

It's Not Just the Privates:
Tuition Discounting and Enrollments in Public Flagship Universities

Leanne M. Davis
The Institute for Higher Education Policy, Washington, DC

Rita J. Kirshstein
The George Washington University

It's Not Just the Privates:
Tuition Discounting and Enrollments in Public Flagship Universities

This paper has two interrelated goals:

1. To further explore the practice of tuition discounting in public institutions, specifically public flagship universities; and
2. To examine whether changes in discount rates in a five-year time period correspond to changes in the composition of the student body

Although a number of studies have focused on tuition discounting in public institutions (Baum, Lapovsky & Ma, 2010; Hillman, 2010; Hillman, 2012; Gianneschi and Pingel, 2014), the privates attract much of the attention on this topic. This unquestionably results from the generally high and steadily escalating discount rates in the privates and the availability of annual data provided by the National Association of College and University Business Officer's (NACUBO) survey of tuition discounting in private institutions.

Recently, however, considerable discussion has focused on ways in which state flagship universities are beginning to look more and more like private universities. "State Universities No More" (Jacquette, 2017), "Flagships Go National" (Anderson, 2018), "Many State Flagships Leave Black and Latino Students Behind" (Kolodner, 2018) are just a few of the report titles and headlines focusing on this issue. Undoubtedly, declines in state appropriations and the decreasing numbers of high school graduates have forced some state institutions to look elsewhere for students. At the same time, students today expect financial aid and more and more institutions are providing aid from their own coffers.

This paper examines tuition discounting in public flagship institutions between 2012 and 2016 to determine the extent of discounting in these universities and whether this practice is related to enrollment changes in out-of-state students, minority students, Pell grant recipients and selectivity.

Background

In 2000, a report warned that private institutions were "discounting toward disaster" (Redd, 2000). Focusing on 266 private four-year institutions, the report noted a 9-percentage point increase in the tuition discount rate in six years and an overall average rate of 30 percent. Fast forward to 2017-18. The NACUBO annual tuition discounting study revealed an average freshmen discount rate of 49.9 percent and an all undergraduate rate of 44.8 percent (NACUBO, 2018). And according to Moody's, a fifth of private institutions had discount rates for first-year students that exceeded 60 percent (Pettit, 2018). Policy analysts have been warning for years that these high discount rates are not sustainable (Wu, 2017), yet there are no signs that this practice will slow down in the near future.

Tuition discount rates among public institutions are considerably lower, on average, than those in the private sector, but some analyses show that they, too, are increasing. An Education Commission of the States report (Gianneschi and Pingel, 2014) indicates that tuition discounting among public institutions increased from 21.4 percent in 2002 to 27.4 in 2011. Discount rates in public research universities were considerably higher than those in other public four-year

institutions, 32.9 percent compared to 18.9 percent in 2011. Two earlier analyses of discount rates among public institutions showed relatively flat rates for time periods ending over ten years ago. Baum and Ma (2010) using College Board data showed a relatively flat discount rate among the publics between 2001 and 2007, hovering around 20 percent. Hillman (2012), using panel data for 174 public four-year institutions also found little change in overall tuition discounts between 2002 and 2008, about 16 percent. These latter two studies are now over ten years old.

Why, then, do institutions discount their tuition? Enrollment management is typically noted as a key reason. Institutional aid that is used to discount tuition allows colleges and universities to attract particular student populations of interest (e.g., low-income, underrepresented minorities, academically talented) (Rine, 2016). For public institutions recruiting out-of-state students, it is often the case that the discount does not reduce the out-of-state price to the in-state level, thus increasing tuition revenue despite the discount. In this case, tuition discounting becomes a form of revenue management. Tuition discounting can also be viewed as a “signaling mechanism,” indicating to potential consumers that their high price suggests quality but their discounting in the form of a scholarship indicates merit or worthiness (Rine, 2016). In addition, institutional grant aid has been shown to influence students’ enrollment decisions (Hurwitz, 2012). And when institutions’ applications and yield have declined, it is often believed that even heavily discounted tuitions are better than no tuition revenue (Hillman, 2012). There’s also the feeling that “everyone’s doing it” (e.g., discounting tuition) so we must do it too in order to remain competitive.

