' on campus. This was deemed to be of greater benefit to the students than intramural sport. This is a clear example of student fees being used for activities that do not directly benefit the students. You may be wondering why we are changing this system. Why are we not keeping student fees? The answer is that we are not. We are moving from a system where student fees support activities to a system where user fees support activities. It is a fundamental change that will benefit our students, and it is not clear who is responsible for what. It is also inefficient. When you are on campus, you are charged a student fee that supports student activities. However, this fee is not just used for'student activities' and instead is used for a range of things that benefit the students. For example, students are charged the same fee as staff, and this money is used to fund things like intramural sports, the student bar and the student union. So a student who is

	make the fee more transparent and the responsibility clear. Students will be able
	to see exactly where their fees are going, and they will be more accountable for
	their fees. The new system is also more efficient, and it will mean that the student
	fee will be more focused on supporting student activities. Why are we doing this?
34	Ultimately, there are several excellent reasons for UT to abolish student
	fees. The most important reason, I believe, is that it would help to reduce the
	perception of the student as a consumer of higher education. It would make
	students more accountable for the quality of the product they receive. Students
	would not feel entitled to a free ride. A free ride implies that the product they
	receive is something for which they are entitled, rather than something they pay
	for. As the cost of education grows, it is increasingly important to convey to
	students that they are not entitled to anything. When they graduate with a
	degree, they must take responsibility for the value of the degree. It is possible
	that abolishing student fees would
35	Ultimately, there are several excellent reasons for UT to abolish student
	fees. The most important reason, I believe, is that it would help to reduce
	the perception of the student as a consumer of higher education. It would
	make students more accountable for the quality of the product they
	receive. Students would not feel entitled to a free ride. A free ride implies
	that the product they receive is something for which they are entitled,
	rather than something they pay for. As the cost of education grows, it is
	increasingly important to convey to students that they are not entitled to
	anything. When they graduate with a degree, they must take responsibility
	for the value of the degree. It is possible that abolishing student fees would
	actually increase the cost of higher education, at least in the short term. Students
	would not have an automatic right to tuition waivers. To some extent, they are
	receiving a free ride. They could easily be forced to pay for their education. But,
	over the long term, abolishing student fees would make the higher education
	system more affordable, and it would help to improve the quality of higher
	education. Wednesday, October 19, 2007 I am no fan of the Free Market. It is an
	ideology that is very useful in many circumstances, but it is also very destructive.
	When it comes to education, it is very destructive
36	Ultimately, there are several excellent reasons for UT to abolish student
	fees. The most important reason, I believe, is that it would help to reduce
	the perception of the student as a consumer of higher education. It would
	make students more accountable for the quality of the product they
	receive. Students would not feel entitled to a free ride. A free ride implies
	that the product they receive is something for which they are entitled,
	rather than something they pay for. As the cost of education grows, it is
	increasingly important to convey to students that they are not entitled to
	anything. When they graduate with a degree, they must take responsibility
	anything. When they graduate with a degree, they must take responsibility

extent, they are receiving a free ride. They could easily be forced to pay for their education. But, over the long term, abolishing student fees would make the higher education system more affordable, and it would help to improve the quality of higher education. Wednesday, October 19, 2007 I am no fan of the Free Market. It is an ideology that is very useful in many circumstances, but it is also very destructive. When it comes to education, it is very destructive. In a free market, the prices of things rise and fall in response to market forces. A lot of people think that this is a good thing, because it allows them to buy whatever they want, when they want it. But, the problem with the free market is that it does not guarantee that anyone will be able to afford what they want. It only guarantees that the price of what they want will rise and fall. Let me give you an example. When the free market came to the movie industry, it led to the development of Hollywood. This meant that more people could watch movies than ever before. But, it