Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Regents
Murray State University
Friday, June 7, 2013
Jesse Stuart Room – Pogue Library

Call to Order/Roll Call

Constantine Curris called the Special Meeting of the Murray State University (MSU) Board of Regents (BOR) to order at 8:05 a.m. in the Jesse Stuart Room in Pogue Library on the main campus of Murray State University.

The roll was called and the following members were present: Marilyn Buchanon, Constantine Curris, Renee Fister, Sharon Green, Susan Guess, Jeremiah Johnson, Phil Schooley, Jenny Sewell, Harry Lee Waterfield II and Stephen Williams. Absent: Jerry Sue Thornton.

Chair Curris reported Regent Thornton earlier asked to be excused from this meeting due to a gala being hosted in her honor upon her retirement from Cuyahoga Community College.

Others present were: Randy J. Dunn, President; Jill Hunt, Senior Executive Coordinator for the President, Coordinator for Board Relations and Secretary to the Board of Regents; Tom Denton, Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services and Treasurer to the Board of Regents; Bonnie Higginson, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Don Robertson, Vice President for Student Affairs; Jim Carter, Vice President for Institutional Advancement; Jay Morgan, Associate Provost for Graduate Education and Research and Provost-elect; Renae Duncan, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Bob Jackson, Associate Vice President for Institutional Advancement; Jackie Dudley, Senior Director for Accounting and Financial Services; John Rall, General Counsel; Joshua Jacobs, Chief of Staff; and members of the faculty, staff, students, news media and visitors.

Agenda

Call to Order/Roll Call — **Dr. Curris**

Personnel Changes — **Dr. Curris**
A. Appointment of Interim President
B. Appointment of Interim Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services

Committee Reports/Recommendations

A. Buildings and Grounds
1) MGT of America, Inc. – Student Housing Strategic Plan
2) 2013 Campus Master Plan Update
3) City of Murray Proposal – Fire Department/Truck Acquisition

B. Finance — **Mr. Williams**
1) FY14 University Budget

Board Organizational Issues — **Dr. Curris**

A. 2013-14 Board of Regents Meeting Dates
B. Appointment of Treasurer to the Board of Regents for 2013-14

Adjournment

Personnel Changes

Appointment of Interim President, approved

Mr. Waterfield moved that the Board of Regents approve the appointment of Dr. Thomas I. Miller as Interim President at a fiscal year salary of $266,286, with the effective date of that appointment being the resignation date of current President Dr. Randy J. Dunn who is assuming

the presidency at Youngstown State University. Mrs. Buchanon seconded and, there being no further discussion, the roll was called with the following voting: Mrs. Buchanon, yes; Dr. Fister, yes; Mrs. Green, yes; Mrs. Guess, yes; Mr. Johnson, yes; Mr. Schooley, yes; Mrs. Sewell, yes; Mr. Waterfield, yes; Mr. Williams, yes; and Dr. Curris, yes. The motion carried unanimously.

Appointment of Interim Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services, approved

Dr. Dunn reported that Jackie Dudley, Senior Director for Accounting and Financial Services, is being recommended to serve as Interim Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services. She is well-prepared to take on this role and the appointment is highly recommended.

Mr. Williams moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, approve the appointment of Jackie Dudley as Interim Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services for fiscal year 2013-14 at a salary of $137,972, effective July 1, 2013. Mrs. Green seconded and Mr. Schooley called for the question. Dr. Curris indicated there has been a call for the question and asked whether anyone objects to voting at this time. Hearing no objection, the roll was called with the following voting: Mrs. Buchanon, yes; Dr. Fister, yes; Mrs. Green, yes; Mrs. Guess, yes; Mr. Johnson, yes; Mr. Schooley, yes; Mrs. Sewell, yes; Mr. Waterfield, yes; Mr. Williams, yes; and Dr. Curris, yes. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Dudley thanked the Board for the confidence it has placed in her today.

Chair Curris reported that due to the schedule this morning the traditional approach taken to BOR meetings will be modified and the Board will now recess into the Buildings and Grounds Committee and subsequently the Finance Committee. He asked Vice Chair Marilyn Buchanon to serve as Interim Chair of the Buildings and Grounds Committee and once that meeting has been completed the Committee will go back into public session so any agenda items requiring action can be voted upon by the full Board. The same procedure will be followed for the Finance Committee.

Committee Reports/Recommendations

Buildings and Grounds Committee

Marilyn Buchanon, Interim Chair
Renee Fister
Susan Guess
Jeremiah Johnson
Harry Lee Waterfield II

MGT of America, Inc. – Student Housing Strategic Plan, discussed

Mrs. Buchanon reported all Buildings and Grounds Committee members were present. In July 2012 the University contracted with MGT of America, Incorporated to provide the University with a strategic plan for housing over the next ten years. In March 2013 the Board was presented with a summary of those findings, voted to table approval of the study at that time and asked for an additional financial analysis to be undertaken to include a 90 percent occupancy assumption (as well as the 95 percent occupancy assumption originally presented). Kim Oatman, Chief Facilities Officer, presented the following:

- The MGT of America, Inc. study was first presented to the Board in March 2013 and additional information has been collected since that time regarding the financial model (Appendix A) which includes the 90 percent occupancy assumption.
- Information on recent occupancy rates was provided with an indication that occupancy varies from Fall to Spring semesters but average occupancy over the past few years has been 90 percent.
- The consultants indicated from their experience in this field once a University renovates the various facilities or builds new ones housing demand increases. They are comfortable with the 95 percent occupancy rate projection originally presented. The newly-renovated buildings, as well as the newly-constructed buildings, have a current waiting list for students desiring to live in those facilities and willing to pay extra to do so. The consultants do not believe there will be any issue maintaining 95 percent occupancy, although the financial model based on 90 percent occupancy has been provided as per the Board's request. In each year, beginning in 2012 and continuing until 2046, the housing

system model in terms of net income does not go into the red in any year. Numbers are even higher assuming 95 percent occupancy.

