

MINUTES
OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS
WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

September 24, 1999

AGENDA ITEM 1 - Call to Order

Required statutory notice having been given, a special meeting of the Board of Regents was held in the Regents Conference Room of the Wetherby Administration Building on the campus. *The special meeting was held to address the following items:*

- *discussion/approval of the 2000-2002 tuition schedule;*
- *discussion of Fund Balance Allocations; and*
- *discussion of the Post Tenure Review Policy.*

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Martin at approximately 11:10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 2 - Roll Call

Ms. Kristen T. Bale
Mr. Amanda J. Coates
Mr. Robert Earl Fischer
Ms. N. Joy Gramling
Ms. Lois W. Gray
Ms. Peggy W. Loafman
Mr. Cornelius A. Martin
Professor Mary Ellen Miller
Mr. James B. Tennill, Jr.

Mr. Sheffer was absent.

AGENDA ITEM 3 - Special Introductions

President Ransdell introduced:

- **Dr. Karen Adams, the new Dean of the College of Education.** Dean Adams is the former Dean of the College of Education at Tennessee Tech and holds a Doctorate in Education from the University of South Carolina, a Masters of Education from the University of Virginia, and a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Texas;
- **Dr. Richard Kirchmeyer, Vice President for Information Technology.** He recently served as Chief Information Officer at the University of Arkansas-Little Rock. He holds a doctorate from University of Arkansas-Little Rock, and bachelor's and master's degrees from University of Maryland; and
- **Dr. Wood Selig, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics.** He served as the Associate Athletics Director for External Operations at University of Virginia. Dr. Selig has an extensive background in athletic administration; he completed his doctorate at the University of Virginia, his bachelor's degree from Washington & Lee and his master's in sports administration from Ohio University.

Dr. Selig introduced:

- **Chris Symington**, Offensive Line Coach, in his fourth year at WKU; he is a former Colorado player and coached at Vanderbilt prior to coming to Western; and
- **Patrick Goodman**, a four-year starter at Western in football; a civil engineering technology major with a 3.7 overall GPA. Patrick is from Elizabethtown and is one of a handful of selectees who will receive a \$10,000 scholarship from Burger King to be donated to the University's general scholarship fund in Patrick's honor during the half-time of the Western-Murray State Game on October 2. Patrick is only the second Hilltopper to receive this honor by Burger King. His predecessor at center on the WKU football team also received this honor. He is a two-time All American on the field and is considered a first team All-American possibility this year. He was red-shirted in his freshman year; has started all 37 games in his career and has only missed one practice. Patrick was also a member of the Concrete Canoe Team that placed 11th in the nation.
- **Dr. Ed Wolfe** was introduced as the new Chair of the Faculty Senate.

AGENDA ITEM 4 - Approval of the 2000-2002 Tuition Schedule

FACTS: In 1999, the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) approved a very significant change with the decentralization of the tuition-setting responsibility. In an effort to provide institutions with more management flexibility, the universities will be responsible for setting their own tuition rates as long as they are consistent with a set of general principles determined by CPE. This is part of a new approach to funding which includes differentiated benchmark institutions for each of Kentucky's universities. The CPE Tuition-Setting Guidelines for 2000-02 are as follows:

- o Rates may be differentiated by factors such as residency status; program level (i.e., undergraduate, graduate, and first professional); and program (e.g., business and biology). Rates may be set on a per credit hour basis.
- o Each institution will submit planned biennial tuition rates and projected tuition and fees revenue for 2000-01 and 2001-02 to the Council by September 1, 1999, for use in developing the Council's 2000-02 biennial budget request. The anticipated tuition and fees revenue should be consistent with the Council's operating funding guidelines.

At its July 30, 1999, meeting, the Board of Regents approved the "*Guiding Principles for Setting Tuition.*" These Principles will assist the University with long-range planning and ensure that decisions are consistent with Western Kentucky University's strategic goals and objectives. It is anticipated that application of these guidelines will address primarily WKU Strategic Goal 1: Increasing Student Learning, WKU Strategic Goal 2: Developing the Student Body, and WKU Strategic Goal 3: Assuring High Quality Faculty and Staff. The Principles address the importance of academic excellence without compromising access.

The proposed 2000-02 Tuition Schedule reflects application of the "*Guiding Principles for Setting Tuition.*"

RECOMMENDATION: President Ransdell recommends that the 2000-02 Tuition Schedule be approved.

