Minutes of the Task Force on Developing Murray State University’s Extended Campus at Paducah Meeting
Monday, February 18, 2008
Crisp Center – Room 76 – 3000 Irvin Cobb Drive, Paducah, KY

Mr. Stout, Chair of the Task Force on Developing Murray State University’s Extended Campus at Paducah, convened the meeting 4:30 p.m. and the roll was called with the following present: Alan Stout, Randy Dunn, Rex Smith, Brian Van Horn, John Yates, Phil Bryan, Daniel Wann, Teresa Wheeler, John Williams, Sandra Wilson and Pam Matlock. Absent: Eric King and Laxmaiah Manchikanti.

Minutes of the Task Force Meeting December 13, 2007

Chair Stout stated that the minutes from the December 13, 2007, Task Force meeting were included in each packet and asked the Committee to review the minutes during the meeting and they would be brought up for approval at the end of the meeting. John Williams moved to defer the approval of the minutes until the next Task Force meeting so that each member would have sufficient time to review the minutes. Motion was seconded and then carried.

President’s Comments

Chair Stout asked Dr. Dunn to provide comments regarding the follow-up from the last meeting. Dr. Dunn began by referencing information provided in the meeting packets, indicating that John Yates would comment on additional information regarding an Adult Education Initiative later in the meeting.

Dr. Dunn stated that John Williams had requested information be presented on what has been happening in Owensboro, and material to that effect was provided in the packets, along with press accounts that indicate Owensboro is creating a postsecondary center for Daviess County. This is a project that would be anchored by Western Kentucky University (WKU) and is an initiative that has been in the planning stages for several years. He indicated that the project closely resembles the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS) model. Dr. Dunn further stated that the development of a postsecondary center in Daviess County had appeared on a list of capital projects several times but was never actually funded. He stated that ultimately the community, driven by the Judge-Executive in Daviess County, decided to take a look at putting local funds toward the creation of a higher education center. Dr. Dunn stated that at this point nothing has been done as far as breaking ground, etc. but that there is a proposal in that community to fund this project locally.

Dr. Dunn also reported that simultaneously there is a Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) proposal within the budget to create an Owensboro Center. He indicated that the CPE project has moved forward and made their recommendation list, but whether the project would actually be approved during the Legislative session is yet to be determined.

Mr. Williams asked if the total student count in Owensboro is comparable to that on the Paducah campus and Dr. Dunn reported that is typically based on course enrollments and it should be roughly the same. The committee then discussed enrollment numbers to provide a basis for comparison between the two campuses.

Dr. Dunn stated that information regarding demographics related to the other campuses was also provided in the packets. He asked Brian Van Horn and John Yates if they had any information to add and informed the Task Force members that their packets also contained photographs of each extended campus building.

Possible Models for Service Delivery

Dr. Van Horn discussed the information that showed the comparisons between the campuses. He indicated that the Henderson campus is the smallest of the four regional campuses. Dr. Van Horn explained that a comparison sheet on Paducah had not been included for this meeting but was located in the notebook from the initial meeting of the task force.
Dr. Van Horn pointed out that one difference in Henderson in comparison with the other campuses is that it is geared more toward graduate students (70 percent) as opposed to undergraduate students (30 percent) and the other campuses are more evenly split. Dr. Yates stated that the Henderson campus has been leasing a vacant elementary school from the Henderson Board of Education and they recently decided to use the building to house their central board offices. The Henderson campus then moved to a smaller facility adjacent to the current Henderson board offices. Dr. Yates reported that there is some indication that once the Henderson Board moves into the renovated elementary school they would allow Murray State’s Henderson campus to use some of the space formerly occupied by the Board offices. Although the facility is rather small with less than 8000 sq. ft., it is functional and there are staff offices and four ITV rooms. He also stated that some space is used for additional classrooms at North Middle School, which is across the parking lot.

Dr. Dunn stated that there have been continuing talks with the community college in Henderson regarding opportunities to house the Henderson campus in their facilities. Nothing is concrete and it would be premature to discuss any details at this point but there has been some positive feedback. It is a good idea to keep those lines of communication open and hopefully an opportunity will arise in the future.

Ms. Wilson asked if the building in Hopkinsville was built solely for Murray State’s use and Dr. Dunn responded that it was. She also asked how that building was funded and Dr. Dunn stated funding was provided as a direct state appropriation. He then asked Dr. Yates to provide details regarding the funding history. Dr. Dunn further stated that once the state appropriation was approved the money was provided to Murray State with the directive to build a postsecondary education center in Hopkinsville. Dr. Yates reported that MSU did not request the money nor the building but, of course, took it when it was offered.

