

AGENDA

Tuition Development Work Group

Council on Postsecondary Education

Thursday, April 19, 2018

2:00 PM

CPE Offices, Conf Rm A

1. Opening Remarks	
2. Enacted 2018-20 Budget (HB 200)	2
3. Key Issues for Upcoming Tuition Cycle	
a. Enacted Reduction (@6.25%)	3
b. KERS Increases	4
c. Fixed Cost Increase Estimates	5
d. Performance Funding	7
4. Budgetary Impact of Key Issues	11
5. Tuition Parameters	
a. Two-Year Cycle	13
b. Proposed Increases (Resident Undergraduate Ceilings)	
6. Data Requests	
a. Cost Savings and Efficiencies (Update)	18
b. Dining Fee Survey	29
c. Special Use Fee Survey	52
7. Other Business	62
8. Adjournment	

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution
 Table 2 - Enacted Budget General Fund Appropriations for Institutional Operations (HB 200)
 2018-20 Biennium

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

	A	B	(A + B) C	D	(C - D) E	(E x (-6.25%)) F	(C - D - F) G	H	I	J	K	Σ(G,H,I,J,K) L	(L - C) M	(L/C) -1 N
Institution	2017-18 Regular Appropriation ¹	Performance Distribution ²	2017-18 Total General Fund	Program Specific Cuts/Eliminations ³	Applicable Reduction Base	Across the Board Reduction (-6.25%)	Governor's Proposed 2018-19 General Fund	Program Specific Cuts Restored ⁴	New Funding	New Funding Debt Service ⁷	Restoration of 6.25% Reduction ⁸	Enacted Budget 2018-19 General Fund	Dollar Change	Percent Change
University of Kentucky	\$253,677,400	\$13,411,800	\$267,089,200	(\$10,176,300)	\$256,912,900	(\$16,057,100)	\$240,855,800	\$8,520,000	\$0	\$848,500	\$0	\$250,224,300	(\$16,864,900)	-6.31%
University of Louisville	126,177,500	6,580,500	132,758,000	0	132,758,000	(8,297,400)	124,460,600	0	150,000	0	0	124,610,600	(8,147,400)	-6.14%
Eastern Kentucky University	61,723,700	3,321,500	65,045,200	(350,000)	64,695,200	(4,043,500)	60,651,700	150,000	0	0	0	60,801,700	(4,243,500)	-6.52%
Kentucky State University	26,729,600	0	26,729,600	0	26,729,600	(1,670,600)	25,059,000	0	400,000	0	0	25,459,000	(1,270,600)	-4.75%
Morehead State University	39,899,700	1,742,900	41,642,600	(200,000)	41,442,600	(2,590,200)	38,852,400	0	0	0	0	38,852,400	(2,790,200)	-6.70%
Murray State University	43,570,800	2,231,300	45,802,100	(1,200,000)	44,602,100	(2,787,600)	41,814,500	3,200,000	0	0	0	45,014,500	(787,600)	-1.72%
Northern Kentucky University	48,875,200	2,745,900	51,621,100	(1,323,900)	50,297,200	(3,143,600)	47,153,600	1,323,900	0	0	0	48,477,500	(3,143,600)	-6.09%
Western Kentucky University	70,823,600	3,830,200	74,653,800	(750,000)	73,903,800	(4,619,000)	69,284,800	750,000	0	0	0	70,034,800	(4,619,000)	-6.19%
KCTCS	172,524,700	9,080,300	181,605,000	(3,760,700)	177,844,300	(11,115,300)	166,729,000	1,000,000	0	0	0	167,729,000	(13,876,000)	-7.64%
Total	\$844,002,200	\$42,944,400	\$886,946,600	(\$17,760,900)	\$869,185,700	(\$54,324,300)	\$814,861,400	\$14,943,900	\$550,000	\$848,500	\$0	\$831,203,800	(\$55,742,800)	-6.28%
												\$31,000,000		
												\$862,203,800	(\$24,742,800)	-2.79%

	(= Col. L) O	P	Q	R	(O - P - Q + R) S
Institution	Enacted Budget 2018-19 General Fund	Performance Allocation ⁹	Program Specific Cuts/Eliminations	New Funding Debt Service ¹¹	Enacted Budget 2019-20 General Fund
University of Kentucky	\$250,224,300	(\$1,811,900)	(\$1,000,000)	\$1,697,000	\$249,109,400
University of Louisville	124,610,600	(1,320,200)	0	0	123,290,400
Eastern Kentucky University	60,801,700	(626,500)	0	0	60,175,200
Kentucky State University	25,459,000	(199,900)	0	0	25,259,100
Morehead State University	38,852,400	(385,600)	0	0	38,466,800
Murray State University	45,014,500	(433,100)	0	0	44,581,400
Northern Kentucky University	48,477,500	(503,000)	0	0	47,974,500
Western Kentucky University	70,034,800	(690,600)	0	0	69,344,200
KCTCS	167,729,000	(1,695,000)	0	0	166,034,000
Total	\$831,203,800	(\$7,665,800)	(\$1,000,000)	\$1,697,000	\$824,235,000
			Postsecondary Education Performance Fund →		\$38,665,800
			Total Institutional Operating Appropriation →		\$862,900,800

Institution	Programs Cut or Eliminated	As Taken	As Restored	Net
UK	Veterinary Lab and Regulatory Services	(\$2,060,000)	\$3,900,000	\$1,840,000
UK	Center for Applied Energy Research	(2,670,000)	2,670,000	0
UK	Robinson Scholars Program	(1,000,000)	1,000,000	0
UK	Mining Engineering Scholarship Program	(300,000)	350,000	50,000
UK	Center for Entrepreneurship	(612,900)	600,000	(12,900)
→	Subtotal	(\$6,642,900)	\$8,520,000	\$1,877,100
EKU	Model Laboratory School	(\$150,000)	\$150,000	\$0
MuSU	Breathitt Veterinary Center	(1,200,000)	3,200,000	2,000,000
NKU	Kentucky Center for Mathematics	(1,323,900)	1,323,900	0
WKU	Kentucky Mesonet	(750,000)	750,000	0
KCTCS	Adult Agriculture Program	(1,410,600)	1,000,000	(410,600)
→	Total	(\$11,477,400)	\$14,943,900	\$3,466,500

2

¹ Enacted General Fund appropriations for institutional operations for fiscal year 2017-18. Figures shown were obtained from the 2016-2018 Budget of the Commonwealth (HB 303).
² Distribution of \$42.9 million from the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund (PEPF) to institutions in fiscal year 2017-18 based on funding model calculations.
³ Governor's proposed cuts and elimination of mandated program appropriations, using 2016-17 mandated program appropriations as a beginning base, and elimination of select scholarship programs at the University of Kentucky.
⁴ Restoration of program specific cut and elimination amounts specifically identified in the enacted budget (HB 200).
⁵ Additional appropriation for Autism Training at UofL.
⁶ Additional funding to meet the required federal match for KSU's land grant program.
⁷ The enacted budget contains debt service for a HealthCare Disparities Initiative at the University of Kentucky (i.e., \$40.0 million). It does not contain any state bond funds or debt service to support asset preservation projects at the postsecondary institutions.
⁸ The enacted budget does not restore any part of the 6.25% across-the-board cut contained in the Governor's proposed budget.
⁹ Amount deducted from each institution's operating base and placed in the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund in fiscal 2019-20. Represents 1.0% of each institution's adjusted net General Fund appropriation.
¹⁰ The \$1.0 million appropriation provided for the University of Kentucky's Robinson Scholars Program in 2018-19 is nonrecurring.
¹¹ Calculated by subtracting the University of Kentucky's 2018-19 appropriation for debt service from its 2019-20 appropriation for debt service.

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution
 Table 3.A. - Change in General Fund Appropriations
 Between Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

	A	B	(B - A) C	(B ÷ A) - 1 D
Institution	2017-18 Total General Fund ¹	2018-19 Enacted General Fund ²	Dollar Reduction	Percent Reduction
University of Kentucky	\$267,089,200	\$249,375,800	(\$17,713,400)	-6.63%
University of Louisville	132,758,000	124,610,600	(8,147,400)	-6.14%
Eastern Kentucky University	65,045,200	60,801,700	(4,243,500)	-6.52%
Kentucky State University	26,729,600	25,459,000	(1,270,600)	-4.75%
Morehead State University	41,642,600	38,852,400	(2,790,200)	-6.70%
Murray State University	45,802,100	45,014,500	(787,600)	-1.72%
Northern Kentucky University	51,621,100	48,477,500	(3,143,600)	-6.09%
Western Kentucky University	74,653,800	70,034,800	(4,619,000)	-6.19%
KCTCS	181,605,000	167,729,000	(13,876,000)	-7.64%
Subtotal	\$886,946,600	\$830,355,300	(\$56,591,300)	-6.38%
Performance Fund	0	31,000,000	31,000,000	NA
Postsecondary Total	\$886,946,600	\$861,355,300	(\$25,591,300)	-2.89%

¹ Sum of regular General Fund appropriations for postsecondary institution operations as enacted (HB 303) for fiscal year 2017-18, plus distribution to the institutions of \$42.9 million from the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund (PEPF) based on funding model calculations.

² Regular General Fund appropriations for postsecondary institution operations provided in the enacted 2018-20 budget (HB 200) for fiscal year 2018-19, minus \$848,500 for debt service included in the University of Kentucky's appropriation.

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution

Table 3.B. - Projected Change in Kentucky Employees Retirement System (KERS) Contributions Between Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

Draft - For Discussion Purposes

April 19, 2018

	A	B	(B - A) C	(B ÷ A) - 1 D	E	(C x -1) ÷ E F
Institution	2017-18 KERS Contributions ¹	2018-19 KERS Contributions ²	Dollar Change	Percent Change	2017-18 Total General Fund ³	Budgetary Impact
University of Kentucky	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA	\$267,089,200	NA
University of Louisville	0	0	0	NA	132,758,000	NA
Eastern Kentucky University	13,880,036	23,594,456	9,714,420	70%	65,045,200	-14.93%
Kentucky State University	1,941,996	3,300,535	1,358,539	70%	26,729,600	-5.08%
Morehead State University	4,688,060	7,971,843	3,283,783	70%	41,642,600	-7.89%
Murray State University	6,823,158	11,600,496	4,777,338	70%	45,802,100	-10.43%
Northern Kentucky University	18,311,898	31,122,629	12,810,731	70%	51,621,100	-24.82%
Western Kentucky University	10,373,542	17,636,809	7,263,267	70%	74,653,800	-9.73%
KCTCS	11,497,814	19,537,220	8,039,406	70%	181,605,000	-4.43%
Total	\$67,516,504	\$114,763,988	\$47,247,484	70%	\$886,946,600	-5.33%

Budgetary Impact on Participating KERS Institutions Only: -9.70%

¹ Estimated employer paid retirement contributions by institution for fiscal year 2017-18. Includes employees in hazardous and non-hazardous positions.

² Projected KERS contributions for fiscal year 2018-19. Depending on potential vetoes to HB 265, this 70% increase may be postponed until 2019-20.

³ Sum of regular General Fund appropriations for postsecondary institution operations as enacted (HB 303) for fiscal year 2017-18, plus distribution to the institutions of \$42.9 million from the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund (PEPF) based on funding model calculations.

Source: Kentucky Retirement System (KRS) projections.

4

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution
 Table 3.C.1. - Change in Other Fixed Costs and Net Tuition Revenue
 Between Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Estimated Fixed Cost Increases

(A - B - C)

Institution	A Total Fixed Cost Increases	B Institutional Financial Aid	C Projected KERS Increases	D Other Fixed Cost Increases
University of Kentucky	\$16,816,346	\$10,163,697	\$0	\$6,652,649
University of Louisville	10,054,100	765,330	0	9,288,770
Eastern Kentucky University ¹	13,440,726	0	9,714,000	3,726,726
Kentucky State University	2,326,000	180,000	1,330,000	816,000
Morehead State University	5,664,796	365,176	2,978,376	2,321,244
Murray State University	9,412,905	3,152,000	4,777,337	1,483,568
Northern Kentucky University	18,056,384	3,242,350	12,762,400	2,051,634
Western Kentucky University	7,966,000	418,000	5,500,000	2,048,000
KCTCS	13,497,913	2,010,381	8,039,400	3,448,132
	\$97,235,170	\$20,296,934	\$45,101,513	\$31,836,723

¹ Does not include anticipated cut of \$13.0 million in EKU's personnel budget.

Estimated Increase in Net Tuition Revenue

Institution	Additional Net Tuition Revenue ²
University of Kentucky	\$3,526,500
University of Louisville	1,269,800
Eastern Kentucky University	1,614,600
Kentucky State University	110,000
Morehead State University	453,300
Murray State University	784,800
Northern Kentucky University	1,155,200
Western Kentucky University	1,269,000
KCTCS	298,900
	\$10,482,100

² Assumes flat enrollment and a 1.0% increase in tuition and mandatory fees for all students.

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution
 Table 3.C.2. - Fixed Cost Increase Estimates by Institution
 Fiscal Year 2019-20

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Calculated Using Fiscal 2016-17 Spending Data

	UK	UofL	EKU	KSU	MoSU	MuSU	NKU	WKU	KCTCS
Direct Costs of Educating Student									
Instruction	\$314,506,000	\$293,306,000	\$94,275,794	NA	\$49,100,356	\$74,414,980	\$70,746,000	\$112,658,083	\$196,399,000
Student Services	39,951,000	31,942,000	21,334,050	NA	19,151,139	16,808,823	27,560,000	33,232,830	61,176,000
Total	\$354,457,000	\$325,248,000	\$115,609,844	NA	\$68,251,495	\$91,223,803	\$98,306,000	\$145,890,913	\$257,575,000
Mission Related (Dollars)									
Instruction + Student Services	\$354,457,000	\$325,248,000	\$115,609,844	NA	\$68,251,495	\$91,223,803	\$98,306,000	\$145,890,913	\$257,575,000
Research	276,088,000	141,177,000	937,655	NA	3,661,242	2,288,416	1,393,000	8,113,760	0
Public Service	186,579,000	140,221,000	43,792,886	NA	7,862,907	8,601,413	14,210,000	15,007,292	39,293,000
Total Mission Related	\$817,124,000	\$606,646,000	\$160,340,385	NA	\$79,775,644	\$102,113,632	\$113,909,000	\$169,011,965	\$296,868,000
Mission Related (Percent)									
Instruction + Student Services	43.4%	53.6%	72.1%	NA	85.6%	89.3%	86.3%	86.3%	86.8%
Research	33.8%	23.3%	0.6%	NA	4.6%	2.2%	1.2%	4.8%	0.0%
Public Service	22.8%	23.1%	27.3%	NA	9.9%	8.4%	12.5%	8.9%	13.2%
Total Mission Related	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	NA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Operational Support									
Academic Support	\$83,117,000	\$142,253,000	\$20,655,863	NA	\$10,019,525	\$7,674,313	\$19,907,000	\$20,265,266	\$27,403,000
Institutional Support	62,730,000	94,167,000	25,541,001	NA	18,286,540	22,340,304	31,540,000	69,195,133	73,848,000
Operation and Maintenance	80,661,000	51,404,000	24,727,894	NA	13,475,409	18,848,211	19,994,000	29,380,587	65,407,000
Libraries	22,637,000	0	4,260,972	NA	3,616,720	3,743,775	6,102,000	6,216,301	6,393,000
Total Indirect	\$249,145,000	\$287,824,000	\$75,185,730	NA	\$45,398,194	\$52,606,603	\$77,543,000	\$125,057,287	\$173,051,000
E&R Spending Calculation									
Instruction	\$314,506,000	\$293,306,000	\$94,275,794	NA	\$49,100,356	\$74,414,980	\$70,746,000	\$112,658,083	\$196,399,000
Student Services	39,951,000	31,942,000	21,334,050	NA	19,151,139	16,808,823	27,560,000	33,232,830	61,176,000
Indirect Cost Allocation	108,075,600	154,314,300	54,211,000	NA	38,840,100	46,996,400	66,921,300	107,949,300	150,146,200
Total E&R Spending	\$462,532,600	\$479,562,300	\$169,820,844	\$24,151,447	\$107,091,595	\$138,220,203	\$165,227,300	\$253,840,213	\$407,721,200
X Inflation Factor	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Cost Increase Allowance	\$9,250,700	\$9,591,200	\$3,396,400	\$483,000	\$2,141,800	\$2,764,400	\$3,304,500	\$5,076,800	\$8,154,400
→ The number highlighted in purple is KSU's 2015-16 Education and Related spending total								System Total:	44,163,200