TUITION RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Increase the undergraduate tuition rates by approximately 6.5 percent for 2000-01. Nonresident undergraduate tuition is to be assessed at three times the resident undergraduate tuition rate.**

Rationale:

1. Principle: "Tuition rates should be moderate and predictable to ensure economic access."
The average annual increase in resident undergraduate tuition, between 1990/91 and 1999/2000, has been 6.2 percent.
2. Principle: "Tuition should address students' ability to pay." An analysis of CPE benchmarks' tuition rates, as a percentage of each respective state's per capita personal income, showed that WKU's 1999-2000 annual, resident, undergraduate tuition rate is \$317 lower than the income-adjusted median.
3. Resident tuition data from other institutions outside of Kentucky show that WKU tuition rates are below comparable institutions.
4. Principle: "Tuition should be appropriate to ensure that Western Kentucky University can achieve its goals of excellence stated in its *Strategic Plan* and the Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997."

- 2. Freeze the 1999-2000 resident undergraduate tuition rates for students officially admitted and enrolled in the Community College 2000-01.**

Rationale:

1. Principle: "Tuition should be appropriate to ensure that Western Kentucky University can achieve its goals of excellence stated in its *Strategic Plan* and the Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997." Access to affordable, entry-level postsecondary educational opportunities is a significant need. South central Kentucky has lower educational attainment levels than other regions of the state and does not have easy geographic access to a community college under KCTCS.
2. Internal assessments support that the limited growth in Community College enrollment is partially attributable to tuition rates significantly higher than the Kentucky community colleges.

- 3. Increase the resident graduate tuition rate by approximately 6 percent for 2000-01. Freeze the nonresident graduate tuition rate.**

Rationale:

1. Principle: Tuition differentials by level (i.e., undergraduate and graduate) and by residency (i.e., resident and nonresident) should be fiscally sound.
2. The current differential between undergraduate and graduate was approved in 1982 by the Council on Higher Education and has been considered as an appropriate average representation of added costs associated with graduate instruction.
3. Principle: "Tuition should take into consideration geographic access and the value of a diverse student body."
4. It has been difficult for Western to enroll additional nonresident graduate students because of the high tuition rate and limited funds for fellowships. Freezing the tuition rate for nonresidents will help with the plan to increase graduate enrollment.

- 4. Tuition for undergraduate students from Incentive Grant Counties will be assessed the resident tuition rate plus \$300 per semester.**

Rationale:

1. Principle: "Tuition should take into consideration geographic access and the value of a diverse student body."
2. Principle: Tuition differentials by level (i.e., undergraduate and graduate) and by

residency (i.e., resident and non resident) should be fiscally sound. Historical enrollment data support, that when Western added the \$400 a semester surcharge, enrollment from this significant market declined.

3. A tuition charge of resident tuition rate plus \$300 per semester keeps Western competitive with resident tuition rates at universities such as Middle Tennessee State University, Austin Peay State University, and University of Southern Indiana.

President Ransdell noted that the State, through the Council on Post Secondary Education, for the first time in the history of higher education has empowered the Board of Regents to set tuition for undergraduate and graduate students. Heretofore, the CPE has set tuition unilaterally for the campuses, and the tuition levels were exactly the same for the comprehensive universities with a separate tuition process followed for the University of Kentucky as the graduate research institution and University of Louisville as the other research institution.

All eight institutions and the KCTCS system have been engaged over the last several months in trying to strategically approach this opportunity to serve the market, to balance the budget, strategically achieve goals, and to serve the existing students in a way that is fair and opportunistic in terms of growth and development of the institution. The institutions have been reluctant to share information with each other because, to some extent, it is a competitive market. Institutions were asked to present preliminary data on September 1 to the Council on Postsecondary Education which would project revenue from tuition for the next two years--the two years of the biennium which will begin on July 1 following the 2000 legislative session. Significant attempts have been made to gather data and to anticipate what might be in store with the new funding model for higher education based on the nineteen benchmark institutions. The unknown factor is the degree to which state revenues and the state budget process will afford funding the new model. If money was not an issue and the model was funded in its entirety, Western would fare very well because it has been relatively under funded compared to universities in the state and compared to the benchmarks. Western is one of four universities targeted for an equity appropriations based on historical under funding. While cautiously optimistic about the legislative session and what stands to come to Western in the budgeting process, preliminary data suggests that the legislative session will be a challenge from a financial standpoint. Revenue projections are not as aggressive as they were in the 1998 session, and there are a lot of competing factors for limited funds.

Therefore, tuition efforts, while not only trying to do the right thing for Western, for students and prospective students, but attempting to judge what might happen legislatively, has been a guessing game.