As noted earlier, public institutions, particularly research universities are now “doing it” too and are coming under intense scrutiny for some of their practices. Declining state appropriations, as well as declines in the numbers of high school graduates, have resulted in the need to increase tuition revenue and one quick way to do this is to recruit out-of-state students. As early as 2014, the out-of-state enrollments at 11 state flagship institutions exceeded 50 percent and in four states, these enrollments exceeded 60 percent (Jaquette, 2017). Furthermore, several recent reports and studies revealed that Black and Latino students are severely underrepresented at selective public institutions (Kolodner, 2018; Carnevale, Ven der Werf, Quinn, Strohl, & Repnikov, 2018).

All of this begs the question: is there a relationship between the practice of tuition discounting and changes in the student population in public flagship universities?

Methodology and Data

The data for our study come from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Financial Aid and Institutional Characteristics surveys. This analysis examines data reported in fall 2012 (2012-13 academic year) and fall 2016 (2016-17 academic year) at each of the 50 public flagship institutions.

Our main variable of interest, *TuitionDiscount*, captures the extent to which institutional aid is used to reduce the tuition that full-time, first-time (FTFT) students pay. The total amount of institutional aid awarded to FTFT students is the numerator in our discount rate calculation. Our denominator is an estimate of gross tuition revenue (e.g., what tuition revenue would have been if all students paid the posted price) that we calculated by multiplying the number of FTFT in-state students by the published in-state tuition and fees, and adding that to the number of

FTFT out-of-state students and the number of foreign students multiplied by the published out-of-state tuition and fees. We made the assumption that international students would pay out-of-state tuition prices and therefore combined out-of-state and foreign student numbers to measure non-resident (i.e., not in-state) student numbers.

Total Amount of Institutional Aid Awarded to FTFT Freshmen

$$(\text{FTFT in-state enrolled } X \text{ in-state tuition and fees}) + (\text{FTFT out-of-state enrolled } X \text{ out-of-state tuition and fees}) + (\text{FTFT foreign enrolled } X \text{ out-of-state tuition and fees})$$

Other studies of tuition discounting in the public sector have used different sources of data. Baum and Ma (2010), for example, used College Board data while Hillman used NPSAS data in one of his analyses and a panel data set in another. The formulas used in each of these studies are basically similar but the different ways that data are defined and collected in each of the studies undoubtedly impacts the tuition discount results.

We use a number of variables to capture the student body composition and the institutional selectivity of the flagships. The percent of FTFT undergraduate students who are ethnic/racial minorities (i.e., non-white) is calculated by combining the reported percentages of students who identify as: American Indian and Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Hispanic; Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; nonresident alien; unknown; and two or more ethnicities. The reported percent of FTFT undergraduate students awarded a Pell grant is a proxy for family income level. We use the percent of students admitted as a proxy for institutional selectivity. Each of these variables is presented in Table 1 for both the 2012 and 2016 academic years.

Table 1 Tuition discounting and enrollment characteristics of public flagship institutions: 2012-13 and 2016-17

Variable	2012 (n=50)		2016 (n=50)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Tuition discount rate	22.1%	8.86%	24.6%	10.1%
Published in-state tuition and fees	\$9,685	\$2,889	\$10,896	\$5,055
Published out-of-state tuition and fees	\$25,209	\$6110	\$29,116	\$6,804
Percent in-state FTFT	64.8%	15.9%	62.1%	16%
Percent out-of-state FTFT	30.5%	16.7%	32.5%	16.7%
Percent foreign FTFT	4.2%	4.3%	4.6%	4%
Percent out-of-state & foreign FTFT	34.7%	15.8%	37.1%	15.5%
Percent FTFT undergrad Pell recipients	23.7%	6.8%	22.1%	6.3%
Percent FTFT non-white students	32.9%	16.6%	35%	16.5%
Percent admitted	65.3%	16.8%	66.2%	18.7%
Number FTFT undergraduates	4347.6	1829.5	4661.4	1987.7

Table 2 examines the change in these same characteristics between the 2012-13 and 2016-17 academic years. Looking at the group as a whole, the average percentage of in-state students decreased by 2.7 percent, while the average percentage of out-of-state students increased by 2.1 percent. The percent of Pell recipients decreased by 1.6 and the percentage of non-white students increased by 2.1. The only relationship that was statistically significant with the tuition discounting rate was that of in-state enrollments for the academic year 2016-17; the correlation coefficient of $-.28$ was significant at the $.05$ level. Thus, a decrease in in-state students in 2016 results in an increase in the tuition discounting rate for that year. While this might imply that the relationship between changes in tuition discounting and changes in out-of-state enrollments would be significant, that was not the case.