9

Council on Postsecondary Education
 Table 3.D.1. - Sample Distribution of Allocable Resources by Institution
 Based on Enacted Budget (HB 200) Appropriations and Planned 2018-19 Mandated Program Expenditures

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Fiscal Year 2018-19

Sample Distribution of \$31.0 M in Performance Funds

Institution	(A - B)			Outcomes Based Components (@ 70%)				Operational Support Components (@ 30%)					D	(D - C)	(E + A)	
	A	B	C	Success Share ²	Student Success	Credit Hour Share ³	Course Completion	Square Feet Share ⁴	Maintenance & Operations	Direct Cost Share ⁵	Institutional Support	FTE Student Share ⁶	Academic Support	Formula Totals	Dollar Difference	Base Change
UK	\$165,179,100	(\$16,517,900)	\$148,661,200	31.2%	\$54,656,300	29.7%	\$52,044,900	33.4%	\$16,704,600	27.0%	\$13,520,200	31.7%	\$15,873,600	\$152,799,600	\$4,138,400	2.5%
UofL	123,869,000	(12,386,900)	111,482,100	21.2%	37,214,100	22.7%	39,825,500	19.1%	9,544,200	25.4%	12,728,500	20.7%	10,375,100	109,687,400	(1,794,700)	-1.4%
EKU	58,601,700	(4,449,100)	54,152,600	11.1%	19,512,900	11.7%	20,492,200	10.5%	5,243,700	10.3%	5,178,700	10.8%	5,418,800	55,846,300	1,693,700	2.9%
KSU	18,807,600	(4,449,100)	14,358,500	1.7%	2,933,200	1.0%	1,747,300	3.3%	1,634,700	1.6%	814,500	1.3%	674,200	7,803,900	(6,554,600)	-34.9%
MoSU	36,030,000	(4,449,100)	31,580,900	5.3%	9,304,600	5.7%	10,048,700	6.2%	3,085,900	5.7%	2,856,900	5.8%	2,911,200	28,207,300	(3,373,600)	-9.4%
MuSU	41,814,500	(4,449,100)	37,365,400	7.3%	12,716,300	6.9%	12,104,400	9.2%	4,599,300	7.4%	3,714,600	7.2%	3,579,700	36,714,300	(651,100)	-1.6%
NKU	47,153,600	(4,449,100)	42,704,500	9.6%	16,752,000	9.3%	16,216,100	8.6%	4,306,800	9.2%	4,621,500	9.7%	4,847,300	46,743,700	4,039,200	8.6%
WKU	64,537,100	(4,449,100)	60,088,000	12.6%	22,048,300	12.9%	22,658,400	9.8%	4,920,200	13.2%	6,604,500	12.7%	6,359,300	62,590,700	2,502,700	3.9%
Sector	\$555,992,600	(\$55,599,400)	\$500,393,200	100.0%	\$175,137,700	100.0%	\$175,137,500	100.0%	\$50,039,400	100.0%	\$50,039,400	100.0%	\$50,039,200	\$500,393,200	\$0	0.0%
			Allocated Dollars:		\$175,137,600		\$175,137,600		\$50,039,300		\$50,039,300		\$50,039,300	\$500,393,100	} Math Check	
			Percent of Total:		35.0%		35.0%		10.0%		10.0%		10.0%	100.0%		

¹ Small School Adjustment defined as fixed base amount that remains constant when sector total appropriation increases or stays the same, but may be reduced if there is a budget cut.
² Student Success component distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student success outcomes produced (i.e., bachelor's degrees; STEM+H, URM, and low-income bachelor's degrees; and student progression at 30, 60, and 90 credit hour thresholds).
³ Course Completion distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student credit hours earned. Weights reflect differences in costs by course level and discipline, as well as, differences in cost structures and mission between sectors. Credit hours earned by out-of-state students are counted at 50% of similar credit hours earned by in-state students.
⁴ Funding for maintenance and operation (M&O) of facilities distributed based on each institution's share of Category I and Category II square feet, net of research, non-class laboratory, and open laboratory space.
⁵ Institutional Support component distributed based on each institution's share of sector total instruction and student services spending (i.e., share of direct instructional costs).
⁶ Academic Support distributed based on each institution's share of total FTE student enrollment, weighted for differences in cost structures and mission between sectors.

Council on Postsecondary Education
 Table 3.D.2. - Sample Distribution of Allocable Resources by Institution
 Based on Enacted Budget (HB 200) Appropriations and Planned 2018-19 Mandated Program Expenditures

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Fiscal Year 2018-19

Sample Distribution of \$31.0 M in Performance Funds

Institution	(A + B)		(C - D - E)				Outcomes Based Components (@ 70%)				Operational Support Components (@ 30%)					(G - F)		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Success Share ²	Student Success	Credit Hour Share ³	Course Completion	Square Feet Share ⁴	Maintenance & Operations	Direct Cost Share ⁵	Institutional Support	FTE Student Share ⁶	Academic Support	G	H
	2018-19 Adjusted Net General Fund	Performance Fund Distribution	2018-19 Revised Net General Fund	Small School Adjustment ¹	Hold Harmless Allocation	Allocable Resources											Formula Totals	Dollar Difference
UK	\$165,179,100	\$8,804,500	\$173,983,600	(\$16,517,900)	\$0	\$157,465,700	31.2%	\$56,325,400	29.7%	\$53,634,200	33.4%	\$17,214,700	27.0%	\$13,933,000	31.7%	\$16,358,400	\$157,465,700	\$0
UofL	123,869,000	1,554,900	125,423,900	(12,386,900)	0	113,037,000	21.2%	38,350,600	22.7%	41,041,700	19.1%	9,835,700	25.4%	13,117,200	20.7%	10,691,900	113,037,100	100
EKU	58,601,700	3,399,100	62,000,800	(4,449,100)	0	57,551,700	11.1%	20,108,700	11.7%	21,118,000	10.5%	5,403,800	10.3%	5,336,900	10.8%	5,584,300	57,551,700	0
KSU	18,807,600	0	18,807,600	(4,449,100)	(6,316,300)	8,042,200	1.7%	3,022,800	1.0%	1,800,600	3.3%	1,684,600	1.6%	839,300	1.3%	694,800	8,042,100	(100)
MoSU	36,030,000	0	36,030,000	(4,449,100)	(2,512,200)	29,068,700	5.3%	9,588,700	5.7%	10,355,600	6.2%	3,180,100	5.7%	2,944,100	5.8%	3,000,100	29,068,600	(100)
MuSU	41,814,500	470,100	42,284,600	(4,449,100)	0	37,835,500	7.3%	13,104,600	6.9%	12,474,100	9.2%	4,739,700	7.4%	3,828,000	7.2%	3,689,100	37,835,500	0
NKU	47,153,600	5,466,600	52,620,200	(4,449,100)	0	48,171,100	9.6%	17,263,500	9.3%	16,711,300	8.6%	4,438,400	9.2%	4,762,700	9.7%	4,995,400	48,171,300	200
WKU	64,537,100	4,414,100	68,951,200	(4,449,100)	0	64,502,100	12.6%	22,721,600	12.9%	23,350,400	9.8%	5,070,400	13.2%	6,806,200	12.7%	6,553,500	64,502,100	0
Sector	\$555,992,600	\$24,109,300	\$580,101,900	(\$55,599,400)	(\$8,828,500)	\$515,674,000	100.0%	\$180,485,900	100.0%	\$180,485,900	100.0%	\$51,567,400	100.0%	\$51,567,400	100.0%	\$51,567,500	\$515,674,100	\$100
						Allocated Dollars:		\$180,485,900		\$180,485,900		\$51,567,400		\$51,567,400		\$51,567,400	\$515,674,000	} Math Check
						Percent of Total:		35.0%		35.0%		10.0%		10.0%		10.0%	100.0%	

¹ Small School Adjustment defined as fixed base amount that remains constant when sector total appropriation increases or stays the same, but may be reduced if there is a budget cut.
² Student Success component distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student success outcomes produced (i.e., bachelor's degrees; STEM+H, URM, and low-income bachelor's degrees; and student progression at 30, 60, and 90 credit hour thresholds).
³ Course Completion distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student credit hours earned. Weights reflect differences in costs by course level and discipline, as well as, differences in cost structures and mission between sectors. Credit hours earned by out-of-state students are counted at 50% of similar credit hours earned by in-state students.
⁴ Funding for maintenance and operation (M&O) of facilities distributed based on each institution's share of Category I and Category II square feet, net of research, non-class laboratory, and open laboratory space.
⁵ Institutional Support component distributed based on each institution's share of sector total instruction and student services spending (i.e., share of direct instructional costs).
⁶ Academic Support distributed based on each institution's share of total FTE student enrollment, weighted for differences in cost structures and mission between sectors.

Council on Postsecondary Education
 Table 3.D.3. - Sample Distribution of Allocable Resources by Institution
 Based on Enacted Budget (HB 200) Appropriations and Planned 2018-19 Mandated Program Expenditures

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Fiscal Year 2019-20

Sample Distribution of \$7.7 M in Performance Funds

Institution	(A - B - C)				Outcomes Based Components (@ 70%)				Operational Support Components (@ 30%)					E	F	G	
	2019-20 Adjusted Net General Fund	Small School Adjustment ¹	Hold Harmless Allocation	Allocable Resources	Success Share ²	Student Success	Credit Hour Share ³	Course Completion	Square Feet Share ⁴	Maintenance & Operations	Direct Cost Share ⁵	Institutional Support	FTE Student Share ⁶				Academic Support
UK	\$171,171,700	(\$16,517,900)	\$0	\$154,653,800	31.2%	\$55,563,800	29.7%	\$52,909,200	33.4%	\$16,982,000	27.0%	\$13,744,700	31.7%	\$16,137,200	\$155,336,900	\$683,100	0.4%
UofL	124,103,700	(12,386,900)	0	111,716,800	21.2%	37,832,300	22.7%	40,486,900	19.1%	9,702,700	25.4%	12,939,800	20.7%	10,547,400	111,509,100	(207,700)	-0.2%
EKU	61,374,300	(4,449,100)	0	56,925,200	11.1%	19,836,800	11.7%	20,832,500	10.5%	5,330,700	10.3%	5,264,700	10.8%	5,508,800	56,773,500	(151,700)	-0.2%
KSU	18,607,700	(4,449,100)	(6,316,300)	7,842,300	1.7%	2,981,800	1.0%	1,776,300	3.3%	1,661,900	1.6%	828,000	1.3%	685,400	7,933,400	91,100	0.5%
MoSU	35,644,400	(4,449,100)	(2,512,200)	28,683,100	5.3%	9,459,100	5.7%	10,215,600	6.2%	3,137,100	5.7%	2,904,300	5.8%	2,959,600	28,675,700	(7,400)	0.0%
MuSU	41,851,500	(4,449,100)	0	37,402,400	7.3%	12,927,400	6.9%	12,305,500	9.2%	4,675,700	7.4%	3,776,300	7.2%	3,639,200	37,324,100	(78,300)	-0.2%
NKU	52,117,200	(4,449,100)	0	47,668,100	9.6%	17,030,300	9.3%	16,485,400	8.6%	4,378,400	9.2%	4,698,300	9.7%	4,927,800	47,520,200	(147,900)	-0.3%
WKU	68,260,600	(4,449,100)	0	63,811,500	12.6%	22,414,500	12.9%	23,034,700	9.8%	5,001,900	13.2%	6,714,200	12.7%	6,464,900	63,630,200	(181,300)	-0.3%
Sector	\$573,131,100	(\$55,599,400)	(\$8,828,500)	\$508,703,200	100.0%	\$178,046,000	100.0%	\$178,046,100	100.0%	\$50,870,400	100.0%	\$50,870,300	100.0%	\$50,870,300	\$508,703,100	(\$100)	0.0%
				Allocated Dollars:		\$178,046,100		\$178,046,100		\$50,870,300		\$50,870,300		\$50,870,300	\$508,703,100		
				Percent of Total:		35.0%		35.0%		10.0%		10.0%		10.0%	100.0%		Math Check

¹ Small School Adjustment defined as fixed base amount that remains constant when sector total appropriation increases or stays the same, but may be reduced if there is a budget cut.
² Student Success component distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student success outcomes produced (i.e., bachelor's degrees; STEM+H, URM, and low-income bachelor's degrees; and student progression at 30, 60, and 90 credit hour thresholds).
³ Course Completion distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student credit hours earned. Weights reflect differences in costs by course level and discipline, as well as, differences in cost structures and mission between sectors. Credit hours earned by out-of-state students are counted at 50% of similar credit hours earned by in-state students.
⁴ Funding for maintenance and operation (M&O) of facilities distributed based on each institution's share of Category I and Category II square feet, net of research, non-class laboratory, and open laboratory space.
⁵ Institutional Support component distributed based on each institution's share of sector total instruction and student services spending (i.e., share of direct instructional costs).
⁶ Academic Support distributed based on each institution's share of total FTE student enrollment, weighted for differences in cost structures and mission between sectors.