Dr. Yates continued by stating that the Kentucky Governor wanted to locate several postsecondary education centers around the state and at that time the Majority Leader of the Senate was from Hopkinsville and indicated one of these centers needed to be located in Hopkinsville and ultimately that was approved. Dr. Yates stated that there were then negotiations with Hopkinsville Community College regarding how that building would be built and operated, and it was determined through a Memorandum of Agreement that HCC did not need additional facilities in Hopkinsville to run its programs but that MSU did, so the building was ultimately assigned to Murray State University.

Dr. Yates reported that it was located on 41-A South towards Ft. Campbell. Mr. Williams asked if the land that the building sits on was donated and Dr. Yates replied that the MSU Racer Foundation bought the land at a lower price than what the land appraised for ($4.1 million). The Racer Foundation bought the land for $3.4 million with the remaining value considered a gift to the Foundation. The Racer Foundation then gifted part of the land and sold some of the land to MSU. MSU paid approximately $600,000 for 75 acres for the Hopkinsville campus location. Mr. Williams asked whether the building was finished on the inside and Dr. Yates responded that all but 4,000 sq. ft. is finished. Discussion followed regarding what portions of the building were unfinished.

Mr. Williams stated that an unhappy taxpayer approached him with concerns regarding this building and that this person had sent an employee to the building to take pictures of the unfinished portions of the building. The citizen showed the pictures to Mr. Williams and stated that their concern centered around higher education leadership and the way this building was being managed. Dr. Yates said that due to multiple delays between the initial granting of the money, and the planning and design and construction phases a decision was eventually made that MSU did not initially need all of the space so some portions were left unfinished to save costs with the plan to go back and finish those spaces on an as needed basis.

Chair Stout indicated he understands why someone would say the building is in an odd location but when one takes into account that Hopkinsville development is moving in that direction, the location really does make sense. Discussion took place regarding the Hopkinsville businesses that are located close to the building. Chair Stout further stated that the Hopkinsville Rotary Club has become very aggressive in putting together scholarship programs to benefit Christian County students who would be going to Hopkinsville Community College and that discussion is taking place to advance this initiative further by funding scholarships for Christian
County students who then want to further their education at the Murray State campus. He indicated this is a very positive sign that the Hopkinsville community wants to embrace MSU and take this initiative to the next level.

Mr. Williams asked if there is a separate facility at Ft. Campbell and Dr. Yates responded that there is an office and classroom space in a facility that the Army provides but Murray State does not pay to lease the space. Dr. Yates stated that Austin Peay State University and Hopkinsville Community College both have a significant presence on the Army base as well. Discussion followed regarding programs offered by Austin Peay, HCC and MSU and the history of MSU’s presence at Ft. Campbell.

A question was posed regarding Troy State University and Dr. Yates responded that this institution serves the military worldwide but ultimately was not invited to occupy space on the base. They are therefore renting a facility nearby where they offer classes. Troy State is approved by the Army for tuition assistance so many soldiers and army personnel who have taken classes through Troy State at other bases have continued to take those classes when transferred to Ft. Campbell.

Dr. Van Horn stated that the Madisonville Campus is the one campus where MSU utilizes Madisonville Community College space, located just down the hall from the MCC President’s Office. He stated that MSU has a very good working relationship with MCC and with the other community colleges. Dr. Van Horn indicated to committee members that Madisonville demographic information was provided in their packets. Mr. Williams asked if the Murray State program at Madisonville was located in a separate building and Dr. Yates responded they did not occupy a separate building like the Hopkinsville, Paducah and Henderson programs. Mr. Williams asked if space and room availability was a problem and Dr. Yates indicated that sufficient classroom space is an issue and classes are being held all over town in other facilities. Dr. Yates stated that there is a picture of a proposed new Madisonville building in the packets and while $300,000 has been granted for Phase I planning, it is not likely that funding approval will come from the General Assembly for constructing the actual building.

Mr. Williams asked if MSU would take complete control of the building or whether it would have to be shared if and when it is built. Dr. Yates stated that the building would be owned by KCTCS and operated by MCC and that MSU would use a portion of the building under the terms of a Memorandum of Agreement which indicates a portion of space in the building would be for MSU’s use and control. Mr. Williams expressed concern as to whether this approach would work and Dr. Yates agreed it can be difficult. Dr. Dunn stated that issues such as this are one of the main reasons why this Task Force has been established. Discussion followed regarding different issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.