Table 2 Change in tuition discounting and enrollment characteristics of public flagship institutions: 2012-13 to 2016-17

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Tuition Discount Rate	2.5%	5.8%	-9.6%	24.1%
Published in-state tuition and fees	\$1,211	\$1,024	-\$1,630	\$4,196
Published out-of-state tuition and fees	\$3,907	\$2,059	-\$164	\$8,736
Percent in-state FTFT	-2.7%	4.5%	-17%	5%
Percent out-of-state FTFT	2.1%	5.2%	-14%	17%
Percent foreign FTFT	.3%	2.2%	-6%	6%
Percent out-of-state & foreign FTFT	2.4%	5.2%	-14%	16%
Percent FTFT undergrad Pell recipients	-1.6%	2.9%	-13%	3%
Percent FTFT non-white students	2.1%	4.4%	-16.4%	8.2%
Percent admitted	.8%	10.1%	-16%	39%

Because there are only 50 flagship institutions, we can examine individual patterns in each of the universities and there is no question that public flagship universities are discounting their tuition. As shown in Table 3, in the 2016-17 academic year, the average discount rate was 24.6 percent. At the low end were institutions such as the University of South Carolina – Columbia (8.1%), the University of Georgia (8.7%), and the University of Nevada – Reno (8.9%). At the higher end, three institutions had discount rates above 40 percent – the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (43%), The University of Alabama (45.2%), and the University of Vermont (47.8%). Table 3 lists discount rates by institution.

Between the 2012-13 and 2016-17 academic years, tuition discounting rates mostly increased, with an average increase of 2.5 percent. The University of Wisconsin at Madison remained constant with a discount rate of 12 percent. Some institutions experienced a decrease in discount rate, such as the University of Texas at Austin (-9.6%), the University of Arizona (-9.3%), and the University of Montana (-8.3%). At the opposite end of the spectrum, some institutions greatly increased their discount rates, such as the University of Vermont (12.9%), and the University of Wyoming (24.1%). What we learn is that tuition discounting rates vary by institution and there is not a unidirectional trend among the group of flagships as a whole.

Table 3 Tuition discount rate by institution: 2012 and 2016

Flagship	TD - 2016	TD - 2012	TD Change 2012-2016
University of South Carolina – Columbia	8.1%	13.7%	-5.6%
University of Georgia	8.7%	10.4%	-1.7%
University of Nevada – Reno	8.9%	11.2%	-2.3%
Pennsylvania State University – Main Campus	9.9%	9.3%	0.6%
The University of Texas at Austin	11.9%	21.5%	-9.6%
University of Wisconsin – Madison	12.0%	12.0%	0%
University of Arkansas	12.2%	13.4%	-1.2%
University of Florida	12.3%	15.5%	-3.2%
University of North Dakota	12.7%	8.5%	4.2%
University of Oregon	15.6%	13.4%	2.3%
The University of Montana	15.7%	24.0%	-8.3%
University of Colorado Boulder	16.6%	13.0%	3.6%
University at Buffalo	17.2%	15.4%	1.8%
University of Washington – Seattle	18.1%	14.4%	3.7%
University of Minnesota – Twin Cities	18.5%	16.2%	2.3%
University of Hawaii at Manoa	18.5%	17.9%	0.6%
University of Alaska Fairbanks	19.2%	15.4%	3.8%
University of Maryland – College Park	20.5%	26.4%	-5.9%
University of Delaware	20.6%	17.8%	2.8%
The University of Tennessee – Knoxville	20.6%	21.1%	-0.5%
Rutgers University – New Brunswick	21.3%	19.0%	2.3%
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	21.6%	18.7%	2.8%
University of Virginia – main campus	21.9%	19.1%	2.7%
University of New Mexico – main campus	22.6%	19.7%	3.0%
University of South Dakota	23.3%	18.9%	4.4%
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College	23.5%	19.4%	4.2%
Indiana University – Bloomington	23.6%	22.1%	1.5%
West Virginia University	24.9%	16.8%	8.1%
University of California – Berkeley	25.0%	27.9%	-2.9%
University of Iowa	28.0%	25.6%	2.4%
University of Arizona	28.1%	37.4%	-9.3%
University of Utah	29.0%	20.4%	8.6%
University of Massachusetts – Amherst	29.3%	19.7%	9.6%
University of Kansas	29.7%	22.1%	7.5%
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor	29.9%	23.1%	6.8%
University of Missouri – Columbia	30.5%	24.7%	5.8%
University of New Hampshire – main campus	30.5%	28.2%	2.3%
University of Oklahoma – Norman campus	31.3%	21.9%	9.3%
University of Wyoming	33.1%	9.0%	24.1%
University of Connecticut	33.3%	28.4%	4.9%
University of Kentucky	34.4%	33.9%	0.4%
University of Maine	34.6%	28.0%	6.6%
University of Rhode Island	36.3%	33.7%	2.7%
Ohio State University – main campus	36.9%	38.0%	-1.1%
University of Nebraska – Lincoln	37.9%	30.6%	7.3%
University of Mississippi	38.0%	32.1%	5.9%
University of Idaho	39.2%	42.1%	-2.9%
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	43.0%	42.5%	0.5%
The University of Alabama	45.2%	36.7%	8.5%
University of Vermont	47.8%	34.9%	12.9%