Council on Postsecondary Education
 Table 3.D.4. - Sample Distribution of Allocable Resources by Institution
 Based on Enacted Budget (HB 200) Appropriations and Planned 2018-19 Mandated Program Expenditures

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Fiscal Year 2019-20

Sample Distribution of \$7.7 M in Performance Funds

Institution	(A + B)		(C - D - E)			F	Outcomes Based Components (@ 70%)				Operational Support Components (@ 30%)					G	H	
	A	B	C	D	E		Success Share ²	Student Success	Credit Hour Share ³	Course Completion	Square Feet Share ⁴	Maintenance & Operations	Direct Cost Share ⁵	Institutional Support	FTE Student Share ⁶			Academic Support
UK	\$171,171,700	\$2,671,500	\$173,843,200	(\$16,517,900)	\$0	\$157,325,300	31.2%	\$56,275,100	29.7%	\$53,586,500	33.4%	\$17,199,400	27.0%	\$13,920,600	31.7%	\$16,343,800	\$157,325,400	\$100
UofL	124,103,700	1,219,700	125,323,400	(12,386,900)	0	112,936,500	21.2%	38,316,600	22.7%	41,005,200	19.1%	9,826,900	25.4%	13,105,500	20.7%	10,682,400	112,936,600	100
EKU	61,374,300	575,100	61,949,400	(4,449,100)	0	57,500,300	11.1%	20,090,700	11.7%	21,099,200	10.5%	5,399,000	10.3%	5,332,100	10.8%	5,579,300	57,500,300	0
KSU	18,607,700	0	18,607,700	(4,449,100)	(6,123,600)	8,035,000	1.7%	3,020,000	1.0%	1,799,000	3.3%	1,683,100	1.6%	838,600	1.3%	694,200	8,034,900	(100)
MoSU	35,644,400	0	35,644,400	(4,449,100)	(2,152,500)	29,042,800	5.3%	9,580,200	5.7%	10,346,300	6.2%	3,177,300	5.7%	2,941,500	5.8%	2,997,500	29,042,800	0
MuSU	41,851,500	399,500	42,251,000	(4,449,100)	0	37,801,900	7.3%	13,092,900	6.9%	12,463,000	9.2%	4,735,500	7.4%	3,824,600	7.2%	3,685,800	37,801,800	(100)
NKU	52,117,200	460,400	52,577,600	(4,449,100)	0	48,128,500	9.6%	17,248,300	9.3%	16,696,500	8.6%	4,434,400	9.2%	4,758,400	9.7%	4,990,900	48,128,500	0
WKU	68,260,600	633,200	68,893,800	(4,449,100)	0	64,444,700	12.6%	22,701,400	12.9%	23,329,600	9.8%	5,065,900	13.2%	6,800,100	12.7%	6,547,700	64,444,700	0
Sector	\$573,131,100	\$5,959,400	\$579,090,500	(\$55,599,400)	(\$8,276,100)	\$515,215,000	100.0%	\$180,325,200	100.0%	\$180,325,300	100.0%	\$51,521,500	100.0%	\$51,521,400	100.0%	\$51,521,600	\$515,215,000	\$0
							Allocated Dollars:	\$180,325,300		\$180,325,300		\$51,521,500		\$51,521,500		\$51,521,500	\$515,215,100	} Math Check
							Percent of Total:	35.0%		35.0%		10.0%		10.0%		10.0%	100.0%	

¹ Small School Adjustment defined as fixed base amount that remains constant when sector total appropriation increases or stays the same, but may be reduced if there is a budget cut.

² Student Success component distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student success outcomes produced (i.e., bachelor's degrees; STEM+H, URM, and low-income bachelor's degrees; and student progression at 30, 60, and 90 credit hour thresholds).

³ Course Completion distributed based on each institution's share of weighted student credit hours earned. Weights reflect differences in costs by course level and discipline, as well as, differences in cost structures and mission between sectors. Credit hours earned by out-of-state students are counted at 50% of similar credit hours earned by in-state students.

⁴ Funding for maintenance and operation (M&O) of facilities distributed based on each institution's share of Category I and Category II square feet, net of research, non-class laboratory, and open laboratory space.

⁵ Institutional Support component distributed based on each institution's share of sector total instruction and student services spending (i.e., share of direct instructional costs).

⁶ Academic Support distributed based on each institution's share of total FTE student enrollment, weighted for differences in cost structures and mission between sectors.

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution

Draft - For Discussion Purposes

Table 4.A. - Budgetary Impact of Enacted Budget, Fixed Cost Increases, and Performance Fund Distribution
Academic Year 2018-19 Tuition Cycle

April 19, 2018

Institution	Budgetary Challenges and Opportunities					Σ (B,C,D,E)	(F ÷ A)
	A 2017-18 Total General Fund ¹	B 6.25% Cut in General Fund ²	C Unfunded KERS Cost Increases ³	D Other Fixed Cost Increases ⁴	E Performance Distribution ⁵	F Combined Dollar Impact	G Combined Percent Impact
University of Kentucky	\$267,089,200	(\$16,057,100)	\$0	(\$6,652,649)	\$8,804,500	(\$13,905,249)	-5.2%
University of Louisville	132,758,000	(8,297,400)	0	(9,288,770)	1,554,900	(16,031,270)	-12.1%
Eastern Kentucky University	65,045,200	(4,043,500)	(9,714,400)	(3,726,726)	3,399,100	(14,085,526)	-21.7%
Kentucky State University	26,729,600	(1,670,600)	(1,358,600)	(816,000)	0	(3,845,200)	-14.4%
Morehead State University	41,642,600	(2,590,200)	(3,283,800)	(2,321,244)	0	(8,195,244)	-19.7%
Murray State University	45,802,100	(2,787,600)	(4,777,300)	(1,483,568)	470,100	(8,578,368)	-18.7%
Northern Kentucky University	51,621,100	(3,143,600)	(12,810,700)	(2,051,634)	5,466,600	(12,539,334)	-24.3%
Western Kentucky University	74,653,800	(4,619,000)	(7,263,300)	(2,048,000)	4,414,100	(9,516,200)	-12.7%
KCTCS	181,605,000	(11,115,300)	(8,039,400)	(3,448,132)	6,890,700	(15,712,132)	-8.7%
Total	\$886,946,600	(\$54,324,300)	(\$47,247,500)	(\$31,836,723)	\$31,000,000	(\$102,408,523)	-11.5%

Budgetary Impact on Participating KERS Institutions Only: -14.9%

¹ Sum of regular General Fund appropriations for postsecondary institution operations as enacted (HB 303) for fiscal year 2017-18, plus distribution to the institutions of \$42.9 million from the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund (PEPF) based on funding model calculations.

² The 2018-20 Executive Budget included an across-the-board reduction in General Fund appropriations of 6.25% for each institution in fiscal 2018-19, which was not restored in the enacted budget. Appropriations for specific programs, which may have been cut or eliminated in the Executive Budget or restored in the enacted budget, are not included in this analysis because they do not impact credit hour generating programs.

³ The enacted budget does not provide any appropriations to offset mandated increases in KERS employer paid retirement contributions at Kentucky comprehensive universities and KCTCS institutions. Projected increases in KERS contributions shown above were obtained from the Kentucky Retirement System.

⁴ Other fixed cost increases include maintenance and operation (M&O) of facilities, health insurance, contractual obligation, and worker's compensation increases. For 2018-19, fixed cost increase estimates were provided by campus chief budget officers.

⁵ Sample distribution of \$31.0 million appropriated to the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund in fiscal 2018-19. Distribution determined based on appropriations for institutional operating funds included in the enacted budget and planned mandated program expenditures for 2018-19 obtained from campus chief budget officers.

Kentucky Public Postsecondary Institution
 Table 4.B. - Budgetary Impact of Enacted Budget, Fixed Cost Increases, and Performance Fund Distribution
 Academic Year 2019-20 Tuition Cycle

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
 April 19, 2018

Institution	(A + B)			Budgetary Challenges and Opportunities			Σ (D, E, F)	(G ÷ C)
	A 2018-19 Enacted General Fund ¹	B Performance Distribution ²	C Revised 2018-19 General Fund	D Performance Allocation ³	E Estimated Fixed Cost Increases ⁴	F Performance Distribution ⁵	G Combined Dollar Impact	H Combined Percent Impact
University of Kentucky	\$249,375,800	\$8,804,500	\$258,180,300	(\$1,811,900)	(\$9,250,700)	\$2,671,500	(\$8,391,100)	-3.3%
University of Louisville	124,610,600	1,554,900	126,165,500	(1,320,200)	(9,591,200)	1,219,700	(9,691,700)	-7.7%
Eastern Kentucky University	60,801,700	3,399,100	64,200,800	(626,500)	(3,396,400)	575,100	(3,447,800)	-5.4%
Kentucky State University	25,459,000	0	25,459,000	(199,900)	(483,000)	0	(682,900)	-2.7%
Morehead State University	38,852,400	0	38,852,400	(385,600)	(2,141,800)	0	(2,527,400)	-6.5%
Murray State University	45,014,500	470,100	45,484,600	(433,100)	(2,764,400)	399,500	(2,798,000)	-6.2%
Northern Kentucky University	48,477,500	5,466,600	53,944,100	(503,000)	(3,304,500)	460,400	(3,347,100)	-6.2%
Western Kentucky University	70,034,800	4,414,100	74,448,900	(690,600)	(5,076,800)	633,200	(5,134,200)	-6.9%
KCTCS	167,729,000	6,890,700	174,619,700	(1,695,000)	(8,154,400)	1,706,400	(8,143,000)	-4.7%
Total	\$830,355,300	\$31,000,000	\$861,355,300	(\$7,665,800)	(\$44,163,200)	\$7,665,800	(\$44,163,200)	-5.1%

¹ Regular General Fund appropriations for postsecondary institution operations provided in the enacted budget (HB 200) for fiscal year 2018-19, minus \$848,500 for debt service included in the University of Kentucky's appropriation.

² Sample distribution among institutions of \$31.0 million appropriated to the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund (PEPF) in fiscal 2018-19 in the enacted budget. Figures shown in this distribution are based on a three-year rolling average of student outcome and operational support activity data that will be updated in coming weeks. For this reason, these numbers can and will change in the final distribution.

³ Amount deducted from each institution's operating base and placed in the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund in fiscal 2019-20. Represents 1.0% of each institution's adjusted net General Fund appropriation, as calculated in October 2017 and included in the Council's biennial budget request.

⁴ Fixed cost increases include maintenance and operation (M&O) of facilities, health insurance, contractual obligation, and worker's compensation increases. For the 2019-20 academic year, cost increase estimates were calculated by multiplying 2.0% times each institution's Education and Related (E&R) spending for fiscal year 2016-17.

⁵ Sample distribution of \$7.7 million appropriated to the Postsecondary Education Performance Fund in fiscal 2019-20. Distribution determined based on appropriations for institutional operating funds included in the enacted budget and planned mandated program expenditures for 2018-19 obtained from campus chief budget officers

April 29, 2014

REVISED

Tuition and Mandatory Fee Recommendation Academic Years 2014–15 and 2015–16

The Council staff used a collaborative process to develop its 2014-15 and 2015-16 tuition and mandatory fee ceiling recommendations, which included sharing information and engaging in discussions with the Council's Tuition Development Work Group, additional Council members, campus presidents and chief budget officers, student groups, and the governor's office. Based on feedback from multiple stakeholders, there is a general sentiment that increases in resident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees should be moderate to support a necessary balance between students' and families' ability to pay for college and institutional funding to support continued progress toward achieving the goals of HB1 and the Strategic Agenda. There is also interest among Council members and campus officials in transitioning to a two-year tuition setting cycle. Adopting a two-year approach will facilitate strategic planning and budgeting processes at the institutions and make college costs more predictable for students and families.

ACTION: For the research and comprehensive universities, the Tuition Development Work Group recommends that the Council approve resident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee ceilings for academic years 2014-15 and 2015-16 that do not exceed 5 percent in any one year and do not exceed 8 percent over two years.¹

For KCTCS institutions, the Tuition Development Work Group recommends that the Council approve resident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee ceilings of no more than \$147.00 per credit hour in academic year 2014-15 and no more than \$150.00 per credit hour in academic year 2015-16, which equates to a three dollar per credit hour increase each year.

It is recommended that the Council and the institutions be able to revisit the academic year 2015-16 ceilings should there be a change in net General Fund appropriations.

It is recommended that the Council maintain the current floor for nonresident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees of two times the resident, undergraduate rate.

Finally, it is recommended that the public universities be allowed to submit for Council approval market competitive resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fee rates for graduate and online courses.

¹ The actual 2015-16 ceiling may slightly exceed 8% above the 2013-14 base rates due to the effect of compounding.

These recommendations are consistent with Council-approved Tuition and Mandatory Fee Policy objectives, including funding adequacy, shared benefits and responsibility, affordability and student access, attracting and importing talent, and effective use of resources.

2014-15, 2015-16 Resident, Undergraduate Tuition and Mandatory Fees

The following table contains the maximum possible 2015-16 resident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee ceilings under the CPE staff recommendation. For the research and comprehensive universities, the one-year percentage point increases in 2014-15 and in 2015-16 cannot sum to more than 8 percent, and the increases in any single year cannot exceed 5 percent. The final 2015-16 ceilings shown in Table 1 represent slightly more than an eight percent increase due to compounding. If there is a change in net General Fund appropriations, the Council and the institutions reserve the right to revisit the 2015-16 ceilings.

Resident Undergraduate Tuition and Mandatory Fees **Table 1**
Recommended 2015-16 Maximum Dollar Ceilings by Institution

Institution	2013-14 Tuition & Fee Base Rates ^(a)	Maximum 2015-16 Tuition & Fees	Biennial Dollar Change	Biennial Percent Change ^(b)
UK – Lower Division	\$9,966	\$10,780	\$814	8%
UK – Upper Division	10,254	11,091	837	8%
UofL	9,750	10,546	796	8%
EKU	7,536	8,150	614	8%
KSU (FTCR) ^(c)	7,061	7,637	576	8%
MoSU	7,366	7,967	601	8%
MuSU	7,044	7,619	575	8%
NKU	8,088	8,748	660	8%
WKU	8,582	9,282	700	8%
KCTCS				
Tuition	\$144.00 pch	\$150.00 pch	\$6.00 pch	4%
Agency Bond Fee ^(d)	0.00 pch	8.00 pch	8.00 pch	
Total	\$144.00 pch	\$158.00 pch	\$14.00 pch	10%

FTCR - Full Time Comparison Rate

pch - per credit hour

(a) Does not include Special Use Fees at NKU, MoSU, WKU, and UL

(b) May exceed eight percent due to compounding.

(c) KSU is planning to transition to a flat-rate pricing structure for 2014-15. This change may necessitate an adjustment to their approved ceiling at the June Council meeting.

(d) KCTCSs Agency Bond Fee is not included in the CPE staff recommendation. It is displayed here for information purposes only.

Nonresident, Undergraduate Tuition and Mandatory Fees

The current floor for nonresident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees is two times the resident, undergraduate rate. The staff recommends the Council maintain the current floor. Any institution desiring to assess a nonresident, undergraduate rate that is less than two times the resident, undergraduate rate is expected to request an exception to this policy when it submits its 2014-15 and 2015-16 tuition and mandatory fee rates for final Council action.

Graduate and Online Tuition and Mandatory Fees

The staff recommends that the public universities be allowed to submit for Council approval market competitive resident and nonresident tuition and mandatory fee rates, as approved by their respective boards, for graduate and online courses.

Budgetary Impact of Fixed Cost Increases

It is estimated that Kentucky's universities and KCTCS will incur increases in fixed costs and other obligations of nearly \$77.9 million in 2014-15 (Attachment 1). The largest individual categories are increases in institutional financial aid (\$25.6 million), health insurance premiums (\$15.5 million), maintenance and operations expenses (\$9.7 million), and employer-paid retirement, contributions (\$8.4 million). Other fixed costs, including, utilities, contractual obligations, workman's compensation, and unemployment compensation, are expected to rise by \$18.7 million.

In addition to fixed cost increases, the universities and community colleges are faced with reductions in their net General Fund appropriations. House Bill 235 provided \$8.4 million to cover half the expected increase in employer-paid retirement contributions associated with state mandated KERS rate increases. A 1.5 percent reduction, totaling \$13.9 million, was then applied to the total of the 2013-14 net General Fund appropriations and the additional KERS funds (Attachment 2).