- The housing projection model provided is based on a 1 percent annual enrollment increase representing a conservative estimate because historically enrollment has increased at a higher percentage.
- The housing study does not include a year-by-year rate structure for each facility and University administration utilized information provided in the study to compile a spreadsheet which illustrates this information (Appendix B). This provides information on the housing rates per year even after renovation and building new facilities. At a previous meeting the Board approved adopting the rate structure provided for this year based on information from this plan which puts the University at a base year and thereafter there will be a 4 percent increase for each building each year, with the exception of when a new building is constructed or an existing facility is renovated. In those instances there will be an increase immediately following occupancy in those new facilities with that rate increase going to 4 percent in the years following. Increases greater than 4 percent are in bold on the spreadsheet provided which is broken down by building renovation, new construction and existing facilities which have experienced no change. Clarification was provided that housing rates have increased by 4 percent beginning this year and every year thereafter there will be a 4 percent increase in every building with the exception that after a facility is renovated or newly-constructed and comes online there will be a greater than 4 percent increase in the first year but years following will represent a 4 percent increase.
- The Board is being asked to adopt this plan but each year will be asked to approve the housing rate structure as well as the cost associated with new structures coming online as part of the Capital Plan. Adoption of this plan will provide the University administration with guidance moving forward.
- Confirmation was provided that the consultant's report originally presented addressed the residential college system at Murray State being viewed by some as tired and reviewing this system was recommended although the consultants were favorably disposed toward maintaining the residential college system. The entire study was based on the assumption the residential college system would be retained and the question was asked whether this review has occurred. Mr. Oatman reported one of the goals was to review the residential college system, gather information through the survey process and meet with various individuals across campus to determine the viability and functionality of the current system. The consultants conducted a financial analysis on the cost of the residential college system and determined if the system were abandoned a new structure would need to be developed to continue offering current programming. The system was determined to be viable but also needed upgrades, including periodic evaluation. The question was asked whether there was anything to suggest this study should be undertaken outside of MGT of America and Dr. Dunn indicated their finding was as Mr. Oatman stated. The administration must determine how to address this recommendation moving forward. To this point nothing has been done because the housing study has not been adopted but, with Board approval, discussion can take place among appropriate staff as to how to move forward to undertake an appropriate review of the current residential college system.

MGT of America, Inc. – Student Housing Strategic Plan, adopted

On behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Mrs. Buchanon moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, adopt the Student Housing Strategic Plan as prepared by MGT of America, Inc., upon the condition that each new construction or renovation project be subsequently approved in the Capital Plan process and that each housing rate increase will subsequently be presented to the Board for approval. Mrs. Guess seconded and all Committee members voted yes with the exception of Mr. Johnson who voted no. The motion carried.

2013 Campus Master Plan Update, discussed

Mrs. Buchanon reported that the Campus Master Plan is approved periodically by the Board. The plan was last approved and updated in 2007 and in June 2012 the University contracted with M2dDesign Group (Element Designs) to update the Campus Master Plan. Mr. Oatman thanked all involved in the process and specifically mentioned Mr. Denton, Dr. Dunn, Dr. Higginson and the Deans who all provided support and input. It is believed the work undertaken will be helpful to the University moving forward with not only campus planning but also space planning for the academic colleges. Mark Arnold with Element Designs and John Whitney, Landscape Architect and planner who undertook the 2007 update, presented the following:

- The Master Plan takes into consideration the mission, purpose and guiding principles for the University. The physiography of the area was reviewed to provide an understanding of how Murray State fits regionally (includes satellite campus facilities).
- Architectural style is an important element on a college campus and should be studied carefully. MSU has an architectural style which represents a progression from the early 1900s, with a more

modern sense in the 1960s and 1970s, to today. A team has undertaken an inventory and analysis to determine where the University currently stands and from this work outlines projects observed as being desirable as well as those suggested by faculty and staff. From those projects alternative sketches are developed and shared allowing for continual input from the various campus constituencies in order to make general recommendations. A good Campus Master Plan will take the next step and begin to develop a series of guidelines in terms of how to develop architecture on campus, including landscape and open space development. Following this work key Master Plan recommendations are made and illustrated with concepts.

- A Planning Committee worked with the academic Deans, representing the core committee throughout the process. The Committee defined the mission, purpose and guiding principles of the University and discussed the physiography of MSU.
- The concept behind the MSU satellite campuses was reviewed and took into consideration growth on those campuses. Projected future needs and issues were also considered. Mr. Oatman reported the previous Campus Master Plan documents did not include a great deal of information about the satellite campuses. A determination was made that most of the satellite campuses have ample room to grow and there are options for future buildings and parking. A Master Plan for all the satellite campuses allows those entities to grow in an organized fashion.
- An aerial view of the MSU campus from 1962 was provided and illustrates how the campus looked before many of the positive changes which have taken place over the last 40 to 50 years were implemented.
- Element Designs walked through campus to define special areas and write about the character of those areas. The Quad represents a key area on campus but the West Campus and the Science Campus were also deemed to be special. Once this work was completed Element Designs worked with Facilities Management staff to update the base map and the existing campus map provided represents exactly the current number of facilities and parking areas on campus. It is important to understand the important traditions that occur on a college campus and for MSU this includes the Shoe Tree and these traditions help Element Designs understand the special quality of the landscape. A review of existing architecture was also undertaken and Pogue Library was deemed one of the most beautiful buildings on campus. A determination must be made in terms of how to continue to capture the essence of the original Georgian style which is prevalent on campus. Over the past 15 years facilities which have been constructed do capture that essence.
- A review of previous planning studies was undertaken to provide a sense of recommendations which have been made but not implemented. This work is key to reviewing the study undertaken 25 years ago to determine which recommendations were important at that time and what factors changed the level of importance so the recommendations have not been implemented.
- An inventory and analysis process is then undertaken in terms of looking at campus precincts and defining those zones where academics, residential life, recreational activities, service activities and administrative activities take place to determine how the campus is currently utilized.
- Circulation patterns are studied and areas where conflicts between vehicular and pedestrians exist have been identified. Discussions with the City of Murray have been underway for a few years to enhance the five-points intersection. Element Designs was provided with an opportunity to look at all alternatives for this particular area although the selected option includes a roundabout. From a planning perspective this option can be supported because a roundabout provides an option for a very strong campus focal point as well as a branding opportunity for the University. In response to a question regarding where the roundabout stands in the city and state planning process, it was indicated the state has moved forward with designing the roundabout but the project has not been funded for construction. Once the project has been designed that is an indication it will proceed once funded and most recent discussion has indicated this could occur in 2016 or 2017 although projected dates could change.
- In terms of parking, lots closest to campus buildings are full and ones that are farther away are not. Individuals naturally want to be able to park as close to a building as possible. Data shows that 36 percent of all parking on campus is empty representing approximately 60 percent utilization of available parking. There are 7,019 available parking spaces being maintained and approximately 4,500 are utilized. This presents an opportunity to strategically consider parking throughout campus to determine where it conflicts with residential life and the academic core and begin to push some parking out. Once these areas are limited the parking usage numbers for lots on the outer edge of campus will increase. It is not desirable to have parking located between residential life facilities or within the academic core. An observation was made that the data presented was collected during a week in October which represented the University's Fall Break and a suggestion was made for this work to be undertaken differently because many vacation during that time and the numbers may need to be adjusted to take this into account. Agreement was reached this factor could be responsible for a slightly higher vacancy rate. Assurance was provided that as options for removing campus parking are being considered work is also underway to identify how those spaces can be replaced outside of campus. Mr. Oatman indicated a majority of surplus parking is located in the Stewart Stadium parking lot. Parking is an issue on a college campus and this discussion must occur but all are in touch with the needs of the college student today and this also represents a key issue among faculty and staff. Information on parking radius areas on campus which represent a five to ten-minute walk

to any building within those areas was provided. The MSU campus has definitely been deemed walkable and is not spread out. The majority of parking – even at the perimeter – is well within a ten-minute radius which is positive in terms of developing a more pedestrian friendly campus. Some years ago a portion of 15th Street was closed and this represents a wonderful spine which allows students to move from the residential area into the academic area of campus by crossing the bridge over Chestnut Street.