Mr. Williams asked whether this option should even be considered for Paducah given the University’s experience in Madisonville. Dr. Dunn stated that MSU wants to solicit ideas from the community to help determine what would be ideal for the Paducah facility. Dr. Dunn also mentioned that there are some benefits from this type of model, stating that the approval process would be easier than if MSU attempted to secure funding to build its own building. Mr. Williams provided the observation that there is a Paducah group that traveled to Greenville, South Carolina to visit a building that was being shared by several different higher education institutions. Dr. Dunn stated that this is yet another model that could be considered. Discussion continued regarding similar issues that could arise from sharing this building. Dr. Yates indicated that he has learned through discussions with other state institutions with similar agreements that they are not working well.
Dr. Dunn suggested that the focus of the Task Force should be aimed at the pros and cons of the different models or to make a recommendation on which model is optimal. He stated that the goal is to be able to discuss with the Board of Regents what the Task Force believes should be pursued and be able to build a legislative case for funding possibly in 2010-2012 biennium. Discussions continued regarding potential funding sources for this project. Dr. Dunn discussed the possibility of a study to determine what kind of programs are needed to fulfill the needs of the community and the results from this study could determine the type of model and building that would best meet the needs of Paducah/McCracken County and surrounding areas.

Chair Stout stated that he hopes the Task Force is ultimately able to make a final recommendation to the Board of Regents and noted that a task force such as this has not been done before but believes it is crucial in order to take a comprehensive approach to evaluating what the needs of the community are and then determining what MSU can do to meet those needs. Ms. Sandra Wilson indicated that she felt the purpose of the Task Force was to determine the best way for this to be done in Paducah and then MSU would determine what programs needed to be offered.

Mr. Williams asked if discussions had taken place with the Paducah City and/or McCracken County schools regarding the availability of facilities within the next couple of years. He stated that if these school systems are planning to build new facilities there would potentially be an old building sitting empty that could be utilized as the new Paducah Campus. Discussion continued regarding the best type of model to be pursued, the task of choosing the best location and how to reach out to potential students in Southern Illinois.

**Update on Adult Learning Initiatives**

Dr. Yates presented information regarding adult learning and referred to the Adult Learner Summit that several Murray State staff members attended. He stated the CPE has realized that if the university is going to be able to meet the 2020 goal of doubling the enrollment numbers it cannot be done solely through recruiting high school age students and that convincing adult students to reenroll and complete their degrees would need to be part of the solution. He referred to two handouts provided in the meeting packet regarding the Adult Learner Summit and discussed adult student statistics.

Dr. Dunn elaborated on exactly what a transfer scholarship entails. He discussed the transfer scholarships and also talked about Project Graduate, which is an incentive to convince adult students who have some college hours but have never finished their degree to come back to school. Dr. Yates mentioned that a $50,000 grant that has been given to MSU (as well as all other state universities) to examine ways that MSU can become more adult friendly.

Mr. Williams asked how MSU identifies former students who have some college hours but who left the University before actually obtaining their degrees. Dr. Yates responded that the identification is done in several ways (transcripts, Alumni Finder through the Alumni Office, social security numbers, etc.).

**Consider Work Plan for Task Force**

Dr. Dunn stated that the next question seems to be how to proceed on all of this work that has been discussed. He opened the discussion among Task Force members to determine how they want to go about deciding which model will be optimal for all. Dr. Dunn asked if there was any other information that the Task Force members needed or wanted to look at to help with their discussions. Dr. Dunn mentioned several options including bringing in a third party who has had experience with these types of models and also mentioned if the decision to use the current facility is made then renovations would need to be identified just to bring the building up-to-date.

A task force member suggested looking at this issue in two ways. The first would be to examine the various models and options that are currently available. The second would be to look at surveying the needs assessment side and allowing Ms. Elaine Spalding and the Paducah Chamber to assist with that. Discussion followed regarding this type of needs assessment.
Mr. Williams indicated that the Task Force has reached the point of the third step in a five-step decision making process and are beginning to look at different models and alternatives that could be utilized. He feels that the next step should be to document the pros and cons of each model so that the choices can be narrowed down. Mr. Smith asked what the overarching goals of the CPE are for setting the double the number enrollment goals. Mr. Williams responded that the overarching goal is contained in House Bill 1 enacted under the administration of Governor Patton in an attempt to raise the per capita income of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Stout indicated that the Task Force has identified six options:

1. Do nothing and stay in the Crisp Center as it currently exists.
2. Explore making improvements to the Crisp Center.
3. Follow the Hopkinsville Model with a stand-alone facility on land owned and controlled by the University.
4. Follow the Madisonville Model with a facility on the WKCTCS campus with shared control.
5. Follow a Postsecondary Center option with multi-campus centers (like the Greenville Mall model).
6. Examine existing facility space that is currently available, including vacated buildings such as former schools or other large buildings.