The Council staff has recommended maximum 2014-15 tuition and fee rate ceilings of up to 5 percent for the research and comprehensive universities and three dollars per credit hour (or about a 2 percent increase) for all KCTCS institutions. When the proposed increases are assessed uniformly across all categories of students (i.e., every academic level, residency, and full-time or part-time status) in an assumed no-growth student enrollment environment, campus officials estimate that the proposed rate increases will generate \$66.4 million in additional tuition and fee revenue, in fiscal year 2014-15 (Attachment 3). This projected increase in tuition and fee revenue will cover only about 72 percent of the estimated \$91.8 million increase in fixed costs and net General Fund reductions, resulting in an estimated budget shortfall of \$25.3 million (Attachments 4 and 5).

2014-15, 2015-16 Rate Proposals

It is anticipated that institutions will submit their proposed 2014-15 and 2015-16 tuition and fee rates for Council approval at the June 20 meeting. This will allow additional time for campus officials to share tuition and fee ceilings with various stakeholders and obtain input from their respective boards prior to setting tuition.

The staff will recommend for Council approval tuition and fee rates that meet the following criteria:

- a) Increases in resident, undergraduate tuition and mandatory fees that are at or below the approved ceiling (including any potential change related to KSU's planned transition to flat-rate pricing);
- b) Nonresident, undergraduate rates that are at least two times the resident, undergraduate rate;
- c) Proposed exceptions to the nonresident rate floor that have been previously approved by the Council and are in line with 2013-14 rates; and
- d) Market competitive tuition and fee rates for graduate and online courses.

Staff preparation by Bill Payne, Shaun McKiernan, and Scott Boelscher

University of Kentucky

- E-Payables-Payable Procurement Innovation (New Revenue)

The University implemented a new payment method in FY 14-15 that pays regular purchase order invoices as virtual procurement card purchases through its procurement card provider rather than paying via check. These payments are eligible for the procurement card rebate, therefore increasing the size of the rebate revenue to the University.

FY 14-15	\$799,892
FY 15-16	\$1,320,134
FY 16-17	\$965,699
FY 17-18 (YTD)	\$737,750

- Campus Multi-Media Rights Innovation (New Revenue)

The University sought a new revenue opportunity through issuing an RFP to develop and market various campus multi-media rights sponsorships packages.

FY 15-16	\$144,110
FY 16-17	\$1,112,225
FY 17-18 (YTD)	\$730,921

- Energy Conservation Management Initiative (Cost Avoidance)

In FY 16-17, the University engaged a consultant engineering company through issuing an RFP to help with optimizing energy usage in campus facilities.

FY 16-17	\$1,054,000
FY 17-18	\$2,527,000 Projected

- UK HealthCare (Expense Reduction)

Supply chain initiative including pricing and utilization of supplies. For example, savings from rebates and contract renewals and results of four clinical optimization teams.

FY 13-14	\$4,100,000
FY 14-15	\$7,558,790
FY 15-16	\$4,800,000
FY 16-17	\$3,460,000
FY 17-18 (YTD)	\$11,000,000

- UK HealthCare: (Expense Reduction)

Productivity initiative of setting staffing targets by functional area resulting in flexing staff to match volume.

FY 14-15	\$10,191,815
FY 16-17	\$1,358,579

University of LouisvilleFY 2014 - 2016

- Voluntary retirement program for faculty and staff \$6,600,000

FY 2017

- Refinanced outstanding debt \$2,000,000
- Third-party vendor utility responsibility \$175,000

FY 2018

- Imposed university-wide hiring “frost” and reduced the number of administrators in executive administration \$8,500,000 (YTD)
- Software reductions and renegotiated software maintenance contracts \$150,000
- Hardware lease reductions \$340,000
- HR Benefits Savings \$1,600,000
- Negotiated new contract for all Banking Services under one contract (new revenue) \$450,000
- Negotiated new contract for managed print service (new revenue) \$250,000
- Adjusted building automation controls, including standardizing temperature set points and schedules in buildings across campus \$250,000
- Eliminated outside vendor for W2 preparation and utilized internal system functionality \$10,000
- Third-party vendor utility responsibility \$175,000

FY 2019 [Estimates]

- Developed university-wide cell phone stipend policy to include eliminating reimbursements/stipends for any position of Associate Vice President and Deans and higher \$250,000
- Third-party vendor utility responsibility \$175,000
- HR Benefits savings \$3,500,000
- Banking services & managed print contracts (revenue & savings) \$550,000
- Impose university-wide hiring “frost” \$10,000,000
- Procurement savings \$10,000,000
- Cost savings related to operational efficiencies \$10,000,000

Eastern Kentucky University

FY16-18

- O&M Sequestration (later a cut) \$3 M
- Academic Program Review \$614.7 K
- E RTP Savings (Enhanced Retirement actions) \$1.7 M
- Operational Savings Actions \$2.6 M
- Academic Vacancies \$1.459 M
- Personnel Reductions \$307 K
- Vacation Accrual Savings \$1.15 M

FY14-16

- Strategic Budget Reallocation Task Force
RIF/Buy-out/Reinvestment Actions \$11.8 M
- Debt restructuring \$350 K

Subtotal FY16-18, expenditure reduction actions \$10.83 M

Subtotal FY14-16 (reinvested back to institution) \$11.8 M

Subtotal FY14-16 savings \$370 K

Kentucky State University

Cost savings or efficiencies that have been implemented or achieved in response to recent reductions in state appropriations for institutional operating fund at Kentucky State University within the past 5 years are listed below. Please note that these actions were taken in 2015 and 2016 and that not all of these measures are currently in place:

- Eliminated Destiny and Legacy tuition programs (tuition discounts) for new students;
- Increased reserves for the write-off of delinquent student receivables - \$200,000;
- Increased tuition by 5% for FY 2016 - \$750,000;
- Eliminated 32 positions across the university (\$1.6 million), an additional 21 positions eliminated in fall 2015 as enrollment did not meet projections (\$1.2 million);
- Eliminated all funding for consultants - \$300,000;
- Eliminated several coordinator positions and transferred duties to department chairs - \$15,000;
- Eliminated the position of Dean in all colleges and created a Dean of the University position – Increased efficiency but no financial savings;
- Significantly reduced reliance on adjunct positions to more effectively utilize full-time faculty - \$50,000;
- Reassigned faculty positions to meet changing course needs;
- Reduced scholarships by 10% - \$500,000;
- Reduced the athletics budget by \$500,000.

Morehead State University

Over the past five years (FY15 through FY18), Morehead State University has implemented numerous cost savings and efficiency measures to offset the continued reduction in state support, rising fixed and unavoidable costs, and declining enrollment. The list below represents some of the cost savings measures that we have implemented with estimated expense reductions or cost avoidance.

- Eliminated faculty and staff positions (filled and vacant) resulting from reorganization/consolidation and reduction in services: \$6,785,700
- Reduced operating budgets across all divisions (supplies, travel, equipment, etc.): \$1,737,800
- Reduced service maintenance contracts with assumed risk of repair expense: \$150,000
- Outsourced painting services: \$150,000
- 5 day furlough for all full-time staff (FY16) and 5 day pay reduction for all full-time faculty (FY17): \$1,324,000 one-time cost savings
- Eliminated 2 athletic programs (men's tennis and women's tennis): \$218,700
- No pay increase to employees since 2015-16
- Refinanced bond debt and reduced annual debt service: \$495,000 annual debt service savings
- Discontinued lease agreements for office space and parking: \$56,300
- Razed several buildings deemed as surplus to reduce costs of utilities, maintenance, and operating expenses: \$50,000 reduction and approximately \$250,000 cost avoidance for deferred maintenance
- Closed regional campus in West Liberty (FY16): \$291,900
- Energy savings contracts – resulting in cost savings: \$1,300,000 annually (excluding rate increases)

Murray State University

Developed new and aggressive tuition/scholarship model	Recruitment initiative
Eliminated faculty and staff positions, including 52 FTE from Academics in just two years.	\$3,100,000
Moved many staff from 12-month positions to 9, 10 or 11 month positions. These are primarily in student services positions such as counseling center and student activities.	\$75,000
Negotiated of many service and software contracts	\$65,000
Bid all financial services contracts, such as banking services, credit card processor, courier services, and purchasing card services	\$40,000
Plan to raze one E&G building without replacement	\$150,000
Reduced student health services	\$600,000
Refinanced debt obligations	Approx. \$600,000 over life of debt
Established print management system	\$125,000
Closed University Cashier's Office	\$225,000
Merged two colleges	\$300,000
Merged academic units	\$225,000
Reduced student worker positions	\$300,000
Reduced unit travel, including student and professional development travel	\$120,000
Reduced departmental services and materials	\$175,000
Increased expenditures on student recruitment	(\$125,000)
Reduced deferred maintenance funding due to Plant funding cuts	\$2 M from within units and savings historically spent on plant
Utilized KY Dept. of Revenue for bad debt collections	\$600,000
Started using LED lighting for replacement lights in many interior and exterior fixtures	\$225,000

Note: All from recurring budget dollars unless noted

Northern Kentucky University

1. Reductions in full-time staff positions (since FY14 over 100 FT staff positions have been eliminated) = Salary = \$4,909,419
2. Reductions in full-time faculty positions (since FY14 over 50 FT faculty positions have been eliminated) = Salary = \$5,066,755
 - a. 1 and 2 Fringe Benefits = \$4,116,934
3. Reorganized the areas of Vice President of Administration and Finance and the Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness into one area reducing the need for a Vice President Position and support staff = \$1,382,890
4. Outsourced certain non-core functions such as athletic trainers and printing services = Trainers = \$182,573; Printing Services = \$367,255
5. Transitioned to self-insurance for Health Insurance saving between \$2.9 - \$4.8 million since 2014 (between 5-8% per year in savings)
6. Workers Compensation plan: moved from state insured to self-insured = \$200K to \$300K each year
7. Reduced procurement cost by directing employees to the most cost effective options available, reducing the administrative costs of procurement, and restricting purchase options available to employees
8. Invested in energy savings to reducing long-term operating costs while implementing programs that encourage faculty, staff and students to reduce energy consumption while on campus. Continue to work with ESCOs on energy savings performance contracts where savings can be realized. Estimated savings of \$175k - \$225k per year.
9. Expanded student employment on campus offers the opportunity to reduce labor costs while enhancing affordability and improving student retention and success. While implementing effective student employment requires additional infrastructure for training students and managers, these costs can be offset through reduced labor costs and increased flexibility in managing labor costs. = \$749,000 annually
10. Enhanced business intelligence capabilities to make more effective, informed decisions while implementing predictive models in academic and administrative processes that allow for proactive responses to predicted results
11. Sold University-owned radio stations which were being subsidized nearly \$1 million each year = based on last year of operation annual savings \$1.3M
12. Terminated a lease for the METS center which was used as a training facility but was requiring an annual subsidy of \$700K a year
13. Closed the Early Childhood Center, a unit that was to be self-funding, but continued to need University support of \$200K annually
14. Refinanced a couple of bond issuances in the last couple of years. Bond refinancing savings is recurring over the life of the bonds. The average annual savings are as follows:
 - a. Series 2016A (Student Union and Welcome Center (BB&T) Garage) – approx. savings \$240K/yr.
 - b. Series 2016B (Callahan Hall and E&G Land) - approx. savings \$140K/yr.

Western Kentucky University

Implemented cost savings and efficiency measures.

- Use of part-time salaries in lieu of full time faculty \$300K
- Energy Savings Performance Contract \$1.3M
- Purchased quality used buses vs. new buses. \$1M
- Negotiated pricing with DELL to save on computers. \$106K
- Moved all marketing initiatives in-house, saving on agency fees. \$75K
- Outsourced our custodial services. \$300K
- Partnered with ECTC, EC3, and Fort Knox, and now receiving free rent maintenance, security and supplies for office and classroom space. \$100K
- Introduction of automatic deliver for larger sections (delivery of student materials through Blackboard automatically with an optional physical book). \$414K
- Decreased direct mail solicitations and increased online solicitations. \$9K
- Renegotiated and combined all Oracle Licensing contracts into a "Campus license." \$55k
- Summer work-hour change: arrived at work 30 minutes earlier in the morning and left 30 minutes earlier in the afternoon. This allowed WKU to reduce power usage during the more costly time of day. First, WKU reduced power costs by better managing electrical loads by increasing late afternoon building temperatures. Second, WKU shifted power usage to business hours rates where power costs were significantly lower. Third we consolidated summer space and classroom use. \$285K
- Refinanced debt service. \$6.6M
- Partnered with Agriculture and Dining to convert cooking oil to biodiesel fuel for buses. \$2K

Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS)

KCTCS has implemented numerous initiatives in recent years to be more efficient and effective, including those outlined below. Please know this is not an all-inclusive list. These actions of cost avoidance and efficiency measures resulted in a leaner KCTCS. We continue to look for ways to reduce and avoid costs and innovatively use resources while maintaining the same level and quality of services to students and employees.

Examples include (within the last five years):

- Eliminated 800+ positions (faculty and staff);
 - Consolidated, realigned and deactivated over 750 credential/programs all across the system as a means to be more efficient and effective.
 - In conjunction with the two initiatives mentioned above, KCTCS has also implemented the following:
 - Reduction in hours and/or length of assignment
 - Redistribution of duties
 - Reductions of overtime
 - Nonrenewal of contract
 - Termination for poor or nonperforming employees
 - Reduction in approved sabbaticals
 - Voluntary separation agreements
 - 2015-16 \$12.7 million
 - 2016-17 \$27.3 million
- As of January 1, 2014, new employees are no longer offered the defined benefit retirement plan (KERS/KTRS). Instead, they are only offered a defined contribution retirement, a (403(B)).
 - Annualized savings of \$900,000
- Increased the use of adjunct faculty and reduced staff positions from full-time to halftime or less to avoid having to pay health insurance benefits as required under the Affordable Care Act.
 - Annualized savings of \$500,000
- Eliminated, reduced, and limited:
 - Travel
 - Professional development
 - Memberships and subscriptions to professional associations, journals, and publications
 - Annualized savings of \$133,500
- Centralized processes to gain economies of scale and greater efficiency. Example: KCTCS created a Centralized Processing Center, located in the System Office, which consolidates student financial aid services, such as the awarding and disbursement of aid, for its 16 colleges.
 - Annualized savings of \$800,000

- KCTCS has for many years, and even more so in recent years, outsourced to third parties many functions to gain efficiencies and control costs. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - KCTCS's enterprise resources software hosting
 - Annualized savings \$100,000
 - payroll tax filings
 - Annualized savings of \$36,000
 - student learning management system
 - Annualized savings of \$225,000
 - deployment of a system-wide student services call center
 - Annualized savings of \$1,000,000
 - collection of delinquent student accounts with Kentucky Department of Revenue
 - \$8.0 million annualized revenue
 - disposal of surplus property per Govdeals.com
 - Annualized savings of \$150,000
- Developed and revised numerous business procedures to provide flexibility on travel, meals, vehicle rental and other operating matters.
 - Annualized savings of \$30,000
- Implemented energy manage performance contracts across all KCTCS colleges to save on energy costs.
 - Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC) contracts will generate nearly \$29 million in savings through the 14-year payback period.
- Renegotiated, rebid, or expanded contracts for goods and services to lower costs and obtain improved services, service level agreements, and/or accountability measures. Examples include switching from Aetna Integrated Services to Centurion Solutions for campus safety support; contracted rate from Pearson Education for student course materials; and lowered overall cost of student books and instructional materials while increasing commission rates per renegotiated contract with Barnes & Noble College Booksellers.
 - Annualized savings of \$550,000
- KCTCS has made significant use of technology where and when possible to avoid, reduce and eliminate cost or cost increases. Examples of employment of technology to be more efficient include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - Switching internet carriers at college campuses
 - Implementation of Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) trunking which moves all long distance calls over the Internet instead of through local phone companies; saving approximately \$131,000 per year in phone bills
 - Rebidding of virtual data centers and reducing services/staff augmentation
 - Renegotiated emergency notification system managed services
 - Moved the Fire Commission's fire rescue training system to managed hosting
 - Buying only Cisco refurbished equipment instead of new equipment, resulting in cost avoidance of over \$100,000 across the system
 - Cancelled degree pathway software project

