

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS, GENERAL:

- **Reducing administration and professional support staff:** The concern here was with the growth of administrative and professional positions to address “student life,” an expansion seen throughout higher ed in the last decade (for more information on this, see the Delta Cost study). Senators understand that “student life” support at MSU is more than likely in line with our sister institutions. The question raised was why we need to accept the “new normal.” The fact that Eastern or Western has as many or more positions than we do doesn’t necessarily make those positions any more cost effective. Senators would like to see “self studies” of these administrative and professional units (not unlike the studies they would like to see in regards to the new travel coordinator position).
- **Rethinking Early College:** The Senate report, which you are all in possession of, demonstrates that EC is not performing in the way it was expected to perform. Although a few Senators did express regret that an added tuition component might prohibit some students from having college access, there was no doubt that we are losing money by giving our credit away for free. If Early College is retained, Senators are in favor of instituting a fair tuition charge for this service.
- **Reassessing regional campuses and ITV:** Senators recognize that this is a logical place to look, as our regional centers are not making money. That said Senators are also well aware of the fact that some students in some programs will not attend MSU if those regional services are cut, and that one campus in particular (Prestonsburg) is a political football. Some strategic work is in order here, perhaps something as simple as completely phasing out ITV, moving to mostly online classes for regional outreach, and limiting a physical presence to a small number of designated programs.
- **Drawing on the untapped potential in existing personnel policies and documents:** Current policies state that Deans teach 3 hours and Chairs 6. If these directives were consistently followed, we could cover more courses with existing personnel. We might also be able to encourage more tenured faculty to increase their teaching load through FWAs if we make that policy more conducive to teaching. Right now some faculty and departments are discouraged from using the FWA in this way because they assume that the minimum percentages have to apply in research and service, even in adjusted loads.
- **Minimizing the use of consultants and post-retirement contracts:** Senators understand that outside consultants may bring skills that some of our internal employees may not have, and that post-retirement contracts allow the institution to hire vetted employees without having to pay for very costly benefits. Some wondered, though, why such support is needed if we’ve done the hiring and training we should have done in the first place. We do have some internal people capable of doing some of the work we have hired external firms to do, just as we’ve hired new people to fill the vacated lines of some of the retirees who have been brought back to serve. If we’ve strategically understaffed positions/areas, and can demonstrate that we can save money by only sporadically bringing in “outside” sources to help every once in a while, that’s one thing. If, on the other hand, we need to routinely bring in “outside” help to aid in the day-to-day operation of the university, we’re looking at a problem in management, as we

have (a) disempowered and devalued staff who could do more for the university, (b) made fundamental errors in the number of employees we need to “do business” in an area/unit, (c) hired the wrong people for the job, or (d) some combination of a, b, or c.

- **Considering small cuts to non-essential services that can have positive academic impacts (and hence aid in retention and graduation rates):** In the large scheme of things, the PLA budget is very small, but that small amount, if redirected to something like Disability Services, could do a world of good, especially for the faculty who are often struggling on their own to help our vision-impaired students. The same holds true for employee picnics, and even some of the swag presented to the BOR. Many of us would give up a “free lunch” if it meant that we had more resources to aid our disabled students. (Admittedly, not a budget solution per se, but a step toward student success in tough economic times.)

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS, ATHLETIC:

Athletics is given its own section in this document because (a) it is a budget line that was previously debated on the Senate floor (in response to the *Huffington Post* article last term), (b) faculty are much better informed on this budgetary topic than they are on some others, and (c) athletics is not a unit whose primary purpose is directly related to student academic success, so it is not a unit that the Senate (per its resolution) considers the highest priority. As one Senator put it, if the full budget cuts go into effect, and if the athletics budget is not reduced, 1 in 4 appropriation dollars will go toward athletics. This Senator is, of course, aware of the fact that the university’s main revenue is tuition, not state appropriations, and that general appropriations and tuition are undifferentiated as far as spending goes, but this Senator contended that the simple metric expressed the gravity of the situation in these dire economic times.

- Consider moving from Division I.
- Consider following the May 5, 1989 Board of Regents resolution regarding athletics (the last known resolution regarding athletics):
 - RESOLVED that the amount of the annual contribution from E&G funds to support an effective intercollegiate athletic program not exceed 3.6 percent.
 - RESOLVED that various sources of athletic related revenue, other than E&G funds, must equal 33 1/3 percent of the annual athletic budget. . . If the revenue goal is not achieved, it is understood that the annual athletic budget will be adjusted so that the ratio of revenue to expenditure meets this policy guideline.
- Consider a partnering with Rowan County High, which needs to renovate its football field, on facilities and see how this partnership might be used as a recruitment and revenue generating opportunity.
- Consider cutting high cost sporting programs.

- Take another look at the high cost of athletic scholarships (a look that may require a movement to a division with fewer or no scholarship opportunities).

IDEAS FOR GENERATING REVENUE

- Charge tuition for Early College (noted above in possible solutions).
- Add more online courses and advertise online programs nationally to increase enrollments (and revenue). Arizona State is advertising widely in KY. We need to let KY students, and students in adjoining regions, that they don't need to look to Arizona for accredited online programs.
- Explore new programs that will generate student enrollment and increase revenue, such as: MSN in Nursing, BNP two admission cohort, a TESOL MA.
- Increase tuition. The President has noted that he doesn't want to discuss tuition increases yet publicly, but this would be the time to lobby the Council to allow us to raise tuition more than the planned increase. If it comes to it, we need to launch a public relations campaign so that students and citizens know that the Governor's budget is directly responsible for these tuition increases.
- Increase the use of campus for summer programs and activities.
- Create Morehead State Academy—a private P-12 academy built on the tradition of the Breckinridge School and akin to the ECU Model School.
- Increase Greek life, which will aid in retention and support alumni giving.
- Sell properties we are not using and able to sell. (Some wondered if the golf course would fall into this category.)
- Go big or go home with rebranding—consider a name change to make over a completely new MSU (and get free press as a result). (An interesting idea expressed by one Senator in particular.)