- An analysis of existing site amenities was undertaken including benches, lighting and waste receptacles and these elements represents a major factor to consider in guiding the campus into the future. A walk-through of each of the zones on campus was conducted to describe what those areas feel like and identify and define the highlights of the campus landscape in order to preserve those particular areas.
- The University currently has in place a system of signage on campus that is well done and organized. Element Designs does not have a large number of recommendations in this area because MSU does better than most.
- The Planning Committee outlined projects with MSU staff to consider possibilities and opportunities for the future. This included athletics, parking lot improvements, tennis courts, Motor Pool, Paint Shop, green space at the end of Waldrop Drive to the five-point area, 12th Street, 16th Street and preservation of the Science Campus open space and linking it to the main campus across 16th Street. Element Designs was included in early studies of where a future Library would be located and the most recent studies have been incorporated in the information provided, along with some recommendations. One of the most charming areas on the Murray State campus is 15th Street and on campuses across the nation there are "Town and Gown" districts where residential and commercial life are intertwined. This represents an opportunity to energize that area of campus. Studies for a new University Library were discussed and an illustration of the "Town and Gown" atmosphere was provided and included cafes and bookstores on the first level along 15th Street with student housing above those businesses. This represents a long-term plan and will likely involve public-private partnerships that are not included in the campus housing study.
- A series of alternatives for 16th Street has also been developed to determine viable ways to provide a loop drive west of the Science Campus (incorporating new parking areas) and establish a boulevard loop which will open up that area and allow the east campus to connect to the Science Campus by creating an open lawn area. Improvements to parking areas attached to the athletic facilities were also reviewed. A more viable option for 16th Street provides gateways such as key card gates on the north and south to allow existing streets to become a looping network while providing access to current parking facilities that will be utilized only by campus traffic. The open space could then be utilized for pedestrian flow although campus service vehicles and emergency vehicles would still be allowed. This represents the creation of a pedestrian street which would eliminate some of the conflict which currently exists. This option is the least expensive and easiest to achieve for 16th Street. The goal is to engage in this conversation in terms of the Campus Master Plan but it is also known this will require a great deal of coordination with the City of Murray. Mr. Oatman indicated information was provided in terms of initiatives the City is already reviewing and considering. Over the last five years 75 accidents have occurred in this particular area in terms of pedestrian and vehicular conflicts because there are 10,000 vehicles utilizing 16th Street per day and 4,000 students crossing back and forth.
- Highlights from the Housing Study were reviewed to determine what those recommendations mean in terms of facilities and renovations and new facilities will eventually be incorporated into the Campus Master Plan.
- The objective of the academic planning process and subsequent analysis was to develop a reasonable 2020 estimate for increases in student and staff full-time equivalency (FTE) and evaluate that growth in terms of existing facilities and the potential for new facilities. The information presented in the new growth and needs analysis is based on the 2007 Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) statewide summary, facility condition assessment and space study project. It is also based on the 2011 CPE space needs model comparison to existing space as well as historical student, staff and full-time enrollment; information gathered from the Deans and ongoing input from the administration.
- The General Fund, Agency Bond Authorization and capital requests submitted by MSU to the Commonwealth for specific projects have also been taken into consideration. The end result of this work is a predicted realistic annual growth rate for the University of 2.95 percent annually through 2020. This growth rate is more than that presented earlier but is less than that predicted by the CPE – which represented a prediction for MSU to grow by nearly 6 percent annually. It is not known how the CPE developed that percentage and all universities in the state have experienced difficulty in meeting the perceived unrealistic CPE predictions. What is being presented represents a better projection in terms of actual realizable growth. The growth rate of 2.95 percent represents an aggregate of the growth in each of the MSU colleges and an extensive process of determining realistic growth rates was undertaken in each of those units. A series of meetings have been held to work toward this goal. Realistic growth rates per year in each of the colleges were determined as follows: Hutson School of Agriculture (2 percent), Arthur J. Bauernfeind College of Business (2.5 percent), Continuing Education and Academic Outreach (1 percent), Education (1.5 percent), Humanities and Fine Arts (3.5 percent), Health Sciences and Human Services (5 percent), School of Nursing (3

percent) and Science, Engineering and Technology (2.5 percent). The conclusions which were reached as a result of these work sessions were presented in a table which begins with a 2012 baseline and a 2020 target year projection established by the CPE. The results compare the CPE's aggressive projection of a 5.99 percent annual growth rate to a more nuanced 2.95 percent realistic annual expansion rate that was developed based on these discussions. The CPE 2012 base year, modified to incorporate Murray State's actual student enrollment, indicates the assignable square footage for the University is currently 1,330,911 square feet. This represents a surplus of space and all are aware the CPE has standards that are difficult for most state universities to meet. According to the CPE, Murray State currently has a surplus of 345,831 assignable square feet. If the University were to grow at the CPE rate of 5.99 percent, by 2020 there would be a deficit and a need for new buildings but this type of growth is not what is being observed. A more realistic growth rate is 2.95 percent but this still projects a campus-wide surplus of space and even with a nearly 3 percent growth each year the University will have surplus space totaling about 91,000 to 92,000 square feet. This could imply there is not a need to build any new buildings but also represents a quantitative analysis and includes raw square footage, not necessarily whether that square footage is ideally suited for the necessary function. There will be a surplus of nearly 123,000 square feet in support space on campus in 2020, a surplus of nearly 30,000 square feet for open labs, 28,000 square feet for research labs, a surplus of 20,000 square feet for physical education and recreation and a surplus of 12,000 square feet for classrooms. The University will also have a deficit of 18,000 square feet for teaching labs, a campus-wide deficit of 53,400 square feet for offices and 49,500 square feet for special and general use facilities. There will be a need in 2020 for new facilities on campus and this would be justifiable to the CPE. The deficits total approximately 121,000 square feet and by 2020 there is no doubt renovation and repurposing of Blackburn Science, upon the completion of the proposed Engineering and Physics Building and the renovation and repurposing of Waterfield and Pogue libraries (assuming a new Library is constructed), will affect space deficits. It is reasonable to conclude there is justification for some new construction on the MSU campus.