- Changed hosting vendor for mobile app and moved to Amazon Web Services
- Use of online self-service, where applicable, for employee benefits and payroll changes
- Use of web base processing of document requests with use of attachments
- Use of online approval (workflow) and reconciliation for journal entries, payment request documents, employee absences and time, etc. to reduce errors and keying time
 - Annualized savings of \$2.1 million
- Automation of many previously manual functions. Examples include:
 - Automation of time and labor to capture and approve all employee leave requests electronically versus completion and filing of paper forms
 - Development of financial statement templates
 - Use of automated reports, reconciliations, etc. via exception reporting that notifies requestors there is an exception that must be address before the next step of the process can be accomplished
 - Use of prepaid and accrual templates to standardize and streamline information providing more accurate financial statements
 - Annualized savings of \$800,000
- Implemented direct deposit (ACH payment) for all employee paychecks and reimbursement, and vendor payments, including e-mail notification to the payee (100% employee participation and same for vendors who have are expected to receive more than a single payment; single payment vendors are paid through an electronic upload process).
 - Annualized savings of \$150,000
- Use of data uploads within PeopleSoft for:
 - banking information for vendor reconciliation
 - escheatment of checks
 - uploading batch journal entries
 - Annualized savings of \$75,000
- Re-engineered administrative software (ERP –PeopleSoft) functionality to capture capital leases versus manual spreadsheet accounting.
 - Annualized savings of \$15,000
- Use of single payment vouchers for non-credit student refunds, registrations, student participant checks where payee is paid only once with no future payment anticipated
 - Implemented scanning and emailing purchase order invoices, check requests, and employee reimbursements versus hardcopy
 - Developed and created electronic voucher loads versus manual keying of invoices
 - Use of IRS web site to verify Vendor TIN Name match
 - Annualized savings of \$75,000

Total annualized savings employed over last five years: \$84,639,500

Council on Postsecondary Education
Summary of Dining and Meal Plan¹ Survey Submissions

Draft - For Discussion Purposes
April 16, 2018

UK	Vendor	Construction/Renovation ²	Commissions/Contributions ²	Students Required to Purchase	Cost	Usage	Opt-Out	Board Approval	Student Involvement ³
	Aramark	Agreed to capital project investments totalling \$75.4 million related to dining. Contract began July 1, 2014.	Since 2014, \$10.7 M in commissions, \$1.0 M for the food institute grant, \$2.0 M in facility contingency funds, \$354 K for athletics investment buy-out, \$1.0 M unrestricted grant, used for scholarships, \$625 K stakeholder fund, \$162 K for food truck.	All on-campus students who do not have a kitchen in their unit.	\$1,450-\$2,225/semester.	All on-campus food service.	Granted for medical reasons.	Board authorized Exec. VP for Finance and Admin. to negotiate contract, which includes pricing structure. Pricing is reported to Board each year.	Dining Advisory Committee, in which SGA reps. are members, meets each year to gather feedback on dining.
	Aramark	Food service locations.	\$600,000 to enhance buildings with food services.	Yes - on-campus and commuter students.	\$275-\$2,048/semester.	All on-campus food service.	About 50/year with special circumstances.	Board approved contract and pricing structure.	SGA was engaged in new dining program.
	Aramark	New \$32.5 M dining facility, \$2.2 M for new locations in student center, \$1 M for café renovation.	\$14.9 M for E&G needs of the campus.	Yes - on-campus and commuter students.	\$300-\$2,122/semester.	Varies, though Flex can be used at all on-campus food service.	No opt out except through ADA office, however students with unused flex can request a return of unused dollars.	Board approved meal plan options and pricing structure.	SGA was involved during contract negotiations.
	Sodexo	None.	None.	Yes - on-campus students.	\$1,675/semester.	Applies to vendor at this time.	None.	Board approved contract and pricing structure.	None.
	Aramark	\$10,550,000 for new facility (East Parking Structure/Dining Commons).	5% of campus sales, 10% off-campus catering. \$4,519,300 primarily to fund auxiliary services.	Yes - on-campus and full-time commuter students.	\$100-\$2,040/semester.	All on-campus food service.	Granted for medical reasons.	President and CFO approved the contract terms and pricing structure.	SGA input is sought when new plans are proposed, and Aramark meets with SGA to discuss changes, quality and pricing.
	None, but RFP has been issued.	N/A	N/A	Yes - on-campus students.	\$385-\$1,895/semester.	University owned dining.	Living at home/dietary restrictions.	Board approved options and pricing structure.	Dining meets with SGA weekly.
	Chartwells	Student Union Food Court & Papa John's construction, library retail location (\$4,050,000).	Commissions (\$6 M), rent (\$1.5 M), repair and maintenance (\$525K) which support central funding and maintenance, renovation, and capital for food service.	Yes - on-campus students.	\$1,770 - \$1,925/semester.	All on-campus food service.	Granted for medical reasons.	President approved the contract, Board approves pricing structure.	Collaboration with SGA and Association of Campus Residents.
	Aramark	Renovation/Construction funding of \$35 M is set aside in the current contract. Recently, \$1,050,000 was used for two renovations, and in the past \$3.6 M went to capital improvements and equipment and \$250K for maintenance.	Funds are received as part of the service contract to help renovate dining facilities and provide equipment upgrades.	All first year students on-campus must purchase a meal plan, and all full-time undergraduate students are automatically enrolled in \$75 Meal Plan Dollar Flex. Unused MPDF balance rolls from year to year.	\$75-1,984/semester.	All on-campus food service.	No opt-out provision.	VP for Student Affairs and AVP (Housing and Dining) signed contract.	Committee that made these decisions contained two students.

KCTCS No dining or meal plans at KCTCS colleges.

¹ For purposes of this summary, mandatory "Flex Dollar" and similar plans are considered meal plans.

² Dollar amounts are for the past ten years unless otherwise indicated.

³ The acronym SGA refers to Student Government Association in the column below.

Note: Please see the accompanying survey responses for more information.

Dining and Meal Plan Survey

April 2018

University of Louisville

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services? If so, who is that vendor?

- Aramark

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years?

- Yes

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- Three fully licensed Starbucks
- Au Bon Pan
- Subway
- Market Place in Student Union
- Chick Fil A
- Panda Express
- Refresh of four existing locations

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- All locations renovated and built by our strategic dining partner was geared towards enhancing the food experience for our students. Most of the work was a turnkey scope.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)?

- Yes

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used?

- \$600k in commissions.
- Funds have been used to enhance buildings that have dining services.

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- Freshman that live on campus are required to have one of three mandatory meal plans
- Student living in campus apartments are required to purchase one of the apartment plans
- All commuter students that have nine credits and more are required to purchase a \$275/semester commuter plan.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

2018/2019 Plans ¹	Meal	Meals ²	Flex Dollars	Price/Semester	Guest Passes ⁷
Traditional Meal Plans ³					
Cardinal All Access Dining Plus Plan		Unlimited	\$325.00	\$2,048.00	10
Cardinal All Access Plan ⁴		Unlimited	\$175.00	\$1,972.00	10
Cardinal 135 Plan		135	\$410.00	\$1,645.00	0
Campus Apartment Plans ³					
Cardinal 135 Plan		135	\$410.00	\$1,645.00	0
Cardinal 100 Plan ⁴		100	\$495.00	\$1,375.00	0
Cardinal 60 Plan		60	\$495.00	\$1,051.00	0
Cardinal Apartment Flex Plan		0	\$1,051.00	\$1,051.00	0
Commuter Plans ⁵					
Commuting Cardinal 5 Plus Plan		5 meals per week	\$290.00	\$928.00	0
Commuting Cardinal 5 Plan		5 meals per week	\$100.00	\$769.00	0
Commuting Cardinal 75 Plan		75 meals per Semester	\$240.00	\$875.00	0
Commuting Cardinal 50 Plan		50 meals per Semester	\$100.00	\$546.00	0
Commuting Cardinal Base Flex ⁴		0	\$275.00	\$275.00	0

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- Aramark has the exclusive right for dining services on campus. Any national or regional brand on campus are subcontractors of theirs. Dining meals plans can be used at any campus-dining venue.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- The university does not have an opt-out program for mandatory student meal plans. However, we do have a process for meal plan exemption. This is based on things like religious constraints, hardship and special diets. We average about 50 students a year that receive an exemption. There is no fee for this exemption.

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- Yes, Aramark provide voluntary meal plan to all commuter students. 6% of overall meal overall meal plans.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- N/A

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- Yes

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- AVP of Business Service negotiated and signed on behave of the university.

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- The board approved the final contract, which included all meal plan options. There is no opt out fee.

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- SGA was engaged in the development of the new dining program ran by Aramark. They were able to provide input on the overall dining program to include meal plans. We rely on our students to provide feedback and recommendations on the dining program. The input helps to ensure the services we are providing are geared to meet their needs.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- Yes. See above.

University of Kentucky

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services?

- Yes

If so, who is that vendor?

- Aramark Educational Services, LLC. Aramark began providing dining services including board plan, retail, catering, and athletic concessions operations on July 1, 2014.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years?

- Yes, Aramark agreed to make capital project investments in UK's campus totaling \$75.4 million for dining facility construction, renovations, and for the purchase and installation of dining services equipment, signage, marketing materials, and other costs associated with the dining services program.

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- See Table below.

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- Total scope was \$75.4 million. See Table below.

Constructed		Renovated	
Facility	Dining Operation Housed	Facility	Dining Operation Housed
Jewell Hall*	Common Grounds	WT Young Library*	Starbucks
Haggin*	KLair	Erikson Hall	Fusion
Bowman's Den*, **	Chick Fil A, Panda Express, Subway, Greens to go, Starbucks	Agricultural Sciences North Building*	Ag Deli
The 90	Fresh Foods Company, La Madeleine, Taco Bell, Papa Johns, Wildcat Pantry	Commonwealth Stadium	Kitchen
Gatton Business & Economics Building*	Brioche Doree	Patterson Office Tower	Intermezzo/Wildcat Pantry
Jacobs Science Building*	Freshii, Wildcat Pantry	Chemistry/Physics Building*	Einstein Bros Bagels
Holmes Hall*	Steak N' Shake, Wildcat Pantry	Patterson Hall	Wildcat Pantry
Student Center*	Champions Kitchen, Chick Fil A, Auntie Anne's, Subway, Panda Express	KY Clinic*	Starbucks
Anderson Engineering Building*	Rising Roll	MI King Library*	Subway

Notes:

*Aramark fit-out/renovated the space dedicated to food service only.

**Bowman's Den dining venues will be decommissioned when the renovated and expanded Student Center comes online in summer 2018. Minor investments were also made in summer 2014 in the now decommissioned Student Center, Blazer Dining, and Commons.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)?

- Yes, Aramark provides commissions on catering, UK residential and retail dining, and athletic venue sales and concessions. Aramark also agreed to make payments toward a Food Institute Grant, Facility Contingency Funds, Athletics investment buy-out, unrestricted grant to the University, a stakeholder fund, and a food truck.

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used?

- Since 2014, UK has received \$10,649,168 (FY15 – FY18) in commissions which are used to fund operating expenses, service assessment, insurance on dining spaces, administrative oversight personnel, and other miscellaneous expenses;
- \$1,000,000 (FY15 – FY18) for the food institute grant, which is used to fund operating expenses for the Food Connection;
- \$2,040,000 (FY15 – FY18) in facility contingency funds, which are used to fund large equipment purchases, repair and maintenance expenses;
- \$354,275 for the athletics investment buy-out, which was used to buy-out former partner's unamortized expense for equipment they purchased for Kroger Stadium;
- \$1,000,000 for an unrestricted grant which was used to fund scholarships;
- A \$624,560 stakeholder fund used to reduce the cost of various student-focused events for the university community; and
- \$162,312 for a food truck.

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes, all students living in on-campus residence halls that do not have a kitchen.

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- Students who live in UK's residence halls are required to purchase a meal plan, with the exception of students living in an upper-class only student hall that has kitchens in every unit. However, UK does not require any students to live on campus. Students who live on campus, but due to medical reasons need to eat elsewhere, may request a waiver to the meal plan requirement through the Disability Resource Center.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan. Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- Meal Plan holders may use meal swipes at residential dining facilities anytime, and in retail facilities at certain times of the day. The flex dollars may be used at all locations anytime. All

Access plans provide unlimited swipes in the two residential (cafeteria-style) locations. See Tables for 2017-18 and 2018-19 plans and rates.

2017-18 Plans	Flex Dollars per Semester	Rate per Semester
7 meals per week	\$200	\$1,464
All Access: all you care to eat (AYCE); unlimited meals at the cafeteria-style dining locations	\$300	\$2,225
Blue 14 meals per week block	\$300	\$2,000
White 10-per week block	\$300	\$1,625
150 meals per semester for RAs	\$500	\$1,450
Flexible Block 100	\$525	\$1,725

2018-19 Plans	Flex Dollars per Semester	Rates per Semester
10 meals per week	\$100	\$1,525
All Access (AYCE); unlimited meals at the cafeteria-style dining locations	\$0	\$1,750
All Access Blue (AYCE); unlimited meals at the cafeteria-style dining locations	\$250	\$1,975
All Access White (AYCE); unlimited meals at the cafeteria-style dining locations	\$400	\$2,075
150 meals per semester for RAs	\$500	\$1,500

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- No.

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- UK does not require any students to live on campus. However, students who live in UK's residence halls are required to purchase a meal plan, with the exception of students living in an upper-class only student hall that has kitchens in every unit. Students who live on campus, but due to medical reasons need to eat elsewhere, may request a waiver to the meal plan requirement through the Disability Resource Center. Commuter students are not required to purchase a meal plan.

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- Yes, students can purchase any of the meal plans above in addition to quantities of flex dollars to spend on campus. Of the undergraduate students who are not required to purchase a meal plan (i.e., do not reside on campus), 10.5 percent purchase voluntary meal plans.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- N/A

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- See Below.

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- UK's Board of Trustees authorized the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration to lead contract negotiations with competitive bid responders for dining services. UK's Chief Procurement Officer signs contracts.

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- The responsibility for the meal plan options and pricing is included in the contract. The Consumer Price Index, Food Away From Home, United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, is the basis of any of price increases or decreases. The meal plan options and pricing structures are reported each year to the Board of Trustees.

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- Mandatory meal plan options and pricing were established in the contract. An appointed Dining Advisory Committee is used to gather feedback on dining operations, staffing, quality, and other issues.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- The Dining Advisory Committee, in which Student Government Association (SGA) representatives are members, meets each year to gather feedback on dining unit operations, staffing, quality, and other issues.

Eastern Kentucky University

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services?

- Yes

If so, who is that vendor?