Dr. Luther Hughes, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, distributed a handout that reflects enrollment goals through the year 2004 which is in keeping with the University's Strategic Plan. Dr. Hughes stated, "There are two issues that are driving the efforts into recruitment and retention of students that deal with tuition--the University's own Strategic Plan Goals which target specific populations, talking about diversity in the broadest sense, in the counties that the CPE has identified where the college-going rate is low and also targeting students from the higher population areas including Louisville. We're also targeting increases in minority students and students from surrounding Tennessee and Indiana areas which we have traditionally called our incentive-grant counties, to which we are suggesting a change to "*Tuition Incentive Program (TIP)*" We're also targeting and wanting to increase out-of-state student enrollment, international students, and transfer students, especially those from community colleges as well as graduate students. The overall enrollment management plan looks at capping out at approximately 10% more students than in the base year of 1997 with an enrollment of 14,543. The Council on Postsecondary Education established 1998 as the baseline with an enrollment of 14,882.

"The University's goals for enrollment in 2004 are generally in line with CPE's goals, so in approaching tuition, we are looking at trying to meet those goals. We certainly want to recruit our students, retain them, maintain our scholarship pool or actually increase so that the current students are not impacted. We would like to maintain access for students throughout our area according to our mission statement, especially including those who might want to choose our community college. We also want to be competitive in value and in cost with other colleges and universities; we want to increase our diversity in the broadest terms, including all diversity populations, and then we want to meet the goals of both the Strategic Plan and CPE goals that would move us toward attaining our benchmark goals in areas outside of enrollment management.

"Over the past decade, the increases have been slightly more than 13% for a two-year period in the past decade, and our recommended increase will be \$65 per semester

for the next two years. We want to encourage more students from our surrounding area to look at the opportunity for access through the Community College

“The recommendation includes a plan to expand the areas in Tennessee and Indiana that have been called our incentive grant counties which we now are suggesting calling our “*Tuition Incentive Program.*” The plan would establish tuition for students in those counties and the recommended added counties whereby the tuition rate would be the resident rate plus \$300 per semester. (Out-of-state tuition is three times the in-state rate.)

The current list of Tennessee and Indiana counties which qualify for the incentive grant are:

TENNESSEE

Cheatham
Clay
Davidson
Tousdale
Williamson
Wilson

INDIANA

Perry
Posey
Spencer
Vanderburg
Warrick

The recommended additional counties are:

Dickson
Houston
Humphreys
Jackson
Maury
Montgomery
Rutherford
Shelby
Stewart
Smith

Clark
Crawford
Floyd
Gibson
Harrison
Scott

It is believed that with the recommended targeted areas, substantial out-of-state enrollment can be increased. Early indications of anticipated results have been very positive. One of our targets is to achieve about a 20% out-of-state students in a given amount of time.

Ms. Ann Mead, Chief Financial Officer, distributed and discussed the following documents which included in the Board’s official files:

- Undergraduate Resident Tuition per Full-Time Student, Per Semester;
- Annual Tuition Comparison to Per Capita Personal Income, CPE Benchmarks, Undergraduate Resident; and
- Funding Scenarios, WKU, 2000-02 Biennium

Ms. Mead noted that information has been received indicating that fiscal outlook for the State is not very positive at the present. Anticipated needs exceed

anticipated revenue by \$100 million in each year of the biennium. Those numbers are subject to revision as the coming legislative session approaches. The recommended tuition increase of 6.4% for the year 2000-01 would generate approximately \$1,951,300, and the second year recommended increase of 6.5% would generate approximately \$2,097,400.

Ms. Mead reported the CPE has acknowledged the fact that Western, along with three other universities, has been under funded and would be in line for special consideration with the State appropriation for equity money; however, it is too soon to know what will happen with either the CPE or the Governor's recommendation. Data shown in the "Funding Scenarios" document reflects different possibilities compared to the "point of reference information on preparation of the current year's budget (1999-2000) which required a total of \$4,126,100.

Following these presentations, Board members were given the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the recommendations. Ms. Coates expressed frustration that Item 11 in the "*Guiding Principals for Setting Tuition*" which the Board discussed and approved at the July meeting states, "tuition increases should be sensitive to the financial planning of currently enrolled students" and she felt that the current recommendation does not call for increased scholarships for currently enrolled students or anything that would address this issue. Ms. Mead explained that when tuition increases, scholarships increase as well and stated that should there be additional revenue through an equity adjustment, certainly there would be sensitivity to additional scholarship pools. Student Government Association can be kept apprised of developments through their representative on the Budget Committee.

MOTION: Approval of the 2000-02 Tuition Schedule.