Analysis and Discussion

Public flagship institutions are often lumped together as a group, but a diverse array of institutions lies within the group of 50 universities. Although we found only one relationship between changes in tuition discount rates and enrollment characteristics in the public flagships, it's likely that each state has its own story to tell.

For example, the largest change in tuition discounting rate between 2012-2016 was at the University of Wyoming. In 2016, the tuition discount rate was 33.1 percent, an increase of 24.1 percent since 2012. The residence of the students changed minimally over the time period – a 1 percent increase in in-state students and a 1 percent decrease in out-of-state students. During that time, the increase in tuition and fees was less than the average increase across all public flagship institutions. However, there was a dramatic increase in the total amount of institutional grant aid awarded to first-time, full-time students, the numerator in our tuition discounting calculation, and this change is what contributed to the significant increase in their tuition discounting rate. In 2012, 35 percent of students were awarded institutional grant aid and the total amount of aid awarded was \$1,215,362, with an average award of \$2,182. Just five years later, in 2016, 67 percent of students were awarded institutional grant aid – with a total amount of aid at \$5,198,475 and an average award of \$5,023.

An article from the University of Wyoming confirms our observations from 2016 – that the number of in-state enrollments increased slightly but the number of out-of-state students dropped, leading to a slight drop in enrollment for fall 2016. The Vice President for Student Affairs is stated that “Nonresident students are an important part of our enrollment mix ... and we are working to reach many more of them ...” (University of Wyoming, 2016), also confirming the importance of nonresident students. As the university continued to focus on recruitment of out-of-state students, they reported two years of nearly double-digit growth in full-time, first-time freshman in fall 2017 and fall 2018, driven by enrollment of students from outside Wyoming (University of Wyoming, 2018).

Another state that we investigated is South Carolina. It had the lowest tuition discount rate in 2016 *and* a decrease of 5.6 percentage points from 2012. Yet we knew that the University of South Carolina had been aggressively recruiting out-of-state students. A 2017 article in *The State* (Wilks, 2017), reported that out-of-state students received \$84 million in tuition breaks in 2016. However, over 37 percent of those students receiving breaks were charged in-state tuition. This would impact our calculation of the discount rate since our denominator assumes that all out-of-state students pay the out-of-state posted tuition. If we were to recalculate South Carolina's rate given this information, the new discount rate would be considerably higher.¹ And this issue might occur in other states as well.

And another example. In the fall 2016, the University of Maine had a tuition discount rate of 34.6 percent, an increase of 6.6 percent from fall 2012. During that same time period, the percentage of in-state students fell 17 percent, while the percentage of out-of-state students rose

¹ The denominator in our calculation multiplies the number of in-state students by the posted in-state tuition rate and adds that to the number of out-of-state and foreign students multiplied by the posted out-of-state tuition rate. If South Carolina, or any state, offered a significant percentage of out-of-state students in-state tuition, the actual denominator would be lower, resulting in a higher tuition discount rate.

by 16 percent. The percentage of non-white students decreased by 4.8 percent, and the percentage of Pell Grant eligible students decreased by 13 percent. These numbers describe an institution that is attracting more students from out-of-state and students from a higher family income bracket. While we cannot prove a causal relationship between any of these variables, there appears to be a trend.