- The Hutson School of Agriculture has experienced remarkable growth over the past five years and is proposing a continued realistic growth rate of approximately 2 percent per year. It is possible to conclude growth in this college may be accommodated utilizing surplus main campus facilities but the School of Agriculture does not believe this would be ideal, especially with regard to current labs or centralized main campus facilities. It may be reasonable to plan to consolidate current agriculture facilities – whether through renovation or new construction. In January Element Designs discussed this issue with the President and at that time proposed the solution was for agriculture to move out of the Applied Science Building (currently occupying 21,000 square feet), moving the College of Health Sciences and Human Services into that building and developing a new or repurposed facility for the Hutson School of Agriculture.
- The Arthur J. Bauernfeind College of Business has a 2.5 percent realistic growth rate projected and with the CPE calculated surplus of classroom space it is not likely this College will need any significant renovation of current facilities and/or construction of new facilities to address 2020 needs.
- The Center for Continuing Education and Academic Outreach is projecting a 1 percent growth rate and essentially is in good shape and, once the new Paducah Regional Campus facility and Madisonville Postsecondary Education Center are completed, there should be very little need for additional facility development in this unit.
- The College of Education experienced negative growth during 2009 to 2012 but is projecting a modest increase as it moves toward 2020. The relatively recent renovation of College of Education facilities indicates it should be able to address current growth needs – through underused and surplus main campus facilities. Approximately 6,000 square feet of classroom and office space will be needed, along with additional laboratory space and it has been suggested a possible plan for future action would be to move any Health Sciences and Human Services entities out of Alexander Hall (currently occupying nearly 7,000 square feet) and allowing the College of Education (currently occupying 53,000 to 54,000 square feet) to take over the entire building.
- The College of Humanities and Fine Arts experienced above-average growth between 2009 and 2012 of 3.5 percent annually and projects continuing that growth into 2020. Due to the size of the college and the strong growth projected it is highly probable it will not be able to address growth with under-used and surplus main campus facilities and will require classroom and office facilities equal to approximately 17,000 square feet (in addition to laboratory facilities). This college represents the largest 2020 estimated increase and will clearly require development of additional built facilities to accommodate the projected demand. One solution – out of many possibilities – could be to shift the Department of Mathematics and Statistics out of Faculty Hall into Blackburn Science Building. The College of Humanities and Fine Arts occupies approximately 45,000 square feet of Faculty Hall and it would be feasible for the college to fill the building to bring it closer to addressing 2020 needs. Agreement was reached that discussion must occur with regard to maintaining enhancements which have been undertaken within the Department of Mathematics and Statistics to ensure they are maintained or enhanced if relocated in a different facility. The College of Humanities and Fine Arts has a large number of students and is experiencing significant growth and if that growth materializes as predicted additional facilities will be needed.

- The College of Health Sciences and Human Services (HSHS) has predicted strong growth to 2020 and will require 8,000 to 9,000 square feet of additional office, classroom and laboratory space. It may be feasible to consolidate HSHS facilities – whether through renovation or new construction – and move Hutson School of Agriculture operations out of the Applied Sciences Building to allow HSHS to occupy the entire facility.
- Growth in the School of Nursing has decreased somewhat between 2009 and 2012 but projects solid growth in the future. It is not believed any additional facilities will be required to address this growth.
- The *Jesse D. Jones* College of Science, Engineering and Technology (CSET) has projected a 2.5 percent annual growth rate through 2020 but it is not likely any additional capital projects or new construction will be required. Recent projects and the proposed Engineering and Physics Building will accommodate any growth with little renovation or new construction.
- Mr. Oatman reported any discussion of moving individual units centered on an effort to consolidate the colleges in their own buildings because currently they are spread out throughout different locations on campus. Each planning project must eventually evolve into a Capital Plan project and additional information will continue to be provided to the Board.
- If the University grows at the projected rate by 2020 there will be justification for one new building although what that will be in terms of the colleges has yet been decided.
- In response to a Regent request, agreement was reached that reference to "if" a Paducah Regional Campus is constructed would be changed to "when."
- A Regent indicated the College of Education experienced negative growth over three consecutive years of one-half of one percent but a projection is being made for 2.5 percent growth and inquired as to the basis for expecting such growth. It was stated some colleges were more optimistic than others in their projections. The College of Education is optimistic in terms of the type of growth it will experience moving forward. In meeting with the Deans an attempt was made to focus on and justify why they believe the growth being projected in their colleges will be realized. This process has not been completed and additional evaluation will be undertaken. Mr. Oatman added the Ed.D. Program has recently been initiated in the College of Education and will likely help increase growth in that college. Dr. Dunn indicated a more proactive approach will be undertaken in the College of Education because over the last two years there has been an Interim Dean and two years before that there was not a great deal of activity in terms of moving the College forward. A permanent Dean is now in place and this represents an opportunity to increase growth.
- Confirmation was provided that each college gave justification to support the growth projections presented. A great deal of modification took place throughout the process and included a review of optimistic, pessimistic and realistic projections. Growth in each of the colleges over the past five years was reviewed which resulted in more realistic projections that could be supported with justifications based on the historical record.
- Confirmation was provided that Ordway Hall square footage was not included in the number presented and Woods Hall represents approximately 93,000 square feet. In terms of how much square footage in Woods Hall is currently being utilized, it was reported actual occupied space represents roughly one-third of the building with a majority being used for storage.
- Dr. Dunn cautioned that growth projections do not necessarily support making big changes within an individual college but all should be concerned about consolidating a College within one building – such as what has been proposed for HSHS and Agriculture – where a strong history of growth has been observed.
- In response to a question regarding whether a space utilization study was undertaken in terms of the hours particular spaces are used – the amount of space being utilized and for what number of students – Mr. Oatman indicated space utilization per classroom was not independently reviewed. The formula which was utilized is the same formula used by the CPE. It has been assumed the CPE has a stringent outlook on the actual utilization of space and this represents one issue where the CPE believes classroom space should be in operation from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. five days per week. This is one reason why there is a high surplus of space on college campuses in Kentucky. Assurance was provided this work has been undertaken internally although it is not part of the analysis presented.
- Guidelines in terms of open space on campus focused on LEED-friendly site development, biofiltration rain gardens and a higher development of service parking areas that include biofiltration zones, representing a "green take" on open space development on campus. General recommendations in terms of building new walkways through outdoor open areas – plazas, steps, ramps and railings – have also been included in the information submitted to provide guidance on maintaining a campus with high-quality construction throughout. This includes site furniture such as durable benches, tables, bike racks and trash receptacles of the appropriate style and some recommendations have been made on pulling together a consistent landscape theme. These recommendations will fit nicely with the new Georgian style and the traditional historic Georgian style but will also work in areas with buildings constructed in the 1960s and 1970s.
- General recommendations in terms of landscape were provided and include ground covering, flowers and vines representing foliage which would be suitable for this area. Also included were native species which could be incorporated into the landscape and a listing produced by the state of numerous invasive species to be avoided.