Ms. Gray made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fischer, **to approve the recommended tuition increases of 6.4% for 2000-01 and 6.5% for 2001-02 for full-time main-campus students; freeze the tuition for Community College students (both years of the biennium); and increase tuition for full-time resident graduate students by 5.9% for 2000-01 and 6.0% for 2001-02 and a freeze on non-resident graduate tuition for both years of the biennium.** The motion carried with Ms. Coates

voting nay.

Motion to approve the **additional counties in Indiana and Tennessee to the Tuition Incentive Program (TIP)** as referred to earlier in these minutes **for the in-state tuition rate plus \$300 per semester** was made by Ms. Loafman, seconded by Ms. Bale, and carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5 - Fund Balance Allocations

Fund balance recommendations will come to the Board for approval at the October 29 meeting; however, President Ransdell called attention to three possible areas which are targeted for fund balance allocations that will likely require expenditure prior to October 29, noting “should they not be approved as fund balance allocations by the Board, I will pull from another part of the budget because they are important initiatives.”

They are:

- \$ 25,000 preliminary schematics for the science complex project;
- \$300,000 operating for the Office of Development
- 5% university-wide increase for travel budgets.

AGENDA ITEM 6 - Post Tenure Review Policy

Professor Miller asked for a slight modification to the Post Tenure Review Policy which the Board passed in January of 1999 and is currently being implemented. Copies of the document were handed to the Board members. Professor Miller stated, “I think the Policy is an excellent one, and the fact that I have a modification to offer does not testify otherwise to that.

Professor Miller referred to page 3 of the policy, under “Procedure - Department Post-Tenure Peer Review Committee,” the second sentence which states **“The PTR appraisal shall include the individual’s annual evaluations from the previous five years along with any other information that the Review Committee considers relevant”** noting that the phrase underlined has caused some confusion and some consternation in the process of implementing the policy. Some people have read that to mean student evaluations of faculty members; some have read it to mean, which apparently was the intention, department head’s annual reviews of the individual for the past five years--which is the problem.

Professor Miller stated, “The department head’s annual reviews were written

one-to-one with the individual where confidential material was discussed and so considered. The individual understood, the information went to no one except that individual, certainly not to colleagues within the department, up the line to the dean, and to the Provost. Those records are there in those offices, always considered confidential. The problem that is viewed now with the Policy is, to bring them forth and make them public in the sense that all tenured members of one's department could see them, is a kind of violation of privacy. That's one problem with it; another problem is that those particular evaluations are not considered in the tenure review. So, if the tenure review, which is a stringent one on this campus, is adequate without those, then we believe the post tenure review should be adequate without them as well.

Professor Miller made a motion to delete the department head's annual evaluations from previous five years from the Post Tenure Review Policy. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gramling.

Following a long period of discussion with several suggested alternatives, Ms. Loafman asked if, since the recommended change was just presented to the Board at the meeting in progress, it could wait until the October Board meeting. Professor Miller noted that the timeline in the review process necessitated an early decision.

Chair Martin commented, "We're trying to come up with a simple solution to a complex resolution, and it's a lot more complex than we think. In fairness to the earlier decision that this Board has made, I would like for the counsel to review this policy to see what implications it has on anything else in the agreement. To get a very complex item put on the agenda this morning and try to solve it without having a chance to review it may be unfair whether or not it's good or bad. I'm not suggesting that the modification is not the best way it should go; I would suggest, with the agreement of Professor Miller, that if we could postpone the reviews until November 10 rather than October 10 that would give you the same amount of days, and we could study this with committee and make sure it's the right decision, and we can all feel comfortable that we've made the right decision. To take action today on a pretty complex document based on three sentences, I think, is probably not the right thing to do"

Professor Miller withdrew her earlier motion, without objection, and moved that the Post Tenure Policy be put on hold until the Academics and Student Affairs

Committee meets to review the entire document, consider modifications, and present a recommendation to the Board for the October 29 meeting.

Ms. Esters was requested to confirm a time for the Academics Committee to meet and discuss suggested modifications to the Post Tenure Review Policy.

With nothing further to come before the Board, motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Fischer and seconded by Ms. Loafman. The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:20 p.m.

CERTIFICATION OF SECRETARY

I hereby certify that the minutes herein above set forth an accurate record of votes and actions taken by the Board of Regents of Western Kentucky University in a special meeting held on September 24, in the Regents Conference Room of the Wetherby Administration Building on the Western campus, and further certify that the meeting was held in compliance with KRS 61.810, 61.815, 61.820, and 61.825 (enacted as Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 of House Bill 100, 1974 Regular Session, General Assembly).

Elizabeth W. Esters
Secretary

Cornelius A. Martin
Chair
October 29, 1999

Elizabeth W. Esters
Secretary
October 29, 1999