A likely explanation for the marked increase in out-of-state enrollments is Flagship Match, a bold program that the University of Maine launched in November 2015. Maine's universities face challenges being in the state with the oldest median age in the country and a declining population of high school students. Flagship Match was created after university officials found that more than 97 percent of students who were accepted decided to enroll out-of-state. The campaign targeted students from nearby Connecticut, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and Vermont and promised that eligible students could attend the University of Maine for the same cost as the in-state tuition and fees at their home states' flagship universities (Gallagher, 2018). As competition becomes fierce for flagship institutions in the northeast, where the population of high school students is declining, there will likely be more regional competition for the same population of students. It is also likely that the tuition rate in Maine is higher than our calculation indicates, given that many out-of-state students are paying in-state tuition.

Conclusions and Further Research

The primary purpose of this paper was to explore the practice of tuition discounting in public flagship institutions and to examine whether changes in discount rates correspond to changes in the composition of the student body. Most of the studies of tuition discounting focus on private institutions, although there is growing discussion about the ways in which public flagship universities are starting to resemble private universities. There is a gap in what is known about tuition discounting at public institutions and to what extent changes in enrollment at public flagships go hand in hand with tuition discounting practices.

We approached this study assuming that we would find a relationship between tuition discounting and the enrollment characteristics under scrutiny in higher education today. Much to our surprise (and dismay), we found only one such relationship, that between changes in in-state enrollments and tuition discounting. We found no overall relationships, however, between changes in tuition discounting and changes in Pell grant enrollments, nonwhite enrollments, out-of-state students, and the percent of students that institutions admit.

We examined tuition discounting in public flagship institutions and found that on average, discount rates have risen 2.5 percent in the period between the 2012-13 and 2016-17 academic years. Within the group of flagships, there are variations in increase and decrease of discount rates, showing that flagships are a diverse group of institutions.

This doesn't mean that some flagships aren't taking measures to ensure adequate enrollments. In examining the data for individual institutions, we found that each state has its own story to tell. As noted, Wyoming dramatically increased the amount of aid they awarded students in the five-year period we investigated, which resulted in a large increase in their tuition discount rate. South Carolina, which has a relatively low tuition discount rate tends to offer a sizeable number of out-of-state students in-state tuition rates. And New England universities

concerned about declining numbers of high school graduates are getting creative as well. Maine's Flagship Match targets students in six nearby states to match the in-state tuition price they would pay.

Public and private colleges and universities also compete with one another. Heavily endowed private institutions can often offer tuition discounts that make their financial aid offers and final net price competitive with the publics. Of course, some smaller institutions have put themselves out of business, particularly in New England, with this practice.

Despite our disappointing findings, we believe that there are a number of areas that warrant further investigation. In this paper, we examined tuition discounts without taking account of the financial situation in each of the states; we plan to examine how changes in state appropriations, as well as state financial aid patterns, impact tuition discounting in the publics. Public regional colleges have also entered the tuition discounting game in order to attract more affluent students and help make up for state budget cuts (Burd, 2015). A future study will compare changes at public institutions within the same state. Of course, there are also those sticky methodological issues. As we uncovered, some states are offering out-of-state students in-state tuition which impacts our particular calculation of tuition discounting. How do different calculations that researchers have used impact results?

We do know that public flagship universities are indeed discounting their tuition. And while we found no relationships between this practice and enrollment changes across the 50 institutions, there just may be 50 different stories to tell.