- General recommendations were provided for parking and circulation, including lighting and architectural design guidelines. Particularly favorable is the design of the Science Campus which has a strong Georgian style that was implemented well.
- Key Master Plan recommendations include:
  - Improvements to the parking area at Stewart Stadium which is currently a very large asphalt area representing a "heat island." Consideration should be given to "greening up" the area by eliminating parking spaces and replacing those with trees and shrubs to soften and green that space. There is also an opportunity to consider solar shade structures – similar to a solar farm – which is included in the Campus Master Plan.
  - Waldrop Drive – particularly in the residential college area where there are many potential conflict zones and how some areas could be closed off to vehicular use while allowing for service and emergency vehicles
  - Hart College – includes the development of two additional buildings in this location which was included in the Housing Study. It is strongly recommended all Hart College parking be removed and new perimeter parking locations developed. The area around Hart College should be "greened up" to provide a green walk from the academic buildings, across Chestnut Street, to the residential colleges, representing a courtyard style.
  - Science Complex – determining what can happen to eliminate 16th Street conflict and a more refined version of the 16th Street alternative was provided with a campus entrance gate that would allow for service of existing facilities and parking in terms of a loop or turnaround. A key-activated gate would provide access to existing parking areas but the goal is to create mainly pedestrian flow in this location and link the two campuses together. The Science Campus must be tied into the main campus with open space and without a major roadway running through it and what was presented represents that initial step. Long-term projects were also included and take into consideration new building locations which could augment that space (potentially a parking structure with the lower decks being for parking and the upper decks being utilized for classroom or other facilities). This plan would be workable with construction of the new Engineering and Physics Building.
  - 15th Street – includes a previously-suggested location for a new Library facility where Ordway and Woods halls are currently located. A placeholder was included for a potential location for another academic facility but not earmarked for any one particular college. This Town and Gown development would be viewed as a public-private partnership project, not the development of traditional dormitories. If the new Library is moved into the proposed area an Ordway Garden could be feasible to provide access through a main atrium space into the Library while also becoming strongly connected with the 15th Street mall area. The space formerly occupied by Ordway Hall would become a historic garden and could include statues, sculptures and outdoor reading areas. This represents an area with a great deal of potential for the University.
  - The state recommendation for five-points with the key of capturing the green spot in the middle to represent a potential branding opportunity for the campus
  - In terms of parking, a realignment on Gilbert Graves where Facilities Management is located going into the General Services Building is being proposed because there is currently an awkward connection which takes place between these road access points. Vehicular conflict currently takes place in this area and if these two points could be lined up that conflict could be reduced significantly. This recommendation was included in the 1970 Master Plan but has not been implemented.
  - A general enhancement and improvement to Regents and White residential colleges within the parking area would allow for sidewalk improvement with setbacks, landscaping and road alignments. This could become a much cleaner and pedestrian-friendly area. It is not being recommended that the roads be removed at this point.

2013 Campus Master Plan Update, accepted

On behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Mr. Waterfield moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, accept the 2013 Campus Master Plan Update. Mr. Johnson seconded and the motion carried.

City of Murray Proposal – Fire Department/Truck Acquisition, discussed

Mr. Denton introduced City of Murray Fire Chief Eric Pologruto and Finance Director Alan Lanier who presented the following:

- On behalf of the City of Murray, appreciation was expressed for the opportunity to address the Board.
- The tower ladder truck currently in service was purchased in June 1993 from Emergency I in Ocala, Florida, and soon after the truck arrived the City and Murray State entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) where details were outlined, including which entity would be responsible for maintenance, fuel and repairs.

- The City Fire Department averages approximately $2,600 per year in fuel and insurance costs for the current apparatus. Over the past 2 ½ years this particular truck has experienced significant repairs which has had a financial impact on the City. More importantly, the amount of time this truck has been out of service essentially leaves MSU and the City without any type of aerial ladder device protection. The most recent breakdown occurred about six weeks ago and involved the electrical harness which supplies electrical power to the ladder as well as the hydraulics. The truck was sent to Bowling Green, Kentucky, for repairs with the hope it would be returned within two to three weeks. Due to the age of the truck, however, the wiring harness is no longer produced and will need to be custom made. As of this date the truck remains out of service.
- The truck belongs to the University, as established in the partnership which was entered into in 1993, but MSU has allowed the City to use the equipment. Discussion needs to occur today with regard to continuing that partnership. The truck is at the end of its useful life, repair costs are continuing to escalate and it is reaching the point where the City has budgeted for and intends to purchase a replacement in the coming fiscal year. The City proposes continuing the partnership which began in 1993 and having the University transfer the title for the existing truck to the City for trade in purposes. In addition, the City is requesting $100,000 from the University to make up the difference in the cost of a truck that would provide protection for the City of Murray and one that would also provide protection for the high rise buildings at Murray State.
- A 75' aerial ladder truck typically costs between $600,000 to $650,000 and a 100' to 105' foot aerial ladder truck costs approximately $800,000 to $850,000 (straight-stick ladder). Currently the University owns a tower ladder and this type of truck costs between $1 million to $1.5 million. The 75' foot aerial ladder truck would provide necessary protection for the City but a 105' ladder would be required to provide protection for the MSU high rise buildings.
- In response to a Committee member's question, information on the cost of repairs was provided with an indication that, including this most recent repair, the cost for all repairs amounts to approximately $65,000 to $70,000. Over the past couple of years the truck has been out of service for five to six months due to necessary repairs.
- A question was asked regarding whether it would be feasible for the City to continue to make these repairs over the next year and then use funding MSU students have already provided through the city sticker tax to purchase the new truck. It was stated that a City Council member reported 2,629 city stickers were sold last year to MSU students and, even if purchased at the lowest price, this amounts to approximately $92,000 in revenue for the City. Western Kentucky University, Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) and Morehead State do not have a partnership with the City for fire protection. A question was asked whether a portion of the funding raised by the City from MSU students purchasing city stickers could be used toward the purchase of a new ladder truck. Most students feel the City's request represents "double dipping" from students and taxpayers because they have already paid this cost through the purchase of city stickers. It was indicated this is a valid point but all should consider the number of city stickers purchased by MSU students before last year when the specific exclusion for MSU students was removed. City sticker monies represent a licensing fee for vehicles and that money must be used for enforcement and administration of the licensing fee, road improvements, sidewalk repair and maintenance and cannot be transferred to another City fund.
- Agreement was reached that it is important not to jeopardize the safety of anyone in the City or the County and especially MSU students. It was stated the City has recently purchased a number of new vehicles and has undertaken other initiatives. The question was asked whether there could be another way to address this need. Revenue raised through MSU students purchasing city stickers last year and next year would more than cover the extra cost of the new ladder truck and the issue could be viewed from that perspective. The City and County already glean a great deal of funding from taxpayers working at Murray State.
- In 1993 the current truck was purchased for $600,000 and the University retains the title to that vehicle. Through an MOU established at that time the University allows the city to use the truck not only for University purposes but also for City purposes. The truck was purchased through a grant appropriation from the state.
- The trade-in value of the current truck is believed to be approximately $100,000 to $140,000. A 75' ladder truck is estimated to cost $600,000 and a 105' foot ladder truck would cost approximately $850,000 ($250,000 difference). It is hoped the City will be able to trade in the old truck for $150,000 and is requesting the University pay the remaining balance of $100,000 for a truck capable of servicing campus needs.
- The City intends to purchase the 75' foot ladder truck but it is hoped through these discussions the existing tower truck can be transferred to the City so the 75' ladder truck can be upgraded to a 105' ladder truck. If an agreement cannot be reached the current ladder truck would then be turned over to the University. Funding for the purchase of the 75' truck is included in this year's budget for the City and it generally takes seven to nine months to complete the purchase process.
- Confirmation was provided that the $100,000 being requested from the University could be spread out over time (possibly 5 years) and would not necessarily represent a lump sum payment.
- The current truck was purchased in 1993 through a grant appropriation to the University and MSU holds the title but the City has had effective control of the truck and has been responsible for operational costs. A question was asked about the number of times the truck has been used for calls