Mr. Stout stated these options are in no particular order of importance. Dr. Dunn indicated that he felt that the first option could be taken off the table if the committee members are in agreement. All Task Force members agreed to remove this option, indicating it really wasn’t even an option to begin with.

Dr. Dunn reported documentation of the pros and cons for all these options would be provided at the next Task Force meeting. He also mentioned another theme to be examined, stating that the land where the community and technical college is located is held by the Paducah Junior College Foundation. He indicated the potential exists, if the stand-alone building option is chosen, to do something close to the community and technical college assuming that an arrangement could be worked out with the Paducah Junior College Foundation. A task force member asked how much land is owned by the Paducah Junior College Foundation and others responded that there was quite a bit of land but they did not have an exact figure. Mr. Stout agreed this is a strong possibility that definitely needs to be considered. Discussion followed regarding this issue as well as other possibilities discussed earlier in the meeting.

Dr. Dunn stated that MSU is the regional university for Paducah and McCracken County and this is the University’s opportunity to get in the game and fulfill its responsibility to the area. Dr Dunn indicated that he does not feel the multi-campus model is the best option available. Dr. Yates agreed to have his staff research the potential models that have been identified and prepare a fact sheet on each model. All Task Force members agreed that this was a good idea.

Concern was expressed concern as to how information is communicated to the community and Dr. Dunn responded that a communication plan will need to be developed. Information should be provided to the community in conjunction with the meetings of the Task Force. Discussion followed regarding how information is delivered from the Task Force to the community and ultimately how to achieve the CPE goal of doubling enrollment by 2020.

Mr. Stout asked whether the Task Force agreed that a work plan has now been put into place. Dr. Dunn agreed a work plan has been put together and that the options must be furthered with additional information being provided to Task Force members prior to the next meeting so there is time for review.

Mr. Williams expressed concern regarding a small number of staff collecting data on the various options and stated that he would feel more comfortable if the entire Task Force worked to prepare the pro/con information together. He indicated that information could be overlooked and that would lead the Task Force to buy into something that it may or may not believe in. He felt that the pros and cons should come from the actual Task Force members if it is to be truly their representative voice instead of coming from staff outside the Task Force. Dr. Yates offered
for his staff to collect the information but it will be presented to the Task Force in a generic format without pros and cons identified. The Task Force could then develop its own set of ideas.

Other Task Force Members’ Issues

Dr. Dunn asked if there is any other information that needs to be prepared prior to the next meeting of the Task Force. Mr. Williams asked if projected numbers for Paducah could be given to assist in deciding what type of building is necessary to facilitate those numbers.

Chair Stout requested that Dr. Dunn communicate with the Paducah Chamber of Commerce regarding initiating the needs assessment study, and others asked WKCTC has undertaken some of the same types of studies and, if so, whether those studies could be used as a starting point. Other Task Force members agreed that it would be a good idea to utilize any existing studies as a starting point. Mr. Williams indicated the Task Force should examine similar models and get input from the leaders of those models.

Chair Stout suggested that the first hour of the next meeting be spent with the liaison group of the WKCTC and the PJC Board to get their input on this issue. The Task Force could then begin the process of identifying pros and cons associated with each model option. Dr. Dunn responded he believes the members of the Task Force already have an idea of what they would like to see and suggested that the next meeting focus solely on developing a list of the pros and cons.

Chair Stout asked if a meeting could be scheduled for two weeks from tonight on March 3, 2008, at 5 p.m. Mr. Williams requested that the meeting be moved to a larger room so there would be enough room for flipcharts. All committee members agreed to this day and time. The next meeting will be held at John Williams’ building, Computer Services, Inc. and that Jill Hunt Lovett in the MSU President’s Office would contact Mr. Williams to coordinate the meeting location and details.

Before the meeting adjourned everyone was asked to introduce themselves for the benefit of Mr. Rex Smith who arrived at the meeting late and missed the first meeting of the Task Force.

Chair Stout asked if there was any other business to be discussed and no other business was identified. The Task Force on Developing Murray State University’s Extended Campus at Paducah meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.
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