References

- Anderson, N. (2018, March 29). Flagships go national: At U-Michigan, nearly half of students now from out of state. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2018/03/29/flagships-go-national-at-u-michigan-nearly-half-of-students-now-from-out-of-state/?utm_term=.a99a3a94fc38
- Baum S., Lapovsky, L., and Ma, J. (2010). *Tuition Discounting: Institutional Aid Patterns at Public and Private Colleges and Universities, 2000-01 to 2008-09*. New York, NY: The College Board. Retrieved from <https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/trends-2010-tuition-discounting-institutional-aid-report.pdf>
- Browning, J. (2013). Determining a relationship between higher education financial position and tuition discount rates. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 20.
- Burd, S. (2015). *The out-of-state arms race: How public universities use merit aid to recruit nonresident students*. Washington, DC: New America. Retrieved from <https://static.newamerica.org/attachments/3120-out-of-state-student-arms-race/OutOfStateArmsRace-Final.b93c2211cdfb4c3da169d668fbb67cc1.pdf>
- Carnevale A.P., Van Der Werf, M., Quinn, M.C., Strohl, J., and Repnikov, D. (2018). *Our separate & unequal public colleges: How public colleges reinforce white racial privilege and marginalize Black and Latino students*. Washington, DC: Center on Education and the Workforce.
- Gianneschi, M. and Pingel, S. (2014). *A hidden cause of rising tuition: Tuition discounting in public colleges and universities*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED560989.pdf>
- Gallagher, N. (2018, October 18). Overall enrollment in UMaine system rebounds following last year's decline. *Press Herald*. Retrieved from <https://www.pressherald.com/2018/10/18/enrollment-rises-for-in-state-out-of-state-students-at-umaine-system/>
- Haycock, K., Lynch, M., & Engle, J. (2010). *Opportunity adrift*. Washington, DC: Education Trust. Retrieved from https://1k9gl1yevnfp2lpq1dhrqe17-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Opportunity-Adrift_0.pdf.
- Hillman, N.W. (2010). Who benefits from tuition discounts at public universities? *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 40(1), 17-30. Retrieved from NASFAA: <http://publications.nasfaa.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=jsfa>.

- Hillman, N.W. (2012). Tuition discounting for revenue management. *Research in Higher Education*, 53: 263-281.
- Hurwitz, M. (2012). The impact of institutional grant aid on college choice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34(3). DOI: 10.3102/0162373712448957.
- Jaquette, O. (2017). *State university no more: Out-of-state enrollment and the growing exclusion of high-achieving, low-income students at public flagship universities*. Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.jkcf.org/research/state-university-no-more-out-of-state-enrollment-and-the-growing-exclusion-of-high-achieving-low-income-students-at-public-flagship-universities/>
- Jaquette, O., Curs, B. R., & Posselt, J. (2016). Tuition rich, mission poor: Nonresident enrollment growth and the socioeconomic and racial composition of public research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(5).
- Kolodner, M. (2018, January 29). Many state flagship universities leave Black and Latino students behind. *The Hechinger Report*. Retrieved from <https://hechingerreport.org/many-state-flagship-universities-leave-black-latino-students-behind/>.
- National Association of College and University Business Officers (2018, April 30). *Average freshmen tuition discount rate nears 50 percent*. Retrieved from <https://www.nacubo.org/Press-Releases/2018/Average-Freshman-Tuition-Discount-Rate-Nears-50-Percent>
- Pettit, E. (2018, November 14). A fifth of private colleges report first-year discount rate of 60 percent, Moody's says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Fifth-of-Private-Colleges/245092>
- Redd, K. (2000). *Discounting toward disaster: Tuition discounting, college finances, and enrollments of low-income undergraduates*. USA Group Foundation, New Agenda Series. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED447775.pdf>.
- Rine, P. J. (2016). *A shell game by any other name: The economics and rationale behind tuition discounting*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Innovative Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/OLPD/PCLN/Rine-WhitePaper.pdf>
- University of Wyoming (2018, September 21). *UW sets first-time freshman enrollment record*. Retrieved from <http://www.uwyo.edu/uw/news/2018/09/uw-sets-first-time-freshman-enrollment-record.html>
- University of Wyoming (2016, October 5). *UW fall 2016 enrollment declines*. Retrieved from <http://www.uwyo.edu/uw/news/2016/10/uw-fall-2016-enrollment-declines.html>

- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 2012-2016, Financial Aid and Institutional Characteristics Surveys. Accessed on July 6, 2018.
- Wilks, A.G. (2017, May 6). USC offers \$84 million in tuition breaks to out-of-state students. *The State*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestate.com/news/politics-government/article149042179.html>
- Wu, F.H. (2017, September 26). Tuition discounting: The problem, not the remedy. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2017/09/26/why-tuition-discounting-has-created-more-problems-solutions-essay>

Table 4 Correlation matrix between tuition discounting and enrollment characteristics of public flagship institutions: 2016-17