at the University and it was indicated the overwhelming majority of time the truck has gone out over the last two years was for Murray State. Excluding the University, there are very few structures in Murray requiring a 105' tower truck but those businesses are not being asked to contribute toward this purchase because the City already garners taxable revenue through property taxes from those entities. The Tower I truck is not only utilized for the high rises but also for any type of commercial structure fires. The purposes for an aerial ladder include rescue and the ability to provide an elevated master stream. There is not one truck that will provide everything needed each time it is called to a fire situation but a 75' tower truck would meet the majority of the needs of the remaining structures in Murray.

- It is believed this level of discussion would not be taking place were it not for the city sticker issue as it involves MSU students. It must also be noted studies have shown that each student that comes to Murray State contributes $6,000 to $8,000 per year to the economy of the area.
- Murray State is currently facing over $4 million in budget cuts and has laid off individuals, is making reductions and has increased fees. In terms of timing the City could not have picked a worse year to make this request. Confirmation was provided the City has pursued grant funding for this purchase but has been unsuccessful because the volume of those monies has decreased significantly over the past couple of years and continues to decrease.
- Since the Chief's arrival three years ago two new pumper trucks have been purchased so the Fire Department is adding to its fleet internally but this represents an area where in 1993 it was important enough to the University leadership to identify this as a need and indicate a willingness to help the City address the issue. Current University leadership is now being asked to do the same.
- Confirmation was provided that current monies raised through city sticker sales goes into the General Fund for road repairs and money could be reallocated to be used toward the purchase of the new fire truck but it was also stated the City has increased the road repair and sidewalk installation and maintenance budget for the coming year by nearly one-quarter of a million dollars. A reallocation from those funds into other areas could be done but the City has chosen not to proceed in this fashion. The intent of the city sticker license fee is to upgrade the City infrastructure. The Livability Grant received by the City for sidewalk enhancement is not included in the figure provided.
- Confirmation was provided that the safety of MSU students is most important and the safety of students, faculty and staff is why two pumper trucks have been added to the City's inventory. The marginal benefit of the extra $250,000 could be better utilized for pumper trucks, police cruisers and in other areas to help maintain and provide for the safety of MSU students.
- The constituency Regents are not pleased with the way the city sticker fee for MSU students was handled but the primary priority of the Board is to ensure the safety of students and attainment of the 105' truck must be assured. If the $100,000 can be spread over a five-year period that would be manageable although now is not the right time for the City to be making this request. It would be disconcerting for the University not to participate in this partnership but there should also be a message included with the approval. The college community does not feel good about how the city sticker issue has been handled with regard to MSU students. The University wants to be a good partner with the City and agrees the purchase of a new fire truck is necessary.
- Confirmation was provided that it may be possible to include the MSU logo on the new vehicle.

City of Murray Proposal – Fire Department/Truck Acquisition, approved

On behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Mr. Johnson moved that the Board of Regents approve deeding the current fire truck over to the City of Murray and creating a five-year payment plan with the City to total $100,000 for the procurement of a 105' foot ladder truck. Mr. Waterfield seconded and the motion carried.

Adjournment

The Murray State University Building and Grounds Committee adjourned at 10 a.m. and the full Board reconvened in Special Session.

Buildings and Grounds Committee – Mrs. Buchanon

MGT of America, Inc. – Student Housing Strategic Plan, adopted

On behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Mrs. Buchanon moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, adopt the Student Housing Strategic Plan as prepared by MGT of America, Inc., upon the condition that each new construction or renovation project be subsequently approved in the Capital Plan process and that each annual housing rate increase will subsequently be presented to the Board for approval. Dr. Fister seconded and the roll was called with the following voting: Mrs. Buchanon, yes; Dr.

Fister, yes; Mrs. Green, yes; Mrs. Guess, yes; Mr. Johnson, yes; Mr. Schooley, yes; Mrs. Sewell, yes; Mr. Waterfield, yes; Mr. Williams, yes; and Dr. Curris, yes. The motion carried.

(See Attachment #1)

2013 Campus Master Plan Update, accepted

Mrs. Buchanon reported the Buildings and Grounds Committee received a full report on the 2013 Campus Master Plan, including inventory, analysis of facilities, framework for potential projects, recommendations to address future growth and campus needs, including adequate space needs for each academic unit.

On behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Mrs. Buchanon moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, accept the 2013 Campus Master Plan update as presented. Mrs. Guess seconded and the roll was called with the following voting: Mrs. Buchanon, yes; Dr. Fister, yes; Mrs. Green, yes; Mrs. Guess, yes; Mr. Johnson, yes; Mr. Schooley, yes; Mrs. Sewell, yes; Mr. Waterfield, yes; Mr. Williams, yes; and Dr. Curris, yes. The motion carried.

(See Attachment #2)

Chair Curris noted that the Board voted to accept as opposed to approve the Campus Master Plan so the document can serve as a guideline. The Board has not signed off on anything specific in the plan.

City of Murray Proposal – Fire Department/Truck Acquisition, approved

On behalf of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, Mrs. Buchanon moved that the University enter into an agreement with the City of Murray to provide transfer of the current fire truck from the University to the City and that the University provide an additional $100,000 over a five-year period for the purchase of a new 105' ladder truck. Mr. Schooley seconded and the roll was called with the following voting: Mrs. Buchanon, yes; Dr. Fister, yes; Mrs. Green, yes; Mrs. Guess, yes; Mr. Johnson, yes; Mr. Schooley, yes; Mrs. Sewell, yes; Mr. Waterfield, yes; Mr. Williams, yes; and Dr. Curris, yes. The motion carried.

Adjournment

The Special Meeting of the Murray State University Board of Regents adjourned for a break beginning at 10:10 a.m.

Finance Committee

Stephen Williams, Chair
Marilyn Buchanon
Constantine Curris
Renee Fister

Mr. Williams called the Finance Committee meeting to order at 10:20 a.m. and reported all members were present.