- Aramark Dining Services

As part of your institution’s contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years?

- Yes

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- Constructed a \$32.35 million, stand alone, dining facility. An additional \$2.2 million was allocated to add two new retail locations to the current renovation of the Student Center, \$1 million was earmarked to renovate Stratton Café, and \$1.45 million was allocated to refresh/upgrade existing dining venues to be determined.

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- Constructed a \$32.35 million, stand alone, dining facility. An additional \$2.2 million was allocated to add two new retail locations to the current renovation of the Powell Student Center, but no funds are going toward the renovation of the building. One million dollars was earmarked to renovate Stratton Café in the Stratton Bldg. that houses the College of Justice and Safety, but no funds are being used to upgrade any part of the facility other than dining.

As part of your institution’s contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)? Yes

Annual Scholarship Contribution	\$20,000	
Catering Fund	\$35,000	
Brand Refresh Funding [starting in FY22 – FY31 (10 years)]		\$300,000 each year dedicated to the enhancement or improvement of existing concepts.
Commissions		
Residential Meal Plans	13% of Net Receipts	
Catering (nonalcoholic events)	10% of Net Receipts	
Catering (alcoholic events)	18% of Net Receipts	
Retail Operations	10% of Net Receipts	
Concessions	25% of Net Receipts	

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used?

- \$14,943,128 and deposited to the university general fund to use for overall E&G needs of the institution.

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- All full-time, residential freshmen (under 30 credit hours) on the Richmond Campus are required to have a 5-day All Access w/\$300 Flex meal plan.
- There is a required \$300 declining balance plan (or Flex dollars plan) for all fall and spring undergraduate students with nine credit hours or more on the Richmond Campus who are not on a residential meal plan. The plan implementation is as follows:
 - 2016 - 2017 Operating Year, Freshmen
 - 2017 - 2018 Operating Year, Freshmen and Sophomores
 - 2018 - 2019 Operating Year, Freshmen, Sophomores, and Juniors
 - 2019 - 2020 and subsequent Operating Years, Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors
- Students who do not use the required \$300 declining balance plan (or Flex dollars plan) may request, and will receive, any remaining funds at the end of the academic year.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

- 5-Day All Access w/\$300 Flex
\$1,801 per semester Weekdays, all you can eat each visit
- 5-Day All Access VIP* w/\$300 Flex
\$1,904 per semester Weekdays, all you can eat each visit
- 7-Day All Access w/\$300 Flex
\$2,070 per semester Every day, all you can eat each visit
- 7-Day All Access VIP* w/\$300 Flex
\$2,122 per semester Every day, all you can eat each visit
- 200 Block VIP* w/\$300 Flex
\$1,923 per semester 200 meals can be used anytime during the semester, all you can eat each visit
- Block 80 w/\$300 Flex
\$920 per semester 80 meals can be used anytime during the semester, all you can eat each visit
- All-Access Lunch w/\$300 Flex
\$1,035 per semester Lunch 7-days per week, all you can eat each visit
- *VIP plans include opportunity for a student to exchange a meal at a retail location (Subway, Panda Express, etc.)

- Flex dollars associated with each meal plan can be used at any Aramark retail location on campus: Subway, Panda Express, Moe’s Southwest Grill, Chick-fil-A, Starbucks, Steak-n-Shake, P.O.D.’s (convenience stores), Einstein’s Bagel, Cuisine, and Stratton Café.

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy’s)?

- Applies only to vendor (Aramark), but the flex dollars associated with each meal plan can be used at any Aramark retail location on campus: Subway, Panda Express, Moe’s Southwest Grill, Chick-fil-A, Starbucks, Steak-n-Shake, P.O.D.’s (convenience stores), Einstein’s Bagel, Cuisine, and Stratton Café.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- No, they cannot opt out of plan(s). The only exceptions are given by the ADA office.

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- The only exceptions to meal plans are given by the ADA office.

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- Yes, on average we have 2877 purchased meal plans for the Fall and Spring Semesters. On average, 61% of the meal plans are voluntary.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- No

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution’s contract with your dining services vendor?

- No

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution’s contract with the services vendor?

- University Legal Counsel (Secretary to the Board of Regents) negotiated the contract and the Vice President of Finance and Administration signed the contract.

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- Yes

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- The Student Government Association was involved during contract negotiations.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- During contract negotiations, the Student Government Association was given the opportunity to discuss and make recommendations for pricing, quality standards, and implementation.

KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services?

- Yes.

If so, who is that vendor?

- Currently Sodexo under an emergency time and materials contract.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years?

- No.

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- N/A.

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- N/A.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)?

- Not in the current contract.

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used?

- See above.

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes.

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- Students living in residence halls.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

- Meal Plan Type – Resident Student: Price: **
 - 19 Weekly Meals with \$200 declining balance (flex/dining dollars) \$1,675.00
 - 15 Weekly Meals with \$300 declining balance (flex/dining dollars) \$1,675.00

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- Currently only vendor.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- Resident students are not allowed to opt out.

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- Yes. Less than 10%.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- N/A

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- Yes.

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- Yes.

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- No.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- No.

Morehead State University

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services?

- Yes

If so, who is that vendor?

- Aramark Services, Inc.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years?

- Yes. Aramark contributed \$10,550,000 to construct a new facility.

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- East Parking Structure/Dining Commons

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- The 25,000-square-foot food service/retail facility seats approximately 250 students and is attached to an 85,000-square-foot, 400 vehicle parking structure. The facility is located near the University's residence hall complex.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)?

- Yes. The commission structure is 5% for on-campus sales and 10% for off-campus catering.

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years?

- The University received dining commission during Fiscal Year 2007/08 – 2016/17 in the amount of \$4,519,256.

How were the funds used?

- Revenue from the dining commission is primarily used to fund auxiliary expenses with the balance supporting general university operations.

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- Freshmen and sophomore students who are enrolled full-time (12 credit hours) and under 21 years of age are required to live on campus and participate in a meal plan. We also have a \$100 Flex Dining Dollars mandatory program for all full-time undergraduate and graduate students (12 credit hours) who do not have a meal plan on campus. Students who either select a meal plan or default into the "EAGLE 15 weekly" plan required for freshmen and sophomores or choose to purchase a meal plan during the semester are NOT required to participate in both a meal plan

and the Dining Dollars program. The \$100 amount is credited back to the student's account when the selected meal plan is charged.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

Name	Description	Price	Eligible Student
EAGLE Unlimited	3 retail meals/day or 21/week – Unlimited meals at “The Rock” and \$200 Flex	\$2,040/semester	All Students
EAGLE 15 Weekly	15 meals/week and \$250 Flex	\$1,960/semester	Default for Freshmen and Sophomores
EAGLE 10 Weekly	10 meals/week and \$300 Flex	\$1,635/semester	FR, SOPH, JR, SR, GR
EAGLE 10 Weekly PLUS	10 meals/week and \$500 Flex	\$1,800/semester	FR, SOPH, JR, SR, GR
EAGLE \$1,000 Flex	Declining balance only. Does not include meals.	\$1,000/semester	SOPH, JR, SR, GR
EAGLE \$750 Flex	Declining balance only. Does not include meals.	\$750/semester	SOPH, JR, SR, GR
EAGLE 30 Block	30 meals/semester and \$300 Flex	\$510/semester	JR, SR, GR

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- The meal plan options are only applicable for Aramark purchases. All dining options on the main campus are operated by Aramark. Students may open an optional voluntary account known as BeakerBUCKS which may be used at on-campus dining locations, university printing, vending, bookstore, library, and at local merchants who participate in our off-campus program.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- No

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- NA

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- Freshmen and sophomore students who are waived from student housing may also be waived from meal plans if requested. The waiver does not apply to the \$100 Flex Dining Plan. Dining-specific waivers are granted for medical reasons with verified documentation from the student's health care provider (i.e. severe allergies or specific diets due to health reasons).

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students?

- Yes

If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- During fall 2017, there were 4,700 meal plans purchased with 1,285 (27%) of the plans purchased voluntarily.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- We do not charge an opt-out fee.

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)? NA

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- No

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- The President and Chief Financial Officer approved the terms and the contract was signed by the Chief Financial Officer.

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- No

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- When new or optional plans are proposed, student input is solicited through contact with the Student Government Association. Market surveys are also issued across campus to generate new ideas and suggestions for improvement.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- Yes. Aramark management meets periodically with a variety of Student Government Association members, including the full SGA congress to discuss changes, quality, pricing, etc.

Murray State University

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services?

- No. However, due to increased pension costs Murray State University has issued an RFP for Dining Services. This RFP process has not been completed, so a decision has not yet been made on possible outsourcing.

If so, who is that vendor?

- N/A

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years? N/A

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated? N/A

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations? N/A

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)? N/A

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used? N/A

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- Freshmen required to purchase the Unlimited plan, Sophomores are required to choose between Unlimited and 175 /150 Block plans. These requirements are related to the requirement for Freshmen and Sophomores to live on campus.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

Meal Plan	Price
All-Access (unlimited meals + \$75 flex)	\$1,830
All-Access Plus (unlimited meals + \$150 flex)	\$1,895
175/400 (175 meals, \$400 flex)	\$1,830
150/300 (150 meals, \$300 flex)	\$1,763
Bronze (\$385 flex)	\$385
Silver (\$550 flex)	\$550
Copper (\$1,000 flex)	\$950
Platinum (\$1,200 flex)	\$1,100

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- Meal plans and Flex plans can only be used in university owned dining locations.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- No.

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- Freshmen and Sophomores may apply for exemptions from the meal plan requirement. These are granted for students living at home and have dietary restrictions that dining is unable to assist with.

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- N/A

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- N/A

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- N/A

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- Yes

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- Dining meets weekly with Residential Student Organization and Student Government to solicit input on many issues related to dining programs and services offered.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- No specific student government committee is established, however Dining staff meets weekly with Student Government.

Northern Kentucky University

Does your institution use a third-party vendor to provide or manage dining services? Yes
If so, who is that vendor?

- Chartwells

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on your campus within the past ten years?

- Yes

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- (1) construction of the Student Union Food Court,
- (2) Steely Library construction of an Einstein's Brothers Bagels, and
- (3) construction of a Papa John's in the Student Union.

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation project(s)? To what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- \$3M applied to the new construction of the food court located in the student union which includes a separate Starbucks. \$650K for the installation of an Einstein's Brothers Bagels, and \$400K for the installation of a Papa John's.

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash contribution to the institution (e.g., commissions, utility funds, enhancement funds, unrestricted funds, etc.)?

- (1) commissions (2) rent (3) repair and maintenance funding

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used?

- (1) commissions \$6M, (2) rent \$1.5M (3) repair and maintenance \$525K
- Funds are used for (1) central funding (2) maintenance/repair/restoration/renovation/capital projects for food and beverage services.

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes

If so, which kinds of students must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshmen and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- Currently meal plan participation is based on the actual residence hall in which they live.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

- Ultimate Plus - \$1925
- (15) Weekly Meals - \$1770
- (15) Weekly Meals with Take-Out Option - \$1825
- Block Meal Plans all Categories - \$1845

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- Meal plan applies to all dining options on-campus. Our business partner is the franchisee for all operations but retail location are part of the dining program through meal transferability.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- We do not charge students fees for opting out of the meal plan.

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- Typically, students are only allowed to opt out of residential meal plans for medical reasons.

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- Yes, less than 10% of students.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- N/A

If so, what is that benefit (e.g., a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

- N/A

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- No

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- President of the University.

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related pricing structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- Yes, on an annual basis through the Development process.

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- We collaborate with both the Student Government Association and the Association of Campus Residents in making all these types of recommendations.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- We collaborate with both the Student Government Association and the Association of Campus Residents in making all these types of recommendations.

Western Kentucky University

Does your institution use a 3rd Party vendor to provide or manage services?

- Yes

If so, who is that vendor?

- Aramark

As part of your institutions contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to construct or renovate any facilities on campus within the past ten years?

- Yes. There is money set aside in the current contract to renovate various dining locations on campus. There is also capital money that is set aside for the construction of a new dining facility. (Renovation/Construction \$35M)
- It is consistent with all vending contracts for dining services vendors to provide resources to continually repair, replace, and renovate the dining spaces so that they continue to be appealing to constituencies. Aramark allocated dollars to be spent on the mutually agreed upon facilities that needed the most attention.

If so, which facilities were constructed or renovated?

- The Downing Student Union has had renovation of the Chik-fil-a, and the POD/food court area was renovated to put in a Den by Denny's.

What was the scope of the new construction or renovation projects?

- Chik-fil-a = \$350,000
- The Den = \$700,000

If your institution's dining-services vendor constructed or renovated any facilities on campus, to what extent do those facilities house dining operations?

- 100% of the areas renovated contain dining operations

As part of your institution's contract with a dining services vendor, did the vendor agree to provide any cash donations to the institution?

- No cash donations but funds were received from the vendor as part of the service contract to help renovate dining facilities and equipment upgrades and improvements.

If so, how much has been contributed over the past ten years? How were the funds used?

- Past funds received from the vendor as part of a previous service contract include \$3.2M for renovation of existing dining facility(DSU); approximately \$400K for the last 10 years for capital improvements and equipment replacement; and approximately \$250K for the last 10 years for maintenance, repair, and equipment.

If so, how much was the donation? How were the funds used?

- N/A

At your institution, are any students required to purchase a meal plan?

- Yes

If so, which kinds of student must purchase a meal plan (e.g., all freshman and sophomore students who attend the main campus must purchase a meal plan)?

- All first-year (less than two regular session semesters) students living on-campus under the age of 21 are required to participate in one of the on-campus meal plans. All other full-time (12 hours or

more) undergraduate students living on-campus or off-campus are automatically enrolled in the \$75 Meal Plan Dollar Flex (MPD Flex) plan and may upgrade to another plan to satisfy their dining needs. On-campus students may upgrade to any of the available on-campus plans and off-campus students may upgrade to any on-campus or off-campus plan.

- Unused meal plan swipes expire at the end of each week for weekly plans and the end of the semester for block plans or the last day of enrollment. Unused Meal Plan Dollar balances, as part of a meal plan, will roll from fall to spring semester but will expire on the last day of the spring semester. Unused MPD Flex balances will roll from year to year. Upon graduation, any remaining MPD Flex will be donated to the WKU Food Pantry.

For the 2017-18 academic year, how much do various meal plan options cost at your institution? Please provide a brief description and pricing options under each plan.

- Plan 1: All Access Plus - \$1,984/Semester
Unlimited meals/week in the Fresh Food Company (up to 10 meals may be used per week as a Value Meal) + \$250 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 2: All Access - \$1884/Semester
Unlimited meals/week in the Fresh Food Company (up to 10 meals may be used per week as a Value Meal) + \$150 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 3: Block 240 - \$1,724/Semester
240 meals/semester + \$150 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 4: Weekly 14 - \$1,684/Semester
14 meals/week + \$250 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 5: Weekly 12 - \$1,647/Semester
12 meals/week + \$275 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 6: Weekly 10 - \$1,485/Semester
10 meals/week + \$300 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 7: Block 80 - \$771/Semester
80 meals/semester + \$150 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 8: Block 65 - \$768/Semester
65 meals/semester + \$250 Meal Plan Dollars
- Plan 9: Block 50 - \$764/Semester
50 meals/semester + \$350 Meal Plan Dollars

Does the meal plan apply only to the vendor (e.g., Aramark) or to all dining options on campus (e.g., Wendy's)?