	Tuition discount	Percent in-state FTFT	Percent out-of-state FTFT	Percent non-white FTFT	Percent Hispanic FTFT	Percent African American FTFT	Percent Pell recipients FTFT	Percent admitted
Tuition discount	1							
Percent in-state FTFT	-0.2849*	1						
Percent out-of-state FTFT	0.2377	-0.9892*	1					
Percent non-white FTFT	-0.2778	0.5774*	-0.5698*	1				
Percent Hispanic FTFT	-0.1851	0.3482*	-0.3516*	0.5937*	1			
Percent African American FTFT	0.0854	0.2154	-0.1877	-0.0387	-0.1596	1		
Percent Pell recipients FTFT	0.0413	0.3842*	-0.3884*	0.2152	0.4493*	-0.1682	1	
Percent admitted	0.0748	-0.3240*	0.3190*	-0.4567*	-0.1261	-0.2187	0.3822*	1

Statistical significance at the 5% level is indicated with a *

Table 5: Tuition discount rate and enrollment characteristics by institution

Flagship	Tuition Discount		Percent in-state FTFT		Percent out-of-state FTFT		Percent nonwhite FTFT		Percent Pell FTFT		Percent Admitted	
	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012
University of South Carolina – Columbia	8.1%	-5.6%	47%	-7%	54%	8%	17.9%	-0.5%	15%	-4%	68%	5%
University of Georgia	8.7%	-1.7%	88%	0%	12%	-1%	32.1%	4.9%	20%	-1%	54%	-9%
University of Nevada - Reno	8.9%	-2.3%	70%	-5%	30%	4%	45.2%	4.1%	27%	-4%	83%	1%
Pennsylvania State University – Main Campus	9.9%	0.6%	53%	-4%	46%	4%	31.5%	2.4%	13%	-1%	56%	4%
The University of Texas at Austin	11.9%	-9.6%	88%	-1%	12%	1%	60.8%	6.3%	23%	-3%	40%	-7%
University of Wisconsin – Madison	12.0%	0%	57%	1%	43%	-1%	27.0%	3.1%	12%	-1%	53%	-16%
University of Arkansas	12.2%	-1.2%	49%	-4%	51%	4%	21.2%	2.1%	20%	-2%	63%	0%
University of Florida	12.3%	-3.2%	83%	-5%	16%	5%	44.3%	3.5%	23%	-6%	46%	2%
University of North Dakota	12.7%	4.2%	36%	4%	64%	-5%	13.9%	0.2%	17%	-4%	84%	13%
University of Oregon	15.6%	2.3%	48%	0%	53%	2%	39.3%	2.7%	26%	3%	78%	5%
The University of Montana	15.7%	-8.3%	64%	-10%	36%	10%	20.4%	4.5%	34%	-6%	92%	-2%
University of Colorado Boulder	16.6%	3.6%	53%	-4%	47%	5%	33.8%	8.1%	15%	-2%	77%	-7%
University at Buffalo	17.2%	1.8%	84%	2%	16%	-2%	50.8%	2.0%	33%	2%	59%	2%
University of Washington – Seattle	18.1%	3.7%	68%	1%	32%	0	61.1%	1.7%	20%	-2%	45%	-13%
University of Minnesota – Twin Cities	18.5%	2.3%	64%	1%	35%	-1%	28.9%	3.8%	18%	-3%	44%	-6%
University of Hawaii at Manoa	18.5%	0.6%	66%	-2%	33%	1%	82.3%	1.0%	28%	0%	85%	7%
University of Alaska Fairbanks	19.2%	3.8%	89%	0%	11%	0%	48.4%	-16.4%	26%	-1%	73%	-
University of Maryland – College Park	20.5%	-5.9%	69%	0%	30%	-1%	45.8%	-0.3%	13%	-2%	48%	1%
University of Delaware	20.6%	2.8%	38%	-2%	62%	3%	29.7%	7.8%	14%	0%	70%	11%
The University of Tennessee – Knoxville	20.6%	-0.5%	82%	-8%	17%	6%	21.7%	1.6%	27%	-3%	77%	10%
Rutgers University – New Brunswick	21.3%	2.3%	82%	-5%	17%	4%	64.6%	5.5%	27%	-2%	57%	-4%
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	21.6%	2.8%	74%	-1%	25%	2%	56.1%	7.2%	24%	3%	60%	-3%