FY14 University Budget, discussed

Mr. Williams indicated the Board has received all pertinent documents related to the Budget for the upcoming year electronically and the Finance Committee received a paper copy, with the remainder of the Board being provided with an opportunity to receive a paper copy if desired. Appreciation was expressed to Mr. Denton and Ms. Dudley and their staff for an excellent job incorporating all of the budget assumptions requested by the Board into the document presented. This work was done under particularly difficult circumstances. Carl Prestfeldt, Director for Fiscal Planning and Analysis and CPE Liaison, also provided significant work toward the document. Mr. Denton reported the following:

- A review of the Budget Executive Summary was provided and included a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures and a Statement of Changes in Revenue and Expenditures in the final Budget. There is an approximate $4.5 million increase in total budget this year (3 percent over prior year) with 2.3

percent being for the General Fund. Assumptions which have been made include a tuition and mandatory fee increase of 3 percent, enrollment growth rate of 1.5 percent, employee across-the-board raises of 3.5 percent, $1.9 million operating deficit in prior year, dining rate increase of 4 percent, approval of the first year of the residence hall plan and the budget reallocations and new revenues, including $4.9 million and a $1.1 million contingency.

- With regard to revenues, there was no increase to state appropriations and tuition increased on a gross basis by $5.1 million. Funding priorities included salaries and wages (3.5 percent) representing approximately $2.5 million of the General Fund and Auxiliaries budget, 104 employees receiving residential college recurring stipend increases and 64 individuals receiving increases for academic promotions, job audits, faculty and staff awards and other miscellaneous items. Some zero increase percentages were included on the Salary Roster in one department – Political Science and Sociology – due to how calculations were made but those now represent 3.5 percent or greater increases – with one individual receiving a larger increase due to promotion.
- With regard to FTEs overall – General Fund and Auxiliaries – there was a net 4.77 FTE change with the largest occurring in academic affairs.
- Fixed costs, particularly health insurance and retirement matching costs, other fringe benefits, utility rates and technology upgrades continue to increase. Fixed cost increases for these items are expected to be approximately $1.8 million. Effective July 1, 2013, the KERS (hourly paid staff) employer-paid retirement matching rates for the General Fund will increase from 23.61 percent to 26.79 percent at a cost of approximately $378,000.
- The University budgeted significant net increases of approximately $2.3 million in scholarships, tuition discounts and geographical waivers, including the following:
  - $267,000 increase for the Racer Academy – a dual credit program for regional high school students
  - $660,000 increase for geographical waivers (regional state neighbors)
  - $1.6 million increase from a 3 percent tuition rate increase and a 1.5 percent growth factor
- A number of ongoing technology improvements will continue to be funded from the remaining balance available from the original project budget, including development of the enrollment management system and course management system; implementation of recruitment system; automating workflow for moving data, approvals and tasks electronically and continuing a pilot study of server-based computing to capitalize on improved security, support, energy savings and flexibility.
- Other specific priorities were outlined in the Executive Summary and include new positions, Library holdings and a 5 percent inflation factor. Capital projects include the Paducah Campus and Hester Hall bonds which will close June 19. The University secured an interest rate of 3.18 percent for total interest costs. There is $4 million for the Breathitt Veterinary Center which represents an ongoing project, including identifying a design for the facility and purchasing property.
- Priority expenditures will be made in support of required or ongoing initiatives across the vice presidential areas, including Youth and Nonprofit Leadership Professor/Director, Communication Disorders Lecturer, Community Health Assistant Professor, Communication Disorders adjuncts, Racer Academy Lecturer and adjuncts, minority hiring adjustment, Library holdings, Honors Program specialized instruction, Ed.D. first-year implementation, Associate Vice President for Institutional Advancement, fringe benefits on above new salaries and interpreter services for the Office of Equal Opportunity.
- With regard to the Statement of Revenue and Expenditures, net education and general expenditures represent a 2.3 percent increase in the General Fund, 5.8 percent in auxiliaries and an overall percentage of 3 percent ($4.5 million increase). The Statement of Change in Revenue and Expenditures includes a 3 percent increase in tuition, 1.5 percent enrollment increase and 3.5 percent salary increase. Information was also provided indicating where the Budget Planning and Review (BPR) savings, efficiencies and increased revenues are located ($4.9 million).
- A condensed version of the BPR items was presented and included reducing the number of cell phone stipends by approximately 75 percent ($128,000), $457,000 increase in institutional support from auxiliaries to the General Fund ($300,000 from charging for Curris Center parking). Another major revenue item includes $1,850,000 in carryforwards (included in the $4.9 million).
- Discussion occurred at the May Board meeting regarding the Paducah Campus and furnishings and equipment that will be needed but for which there is no funding available in the upcoming fiscal year. Mr. Denton confirmed there is not a recurring item specifically designated for this purpose although there may be some availability of funds. Dr. Jackson reported there is approximately $500,000 needed and discussions are underway to establish a fundraising initiative not only to fund those needs for the Paducah Campus but also future scholarship needs which will help students from the Paducah and McCracken County area feed into that campus. The recommendation is for this Board to advance the necessary funds with the intent being future fundraising efforts will repay those monies. This may require securing Capital Projects and Bond Oversight Committee approval in the Fall. A Regent indicated that bids for the Paducah Campus were lower than anticipated and asked whether there have been change orders or other sources which have created the gap in necessary funding. Mr. Denton reported when the University initially requested the project it asked the Capital Projects and Bond Oversight Committee for $10 million in bond authorization in McCracken County and up to $1 million for private funds (for furnishings and equipment). There is $100,000 remaining in the project

budget but the University was depending on an additional $1 million in private funds for furnishings and equipment. This gap in necessary funding is not related to construction of the facility. There is also an additional $180,000 included in the Budget which is being used to make the Crisp Center lease payment and at some point that will be folded into the operation of the new facility. Dr. Dunn confirmed the building will open with furnishings, fixtures and equipment in place, whether that will be accomplished through an internal loan based on fundraising or other initiatives, and work is on schedule for facility completion. Mr. Waterfield expressed appreciation to Mr. Oatman for providing a recent tour of the facility and is proud to report the project is moving forward nicely.