- The meal plans apply to all dining locations on campus. Most locations have certain meal value meal options that student can exchange a meal swipe for.

Does your institution charge students a fee for opting out of a meal plan?

- No. There is no opt out option

If so, for the 2017-18 academic year, how much is the charge to a student who opts out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Which kinds of students are allowed to opt out of a meal plan?

- N/A

Does your dining partner provide voluntary meal plan options for non-mandatory students? If so, what percentage of students purchase the meal plan?

- Yes. However, since the vast majority of students are required typically students who are not required don't purchase (because they're only taking one class, their classes are on other campuses, etc.

Does the institution provide a benefit associated with paying an opt-out fee?

- N/A

If so, what is the benefit (e.g. a \$100 fee provides a student \$100 in flex points; or a \$100 fee can be applied toward a meal plan, if the student decides to purchase a meal plan later)?

- N/A

Did your board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the terms of your institution's contract with your dining services vendor?

- No

If your Board did not approve the contract terms, which institutional official was authorized by the board to negotiate terms and sign your institution's contract with the services vendor?

- The two individuals that signed the current contract were Mr. Brian Kuster, VP for Student Affairs and Dr. Mike Reagle, AVP for Student Affairs and Executive Director of Housing and Dining.

Did your Board of Regents or Board of Trustees approve the meal plan options and related structure and opt out fees for your dining services operation?

- No

To what extent has your institution allowed student participation in decisions pertaining to mandatory meal plan options, pricing, and opt out fees?

- The committee that made these decisions contained 2 students.

Was a Student Government committee asked to make any recommendations or give feedback on the prospective student pricing policies and the quality standards discussion?

- Yes. The reason that there were multiple students from SGA on the committee was so that they could represent students and take back the information to them.

The following institutions do not have Special Use Fees: UK, KSU, MuSU, KCTCS

University of Louisville

Fee Initiated: Fall 2011 (will be reduced when bond is retired)

Fee: \$98/semester (pro-rated for part-time students)

Fiscal Year	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total
Fee Revenue:	\$0	\$0	\$3,090,224	\$3,312,283	\$3,501,073	3,508,664	\$13,412,244

Project Supported:

Student Recreation Center - Completed (October 2013)

Project Scope: \$37.5 million

Eastern Kentucky University

Fee Initiated: 7/1/2015 (20-year)

Fee: \$150/semester (pro-rated for graduate and part-time)

Fiscal Year	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total
Fee Revenue:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,574,485	\$4,438,531	\$9,013,016

Projects Supported:

Student Recreation Center - Under Construction

Scope: \$40.0 M

Powell Student Center Renovation - Under Construction

Scope: \$20.0 M

Robert Martin Bypass Pedway - Planning, out for bid

Scope \$2.5 M

Authorized as part of a \$93.0 M Student Life Facilities project

Morehead State University

Fee Initiated: Fall 2011 (20 year)

Fee: \$5/credit hour, capped at 12 credit hours

Fiscal Year	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total
Fee Revenue:	\$684,635	\$686,103	\$708,517	\$650,907	\$646,030	\$637,391	\$4,013,583

Project Supported:

Student Recreation and Wellness Center - Completed (August 2011)

Project Scope: \$39.0 million

Northern Kentucky University

Fee Initiated: Fall 2011 (To end September 2033)

Fee: \$16 per credit hour, capped at 12 credit hours (\$192 per semester)

Fiscal Year	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Total
Fee Revenue:	\$1,237,000	\$2,504,000	\$3,658,000	\$4,713,000	\$4,605,000	\$4,534,000	\$21,251,000

Project Supported:

Renovation/Expansion of Student Rec. Ctr (Albright Health Ctr.) - Completed (August 2014)

Project Scope: \$47.6 million

Western Kentucky University

Fee 1 Initiated: Fall 2011

Fee: \$70/semester (pro-rated for part-time). See survey for more detail.

Fee Revenue: FY 2012 to date: \$14,032,311

Project Supported:

Downing Student Union Renovation - Completed (August 2014)

Project Scope: \$37.5 million

Fee 2 Initiated Fall 2016

Fee: \$30/semester (pro-rated for part-time). See survey for more detail.

Fee Revenue: FY 2016 to date: \$2,466,089

Project Supported:

Creason Parking Garage - Completed (November 2017)

Project Scope: \$11.0 million

Special Use Fee Survey Responses April 2018

Introduction to Survey Questions

At its April 28, 2011 meeting, the Council adopted a Special Use Fee Exception Policy that allows certain kinds of student-endorsed fees to be considered outside of Council approved tuition and fee rate ceilings. Revenue from such fees may be used to pay debt service and M&O expenses on new facilities or capital renewal and replacement costs on existing facilities and equipment that support student activities and services, such as student unions, fitness centers, recreation complexes, health clinics, or tutoring centers.

Members of the 2018-19 Tuition Development Work Group (TDWG) have requested an update on the status of these fees. We are asking institutions that have requested and received a Special Use Fee exemption to respond to a list of questions pertaining to Special Use Fee implementation at their campus.

University of Kentucky

[The University of Kentucky has not implemented a fee under CPE's Special Use Fee Exception Policy.](#)

University of Louisville (UofL)

- Has your institution implemented a mandatory Special Use Fee? If so, on what date did your institution begin charging students a Special Use Fee?
[Yes, the University of Louisville approved the Student Recreation Center fee for the fall semester 2011.](#)
- What is the amount of the fee? How is the fee assessed (e.g., per credit hour, per semester, other)? How long will the fee be in place?
[The Student Recreation Center fee is \\$98 per semester and pro-rated per credit hour for less than full-time students. There is no end date for the fee but it will be reduced once the bond is retired.](#)
- Is the amount paid for the fee capped for full-time students? If so, what is the cap (e.g., 15 credit hours per semester, other)?
[The Student Recreation Center fee is capped at \\$98 per semester for full-time students.](#)
- To date, how much revenue has been raised by the fee? How much fee revenue has been expended and for what purpose? Please provide a breakdown of the revenue raised, revenue expended, and uses of funds in each fiscal year since the fee was implemented.

	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Revenues	\$ -	\$ -	\$3,090,224	\$3,312,283	\$3,501,073
Expenses					
Salaries	-	35,222	211,753	354,262	366,516
Fringe Benefits	-	570	28,176	70,791	65,195
Operating Expenses	-	(35,793)	67,714	383,386	414,588
Debt Service	814,437	2,641,550	2,643,325	2,643,150	2,640,650
Total Expenses	\$814,437	\$2,641,550	\$2,950,969	\$3,451,588	\$3,486,950

- What is the status of the building project that is supported by Special Use Fee revenue?
The Student Recreation Center opened in October 2013.
- Have bonds been issued to finance the project? If so, what was the date of issuance and bond amount?
• The university issued \$33,790,000 of General Receipts 2011 Series A bonds on August 24, 2011.
- What were the terms of the financing (e.g., interest rate, over how many years)? What are the annual debt service payments?
Total Interest Cost of 3.58 percent (fixed rate) over 20 years. Annual debt service payments are approximately \$2.6 million.
- Is your institution in the planning or construction phase of the building project? Has the building project been completed?
Planning and construction complete, the Student Recreation Center opened in October 2013.
- What is the next major milestone for the project and when will it occur?
There are actually two milestones – October 28, 2018 will mark the 5-year anniversary of the Student Recreation Center (SRC). The second milestone is that in 2017-18 we had our 2,000,000th user hour, demonstrating the popularity of the SRC with our students.
- What, if any, feedback has been received from students regarding implementation of the Special Use Fee?
The feedback has been extremely positive. Our students have overwhelmingly embraced the SRC, as evidenced by the outstanding usage. They feel they are getting a great value for the recreation fee they are paying.

- What, if any, feedback has been received from faculty, staff, and administrators?
The feedback from faculty, staff and administrators has been extremely positive. Our Admissions Office has stated that the SRC is a great asset in recruiting students to the University of Louisville. Our faculty, staff and administrators recognize that the SRC is enhancing the vibrancy of student life on campus, as well as contributing to student recruitment and retention. In fact, a study in 2015 revealed that freshmen using the SRC had a retention rate of 85% from Spring 2015 to Fall 2015.

Eastern Kentucky University (EKU)

- Has your institution implemented a mandatory Special Use Fee? If so, on what date did your institution begin charging students a Special Use Fee? **07/01/2015**
- What is the amount of the fee? How is the fee assessed (e.g., per credit hour, per semester, other)? How long will the fee be in place? **\$150 per semester, per student fee. Prorated for Graduate and Part-time students. The fee has a 20-year life.**
- Is the amount paid for the fee capped for full-time students? If so, what is the cap (e.g., 15 credit hours per semester, other)? **Yes, \$150 per semester**
- To date, how much revenue has been raised by the fee? How much fee revenue has been expended and for what purpose? Please provide a breakdown of the revenue raised, revenue expended, and uses of funds in each fiscal year since the fee was implemented.

	Fiscal Year	2016	2017	2018
Revenue		\$ 4,574,485	\$ 4,438,531	\$ 3,943,552
Expended				
For Debt Service				\$ 3,518,813

- What is the status of the building project that is supported by Special Use Fee revenue? There are three separate building projects:
Student Rec. Center – Under Construction
Powell Student Center Renovation – Under Construction
Robert Martin Bypass Pedway – Planning, out for bid
- Have bonds been issued to finance the project? If so, what was the date of issuance and bond amount? **Yes, there were two separate bond issues for the project:**
2017 Series A General Receipts Bonds - \$46,140,000, closed 04/11/2017
2018 Series A General Receipts Bonds - \$21,860,000, closed 01/30/2018
- What were the terms of the financing (e.g., interest rate, over how many years)? What are the annual debt service payments?

2017 Series A General Receipt Bonds – 3.433% TIC, 20 Year repayment schedule, \$3,362,000 average annual debt service.

2018 Series A General Receipt Bonds – 3.017% TIC, 20 Year repayment schedule, \$1,580,463 average annual debt service.

- Is your institution in the planning or construction phase of the building project? Has the building project been completed? [We are in the construction phase on two projects and planning on the third.](#)
- What is the next major milestone for the project and when will it occur?
[Steel erection for the Student Rec Center will begin Summer/Fall 2018.](#)
[Phase I of the Powell Student Center project will open in September 2018.](#)
[Bid packages for the Pedway are due back April 25th.](#)
- What, if any, feedback has been received from students regarding implementation of the Special Use Fee? [The students voted to impose the Special Use Fee to improve Student Life Facilities.](#)
- What, if any, feedback has been received from faculty, staff, and administrators? [None](#)

Kentucky State University

[Kentucky State University has not implemented a fee under CPE's Special Use Fee Exception Policy.](#)

Morehead State University (MoSU)

- Has your institution implemented a mandatory Special Use Fee? [Yes](#) If so, on what date did your institution begin charging students a Special Use Fee? [August 2011 \(beginning with fall 2011 semester\)](#)
- What is the amount of the fee? [\\$5 per credit hour, not to exceed \\$66 per academic term](#) How is the fee assessed (e.g., per credit hour, per semester, other)? [\\$5 is assessed on a per credit hour basis for part-time students and graduate students in all academic terms, \\$66 is assessed to full-time undergraduate students enrolled in 12-18 credit hours per semester](#) How long will the fee be in place? [20 years \(until bond is paid in full\)](#)
- Is the amount paid for the fee capped for full-time students? [Yes \(see response above\)](#) If so, what is the cap (e.g., 15 credit hours per semester, other)? [12 credit hours per semester \(full time enrollment\)](#)
- To date, how much revenue has been raised by the fee? [Since FY12 implementation through FY17, the fee has generated \\$4,013,583 in net revenue \(gross revenue assessed to students minus scholarship discount\).](#)

- How much fee revenue has been expended and for what purpose? The entire amount of fee revenue is expended as debt service payment used to finance construction of the student recreation center facility.
- Please provide a breakdown of the revenue raised, revenue expended, and uses of funds in each fiscal year since the fee was implemented.

Fiscal Year	Special Use Fee Gross Revenue	Special Use Fee Net Revenue
2011-12	\$ 975,819	\$ 684,635
2012-13	\$ 1,002,635	\$ 686,103
2013-14	\$ 1,037,512	\$ 708,517
2014-15	\$ 977,052	\$ 650,907
2015-16	\$ 962,831	\$ 646,030
2016-17	\$ 927,946	\$ 637,391
Total	\$ 5,883,795	\$ 4,013,583

- What is the status of the building project that is supported by Special Use Fee revenue? Construction of the facility was completed in August 2011.
- Have bonds been issued to finance the project? Yes If so, what was the date of issuance and bond amount? General Receipts Bond, Series 2009A issued July 29, 2009 for \$24 million. Refunded with General Receipts Bond, Series 2014A issued July 24, 2014.
- What were the terms of the financing (e.g., interest rate, over how many years)? General Receipts Bond, Series 2009A with coupon rates ranging from 2.0 – 6.0%, 20 year bond; General Receipts Bond, Series 2014A with coupon rates ranging from 2.0 – 5.0%
- What are the annual debt service payments? Per the debt service payment schedule, the annual payments vary slightly from year to year. The average payment for the current bond issue is \$1,689,650 with final payment to be made 10/1/2028.
- Is your institution in the planning or construction phase of the building project? No Has the building project been completed? Yes
- What is the next major milestone for the project and when will it occur? N/A. The project has been completed.
- What, if any, feedback has been received from students regarding implementation of the Special Use Fee? There has been an overwhelmingly positive response from students since the opening of the student recreation and wellness center. The center houses three basketball courts, two racquetball courts, multiple fitness areas with weight and exercise equipment, and a swimming pool. The facility also offers free group fitness classes to students and is home to numerous intramural sports leagues. Students may also sign up for outdoor adventure trips, take workshops on various survival skills, rent camping and hiking equipment, or kayaks and

paddleboards for Eagle Lake. Over the course of the Fall 2017 semester, 115 students were hired in various areas of the center and were trained on facility policies, use of the management software system, and emergency procedures and CPR/First Aid.

- What, if any, feedback has been received from faculty, staff, and administrators? The facility has been a welcome addition for faculty, staff, and administrators. MoSU employees frequently use the equipment, walking track and attend group fitness classes. Several employees engage in friendly games of basketball during evening and weekend hours. The center provides an atmosphere for employees to focus on a healthier body and mind.

Murray State University

Murray State University has not implemented a fee under CPE's Special Use Fee Exception Policy.

Northern Kentucky University (NKU)

- Has your institution implemented a mandatory Special Use Fee? **Yes**. If so, on what date did your institution begin charging students a Special Use Fee? **NKU implemented Special Use Fee (Campus Recreation Fee) in FY 2011-2012 and began charging students the fee in the fall of 2011.**
- What is the amount of the fee? **\$16 per credit hour** How is the fee assessed (e.g., per credit hour, per semester, other)? **Per credit hour** How long will the fee be in place? **Until the Bonded Debt Service is paid in full on Sept. 1, 2033.**
- Is the amount paid for the fee capped for full-time students? **Yes**. If so, what is the cap (e.g., 15 credit hours per semester, other)? **Capped at the 12th credit hour (\$192 full-time semester rate).**
- To date, how much revenue has been raised by the fee? **At year end FY2017 \$21,251,000.**
- How much fee revenue has been expended and for what purpose? **\$16,488,766 for staffing and operating of new space by Campus Recreation unit, M&O for facilities and maintenance staffing and operating of new space, project construction costs and Debt Service.**
- Please provide a breakdown of the revenue raised, revenue expended, and uses of funds in each fiscal year since the fee was implemented.
 - Revenues FY2012 = \$1,237,000; No special use fees expended. Project in design.
 - Revenues for FY2013 = \$2,504,000; No special use fees expended. Project in design.
 - Revenues for FY2014 = \$3,658,000; Expenses of \$66,897 for Campus Recreation Staffing of new space; \$459,783 project construction costs and \$275,329 Debt Service (partial year).
 - Revenues for FY2015 = \$4,713,000; Expenses of \$55,648 for Campus Recreation Staffing of new space; \$39,000 for O&M staffing and operating of new space and \$3,037,670 Debt Service.