Flagship	Tuition Discount		Percent in-state FTFT		Percent out-of-state FTFT		Percent nonwhite FTFT		Percent Pell FTFT		Percent Admitted	
	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012
University of Virginia – main campus	21.9%	2.7%	66%	1%	34%	-1%	42.6%	4.5%	12%	1%	30%	0%
University of New Mexico – main campus	22.6%	3.0%	83%	-5%	16%	5%	70.2%	3.2%	39%	1%	58%	-6%
University of South Dakota	23.3%	4.4%	61%	0%	36%	-2%	19.0%	6.4%	28%	-1%	88%	39%
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College	23.5%	4.2%	81%	2%	19%	-2%	27.4%	0.6%	23%	0%	76%	-4%
Indiana University – Bloomington	23.6%	1.5%	57%	-4%	43%	5%	30.1%	4.4%	19%	0%	79%	5%
West Virginia University	24.9%	8.1%	45%	3%	55%	-4%	20.5%	4.1%	28%	2%	76%	-9%
University of California – Berkeley	25.0%	-2.9%	76%	5%	24%	-5%	74.4%	0.1%	19%	-8%	17%	-5%
University of Iowa	28.0%	2.4%	50%	3%	50%	-3%	26.8%	0.0%	22%	2%	84%	6%
University of Arizona	28.1%	-9.3%	55%	-5%	44%	5%	45.9%	1.1%	26%	-4%	79%	8%
University of Utah	29.0%	8.6%	69%	-1%	29%	0	31.1%	-1.3%	22%	-2%	76%	-7%
University of Massachusetts – Amherst	29.3%	9.6%	71%	0%	26%	-1%	39.0%	8.2%	22%	0%	60%	-3%
University of Kansas	29.7%	7.5%	57%	-11%	43%	12%	26.6%	3.4%	23%	1%	93%	0%
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor	29.9%	6.8%	51%	-7%	49%	7%	38.4%	2.2%	16%	2%	29%	-8%
University of Missouri – Columbia	30.5%	5.8%	66%	3%	34%	-3%	18.8%	-2.2%	19%	-4%	75%	-6%
University of New Hampshire – main campus	30.5%	2.3%	41%	-4%	59%	5%	15.5%	-7.0%	21%	-2%	76%	-2%
University of Oklahoma – Norman campus	31.3%	9.3%	58%	-2%	42%	5%	37.0%	1.7%	22%	-1%	71%	-8%
University of Wyoming	33.1%	24.1%	51%	1%	46%	-2%	24.1%	8.2%	19%	-1%	95%	-1%
University of Connecticut	33.3%	4.9%	66%	-5%	34%	6%	44.8%	3.0%	20%	2%	49%	4%
University of Kentucky	34.4%	0.4%	61%	-6%	38%	6%	25.6%	1.5%	24%	-1%	91%	23%
University of Maine	34.6%	6.6%	56%	-17%	44%	16%	15.3%	-4.8%	29%	-13%	90%	12%
University of Rhode Island	36.3%	2.7%	44%	-4%	56%	5%	26.3%	-4.4%	24%	-2%	73%	-12%
Ohio State University – main campus	36.9%	-1.1%	67%	-8%	34%	9%	33.0%	5.5%	16%	-3%	54%	-10%
University of Nebraska – Lincoln	37.9%	7.3%	70%	-7%	28%	6%	24.4%	5.2%	24%	0%	75%	11%
University of Mississippi	38.0%	5.9%	43%	-5%	57%	5%	20.4%	-3.4%	22%	-4%	78%	17%

Flagship	Tuition Discount		Percent in-state FTFT		Percent out-of-state FTFT		Percent nonwhite FTFT		Percent Pell FTFT		Percent Admitted	
	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012	2016	Change from 2012
University of Idaho	39.2%	-2.9%	72%	2%	26%	-1%	26.8%	6.7%	39%	1%	76%	15%
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	43.0%	0.5%	83%	0%	17%	1%	37%	4.1%	19%	-1%	27%	-6%
The University of Alabama	45.2%	8.5%	32%	-13%	68%	13%	19.5%	-0.9%	17%	-1%	53%	0%
University of Vermont	47.8%	12.9%	21%	-2%	63%	-14%	12.9%	-0.3%	15%	-5%	69%	-8%