- In response to a question regarding credit card fees, Ms. Dudley reported this represents discount fees the University must pay to financial institutions for accepting credit cards. Students pay a convenience fee to use a credit card and there are a number of other credit card transactions on campus for which the University must pay fees.
- Confirmation was provided that the budgetary decisions which have been made by this Board, based upon the provided recommendations, have been incorporated where appropriate for this fiscal year in the document presented for approval. Clarification was provided that the proposed Health Services fee is not included in the Budget and, if enacted, will require future Board approval.
- Dr. Fister indicated as a result of conversations she has had with many across campus, including students, she remains concerned about the $300,000 which will represent revenue from charging for parking in the Curris Center lot. It is unknown if individuals will continue to park in that area and whether the anticipated revenue will be realized. There is a contingency fund within the budget in the event this revenue is not realized but all should be aware of the potential shortfall. Mr. Denton confirmed the referenced $300,000 is included in the Budget and if it does not occur the University has $1.1 million in contingency to cover that as well as other needs which must be met as a result of the BPR recommendations. The parking area must still be designed and discussions must occur in terms of what mechanisms might be available for monitoring purposes. The original figure presented is conservative to take these factors into account. Mr. Oatman reported there will be an initial cost associated with implementing this recommendation and a provision will need to be made to allow vehicles to turn around if individuals do not want to pay to park in this area. Dr. Fister added that another potential concern which has been expressed is traffic flow. Mrs. Green indicated she has strong opposition to this recommendation because some students have stated to her they already pay $55 to park on campus and if they have to pay an extra dollar or two in order to attend a two-hour Student Government Association meeting or other event this represents an added fee. She has had a bad experience with being required to get a parking ticket to place on the dash and also with exiting through the type of parking gates being discussed. Mr. Johnson reported this area is already congested in the mornings and afternoons with traffic from Calloway County High School and the proposed action will make the situation worse. Potential students visiting campus also park in the Curris Center lot so they will either have to be charged or some type of waiver for those individuals will need to be developed and it is believed that will not shed a favorable light on the University. Dr. Fister believes this particular situation can be addressed because it is done at other universities and the projected revenue could feasibly be realized. Mrs. Green added that the 139 spaces (if utilized 8 hours per day, five days a week for 50 weeks a year) could bring in revenue of $278,000 but also does not believe anyone in this room thinks all the parking spaces will be utilized 8 hours a day over this period of time, especially taking into consideration the University is closed several weeks during the course of a year. Mr. Schooley is concerned about vehicular safety in this particular area if this recommendation is implemented and it is believed individuals will choose to park in the lot located at the Industry and Technology Building. Confirmation was provided this represents a typical source of revenue which has been successfully implemented on many other campuses. Mr. Williams suggested delaying implementation of this recommendation until Mr. Oatman can complete work which must take place and perhaps a reevaluation of potential revenue will need to be undertaken at the next Board meeting. Mrs. Buchanon also requested that the actual usage of the Curris Center parking lot be studied because she is unsure it is utilized as heavily as what is being anticipated and it was mentioned that busses also utilize this parking area. Mr. Waterfield indicated the Board of Trustees meets in the Curris Center and members are provided with free parking. Dr. Dunn confirmed there will be an opportunity to allow guest tickets to be provided to such groups visiting campus and the unit hosting those groups could cover the cost of parking but there must also be a means to address student visitors to campus.

Mr. Williams indicated the Budget process this year has been particularly difficult and he applauds Mr. Denton and Ms. Dudley and their staff for undertaking this work under extraordinary circumstances with an extremely complex Budget. The end result is an excellent Budget.

FY14 University Budget, approved with caveat

On behalf of the Finance Committee, Mrs. Buchanon moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, approve the FY14 University Budget. The Board added the caveat that further study will take place to gather additional information which

has been requested in terms of recommendation #97 – Gated parking (139) spaces at the Curris Center parking lot to charge $1 per hour Monday through Friday, 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. – with the intent being for that information to be presented at the next Board meeting and prior to final implementation of this recommendation. Dr. Curris seconded and the motion carried.

Adjournment

The Finance Committee adjourned at 10:55 a.m. and Dr. Curris reconvened the full Board in Special Session.

FY14 University Budget, approved with caveat

On behalf of the Finance Committee, Mr. Williams moved that the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, approve the FY14 University Budget. The Board added the caveat that for budget recommendation #97 – Gated parking (139) spaces at the Curris Center parking lot to charge $1 per hour Monday through Friday, 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. – with the intent being for that information to be presented at the next Board meeting and prior to final implementation of this recommendation after additional study and investigation by management has been undertaken relative to projected revenue as well as implementation. Mrs. Buchanon seconded and there being no further discussion the roll was called with the following voting: Mrs. Buchanon, yes; Dr. Fister, yes; Mrs. Green, yes; Mrs. Guess, yes; Mr. Johnson, yes; Mr. Schooley, yes; Mrs. Sewell, yes; Mr. Waterfield, yes; Mr. Williams, yes; and Dr. Curris, yes. The motion carried.

(See Attachment #3)

Board Organizational Issues

2013-14 Board of Regents Meeting Dates, approved

Chair Curris reported the Board of Regents Special Meeting – Annual Planning Retreat and Work Session – has been scheduled for September 5, 2013, the Board of Regents Summer Quarterly Meeting has been scheduled for September 6 and the Fall Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting was scheduled for Friday, December 6, 2013. He believes it would be particularly helpful to the degree to which meetings of the Presidential Search Committee can be tied in where appropriate to Quarterly meetings of the Board for an effort to be made to proceed in this fashion. This would hold particularly true for Board meetings in February or March of 2014. The Search Committee will determine its own timetable but the Board passed the Presidential Search Process which indicated by the time the Board holds its March meeting it would be in a position to make a decision in terms of who will be the next President of Murray State University. The Board asked the Search Committee to recommend without any ranking between two to four finalists to come to campus to meet with the Board and simultaneously participate in public meetings and forums (with feedback from those meetings then being provided to the Board). For those members on the Board who are not on the Search Committee this would represent the time at which those individuals engage in interviewing the finalists. It would be desirable for the February or March meeting to be scheduled to coincide with when the Search Committee brings these candidates to campus. Mr. Williams indicated in terms of the Presidential Search Committee it would be safest to plan the Winter meeting in March. Chair Curris reported until the Board knows the exact schedule for the Search Committee meetings Board members were asked to hold the following dates on their calendars for the Winter meeting:

Friday, February 7, 2014
Friday, February 14, 2014
Friday, March 7, 2014 (least desirable due to the Ohio Valley Conference Tournament)
Friday, March 14, 2014

It is hoped a decision can be made over the summer as to a final meeting date with which everyone will be comfortable. Board members were asked to hold the following potential dates on their calendar for a Spring meeting:

Friday, May 16, 2014
Friday, May 30, 2014
Friday, June 6, 2014
Friday, June 13, 2014

Treasurer to the Board of Regents for 2013-14, appointed

Dr. Curris reported that in accordance with the *Bylaws* of the Board of Regents, the Treasurer serves at the pleasure of the Board and shall not be a member of the Board. The current Board Treasurer – Tom Denton – will retire June 30, 2013, and will continue working for the University on a part-time contract for the next four years. Therefore, newly-appointed Interim Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services – Jackie Dudley – is being recommended to serve as Treasurer to the Board of Regents for 2013-14.

Mr. Williams moved that the Board of Regents approve the appointment of Jackie Dudley, Interim Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services, as Treasurer to the Board of Regents for 2013-14. Mr. Schooley seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

The Special Meeting of the Murray State University Board of Regents adjourned at 11:20 a.m. Chair Curris reported the Presidential Search Committee will meet beginning no later than 1 p.m. and the meeting will be held in Open Session so any Regent or others can attend.

Chair

Secretary

(The remainder of this page intentionally left blank.)

(This page intentionally left blank to allow for inclusion of attachments.)