- Revenues for FY2016 = \$4,605,000; Expenses of \$741,027 for O&M staffing, operating and utilities costs of new space; \$220,822 for Campus Recreation Staffing and operating of new space; project construction costs \$4,232,207 and Debt Service \$3,039,446.
 - Revenues for FY2017 = \$4,534,000 Expenses of \$940,143 for O&M staffing, operating and utilities of new space; \$245,726 for Campus Recreation Staffing and operating of new space; project construction costs \$96,925 and Debt Service \$3,038,143.
- What is the status of the building project that is supported by Special Use Fee revenue?
The building has been on-line since summer of 2014.
 - Have bonds been issued to finance the project? Yes. If so, what was the date of issuance and bond amount? As follows:

BOND SUMMARY STATISTICS

Northern Kentucky University General Receipts Bonds, 2014 Series A

Dated Date	01/07/2014
Delivery Date	01/07/2014
Last Maturity	09/01/2033
Arbitrage Yield	3.396520%
True Interest Cost (TIC)	3.704014%
Net Interest Cost (NIC)	3.956700%
All-In TIC	3.728710%
Average Coupon	4.810309%
Average Life (years)	11.718
Duration of Issue (years)	8.985
Par Amount	47,375,000.00
Bond Proceeds	52,176,536.60

The par amount of the 2014 Series A General Receipts bonds was \$47.375 million, but the total bond proceeds available for the Welcome Center (BB&T) Garage and the Rec Center Expansion projects, including the bond premium, was \$52 million (excludes cost of issuance) as follows:

Campus Rec		43,000,000.00
N. Terrace		9,000,000.00
Bond proceeds		52,000,000.00

- What were the terms of the financing (e.g., interest rate, over how many years)? What are the annual debt service payments? (See above info) [20 yr. fixed debt, True Interest Cost 3.70%, average annual debt service payment \\$3,050,000, last bond maturity Sept. 1, 2033.](#)
- Is your institution in the planning or construction phase of the building project? [No.](#) Has the building project been completed? [Yes](#)
- What is the next major milestone for the project and when will it occur? [The project is complete.](#)
- What, if any, feedback has been received from students regarding implementation of the Special Use Fee? [No feedback has been requested or received, but use of the center is up.](#)
- What, if any, feedback has been received from faculty, staff, and administrators? [No feedback has been requested or received, but use of the center is up.](#)

Western Kentucky University (WKU)

- Has your institution implemented a mandatory Special Use Fee? If so, on what date did your institution begin charging students a Special Use Fee?
[Fall 2011 Student Centers Fee, DSU Renovation Bonds](#)
[Fall 2015 Parking Structure Fee, Creason Bonds](#)
- What is the amount of the fee? How is the fee assessed (e.g., per credit hour, per semester, other)? How long will the fee be in place?
[Fall 2011 Student Centers Fee, DSU Renovation Bonds, \\$70/full-time student and prorated to part-time students except for professional MBA, part-time only online students, dual credit and active military.](#)
[Fall 2015 Parking Structure Fee, Creason Bonds, \\$30/full-time student and prorated to part-time students except for professional MBA, part-time only online students, dual credit and active military.](#)
- Is the amount paid for the fee capped for full-time students? If so, what is the cap (e.g., 15 credit hours per semester, other)?
[Undergraduate part-time is per credit hour up to 12 hours. 12-18 hours no additional charge. Over 18 hours tuition but no mandatory student fees.](#)
[Graduate students pay rate per credit hour.](#)
- To date, how much revenue has been raised by the fee? How much fee revenue has been expended and for what purpose? Please provide a breakdown of the revenue raised, revenue expended, and uses of funds in each fiscal year since the fee was implemented.
[DSU renovation bonds, all revenue supports debt payments: FY2012 to date \\$14,032,311.01](#)
[Creason Garage bonds, all revenue supports debt payments: FY 2016 to date \\$2,466,089.28](#)
- What is the status of the building project that is supported by Special Use Fee revenue?
[DSU renovated. Creason Garage constructed and open.](#)

- Have bonds been issued to finance the project? If so, what was the date of issuance and bond amount?
 On June 6, 2012, the University issued Western Kentucky University General Receipts Bonds, Series 2012A. The \$35,860,000 proceeds generated from the bond issue were used for the renovation of Downing Student Union.
 On October 25, 2016, the University issued Western Kentucky University General Receipts Bonds, Series 2016B. The \$8,905,000 proceeds were used to construct a parking structure (Creason Garage).
- What were the terms of the financing (e.g., interest rate, over how many years)? What are the annual debt service payments?
 Series 2012A: interest rates from 2.00% to 5.00%. Final principal payment date is May 1, 2032. Annual payments increase slightly over life of bonds. FY 2018 P&I totals \$2,488,072.50
 Series 2016B: interest rates from 2.00% to 4.00%. Final principal payment date is September 1, 2036. Annual payments increase slightly over life of bonds. FY 2018 P&I totals \$632,850.00
 If any surplus in special use fees, the bonds will be paid off early.
- Is your institution in the planning or construction phase of the building project? Has the building project been completed? *All construction completed.*
- What is the next major milestone for the project and when will it occur? *N/A*
- What, if any, feedback has been received from students regarding implementation of the Special Use Fee? *None regarding the fees. Students are pleased with garage and student union.*
- What, if any, feedback has been received from faculty, staff, and administrators? *None.*

Kentucky Community and Technical College System

The Kentucky Community and Technical College System has not implemented a fee under CPE's Special Use Fee Exception Policy.

EKU APPROVES BUDGET CUTS

By **Lauren Shepard** - April 6, 2018



RICHMOND, Ky. (WTVQ) – Jobs, academic and athletic programs at Eastern Kentucky University are going away, victim of an estimated \$25 million budget deficit.

That deficit, the school blames on reduced funding from the state and pensions.

The Board of Regents met Friday to vote on the proposed cuts.

Most of them passed.

In a matter of hours, votes were made and 153 jobs throughout the university were eliminated.

Related Article: [Jobs for Panhandlers – New Life Day Center](#)

The men's and women's tennis teams are gone, and ECU's regional campus in Danville will close.

The biggest discussion during the meeting was in regards to the proposed cuts to academic programs.

Of 13 listed, 12 will be cut. Those include Theater, the Associates Degree in Nursing, Nursing Administration emphasis, Business and Marketing Teaching, Deaf Studies, American Sign Language Studies, Family and Consumer Science Teaching, PE and Health Teaching, Economics, Religion, Sculpture, and Individualized Studies.

The School of Psychology degree is up for suspension as well. Its vote was tabled to allow for further discussion.

Four other degrees were cut, but rather than suspending the entire program, those in the major will be transferred to another path.

Those include a BS in Risk Management, BA in Chemistry, BS in Mathematics Teaching, and MS in Mathematical Sciences.

The president of the Student Government Association, Laura Jackson, sits on the Board of Regents as a voting member. She wants her fellow classmates, and others at the university, to know the cuts aren't meant to be personal. It's something she says the university has to do.

"In the end, I know, as I was thinking and as I was making my votes, it's important that the university continue on and educate students and it's important that we all keep in mind moving forward that we're making these cuts for a reason, so that we can continue, and even though it's very unfortunate that we have to cut anything, it's the fact of the situation," said Jackson.

Craig Turner, chairman of the board, sees these cuts as a way for the university to improve.

“Sometimes you prune a tree so it grows a little stronger,” said Turner. “We’re going to be more directive in the programs that we’re extremely successful at, and those that have low enrollments and low graduations, those are the ones that we’ve looked at about how to deal with those programs.”

As for students currently enrolled in the cut programs, they will be entered into a teach out agreement, meaning they will get to finish their degrees at ECU.

[REPORT A TYPO](#)

Subscribe to WTVQ's Daily News Email

Your Email Address

SUBSCRIBE

Weather Alert

Special Weather Statement

Home / News

http://www.bgdailynews.com/news/wku-faces-m-in-second-round-of-cuts/article_db485d55-c2ed-5487-8e56-580fa6a18695.html

TOP STORY

WKU faces \$16M in second round of cuts

By WES SWIETEK wswietek@bgdailynews.com Apr 17, 2018



People walk in and out of Western Kentucky University's South Campus on Monday, April 16, 2018. (Austin Anthony/photo@bgdailynews.com)

Buy Now

Austin Anthony / Daily News

Just weeks after more than 100 positions at Western Kentucky University were eliminated to make up a \$15 million budget deficit, the university is now making plans to cut an additional \$16 million because of state budget cuts and pension cost increases.

In an email to WKU employees Monday, WKU President Timothy Caboni said the university will avoid across-the-board staffing cuts but is still finalizing details on how it will make up the shortfall.

“In this second round, we will rely upon the recommendations of deans and division heads to manage their respective reduction shares as we further decrease our budget by an additional \$16 million,” Caboni wrote.

“As with the Budget council recommendations, we will again avoid across-the-board cuts, as they are not strategic nor do they address the differences in revenues produced across units. We also will strive to maintain support of those areas operating at critical levels, specifically those with direct responsibility for student recruitment and retention. Finally, we will strive to achieve a balanced budget with as little job loss as possible.”

In March, WKU announced it had cut 119 positions in light of a \$15 million budget shortfall, with 62 staff members being cut and 57 unfilled positions being eliminated.

WKU’s regional campuses saw large job cuts and elimination of its regional chancellors and the University College was eliminated, among other cuts.

Caboni at the time cautioned that another round of cuts would be coming after the state passed a budget, which it did Saturday after legislators overrode Gov. Matt Bevin’s vetoes of state pension and budget bills.

“Although we still need time to study technical amendments made on Saturday, particularly those related to pensions, we now have most of what we need to finalize the University budget for the coming year,” Caboni wrote in his email.



STAR

“(W)e intend to look to the divisions to manage a reduction of \$5.7 million. We will manage the remainder with an approximated combination of \$1.6 million in new revenue and \$5 million in savings through reorganization, attrition and elimination of vacant positions. We also will devote approximately \$4 million of carry forward funds as a final transition year before we fully implement a new budget model in 2019-20. Also, next year our new provost will lead a fully transparent and thorough academic program review to ensure our offerings align with market demand, support the needs of our region and provide the breadth of experience our students require for their future success.

“Members of the cabinet and deans are identifying strategies to meet reduction scenarios for each of their divisions. We still need to determine how the performance funding model will affect our total state appropriation, and we are working to fully understand our increased pension obligations for the biennium. We will bring forward a complete and detailed budget reduction plan before the end of the semester.

“We are seeing optimistic signs as a result of our efforts to attract more Kentucky and domestic out-of-state students. Our first-time, first-year enrollments are trending positively for the Fall, but we must accelerate our yield strategies and maintain our aggressive and proactive outreach to prevent the melt that reduces the size of our incoming class during the summer months. Our projections on international enrollments, however, appear to follow the national trend of significant decline, and we have substantially more to do to boost retention of current students.

“I know this is a difficult process, but the goal is to create a realistic and stable institutional budget so we can position ourselves for healthy, sustainable growth in future years. I appreciate your patience and continued good work, and I am confident we will be a stronger, more focused university going forward.”

– Follow News Director Wes Swietek on Twitter @BGDNgovtbeat or visit bgdailynews.com.

Wes Swietek

Wes Swietek is the Bowling Green Daily News News Director.

Ad



America's largest mortgage lender.

http://www.themoreheadnews.com/news/msu-to-freeze-tuition/article_1d4d5472-4275-11e8-98b7-03630e4de67e.html

BREAKING

FEATURED

MSU to freeze tuition

By Megan Smedley 19 hrs ago



Morehead State University announced Tuesday its plan to freeze tuition for the 2018-2019 academic year, despite the 6.7 percent budget cut that came from Frankfort during this year's budget session.

“Part of MSU’s dedication to student success is not just an experience that combines personalized attention and high-quality academic programs, but making that experience affordable to students and families,” said Dr. Jay Morgan, MSU president.

“Even in difficult times in state budgets, Morehead State University has a commitment to retaining its long-held status as the most affordable university east of Frankfort.”

He added, “We understand our service region and the students and communities within it. We will continue to evaluate strategies and to look for ways to make higher education as affordable as possible to as many students as possible at Morehead State.”

The MSU Board of Regents will approve the freeze at its June meeting.

Morgan says it will be another week or two before administration knows the full effects of the budget.

“We value our students, maybe more than we value ourselves. We have to put our money where our mouth is,” he says. “We know not raising tuition will cause some pain, but we know the region we serve.”

To offset the roughly \$2.7 million reduction from the annual state appropriation, MSU sought volunteers earlier this year to participate in voluntary separations, with several employees opting to take a reduction in employment status.

“Faculty and staff have been very patient and worried, but that is understandable in our state climate right now,” said Morgan. “We have done a fairly decent job so far of weathering this, but we are not out of the forest yet.”

He added, "We are trying to invest as much as we can into our people, but we know in tough times that we have to make tough choices."

Morgan says compared to dollar figures that other regional universities are putting out, Morehead State seems to be in a little bit better shape, even though there are more cuts to make.

"Our folks have been very conservative with their dollars, and we are going to get through this storm," he said.

MSU also plans to continue to reduce the size of the campus footprint.

"Our goal is to be a nice, high-quality institution, but yet with a little bit smaller infrastructure," said Morgan. "My tagline is 'bigger is not better, better is better.' We want our facilities to be better, and we are going to pour our money into the facilities that we want to keep."

Other plans to offset the budget reduction include a focus on being more efficient, including lighting, travel reductions, and other strategic areas where the university can find savings.

One MSU program directly impacted is the Kentucky Folk Art Center, which funds were not allocated for in the budget.

Morgan says the university is working on "continuation options" for the folk art center, despite the removal of the \$200,000 line item from MSU's budget.

"Without that \$200,000 it is going to be difficult to operate, so we are looking for partners that are willing to come to the table," he said.

Morgan says the KFAC will not close at the end of the fiscal year, and that funds specifically raised for folk art will be used in order to keep it open while the university looks at what the options are.

Even with the reduction, he remains optimistic.

“We are resilient. Morehead State University has been resilient for 130 years now, and will continue to be,” said Morgan. “We aren’t going anywhere.”

He asks for continued support from the community and the region.

“All Kentucky universities will be working on this for years to come,” said Morgan.

Tuition per semester at MSU for full-time Kentucky residents is \$4,475.

MSU is the second state university to announce a tuition freeze.

The Eastern Kentucky University Board of Regents announced last fall that it had approved a tuition freeze for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Megan Smedley can be reached at msmedley@themoreheadnews.com or by telephone at 784-4116.

1 comment

Sign in

10 people listening 

	+ Follow	Share	Post comment as...