MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION
OF THE
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF REGENTS
HELD ON THE
TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF OCTOBER 2010

The Board of Regents for Southeast Missouri State University met at 12:45 p.m. on Friday, October 22, 2010, in Robert A. Dempster Hall, Glenn Auditorium, Southeast Missouri State University. A roll call was taken. Regents present were: Mr. Donald B. Bedell, President of the Board of Regents (via teleconference); Mr. Albert M. Spradling, Vice President of the Board of Regents; Mr. Reginald D. Dickson (via teleconference); Mr. Brian P. Kelly, Student Representative to the Board of Regents; Mr. James P. Limbaugh; Mr. Doyle L. Privett; and Mr. Daren K. Todd. Also present were: Dr. Kenneth W. Dobbins, President of Southeast Missouri State University; Mrs. Kathy Mangels, Board Treasurer; Mr. John Grimm, Legal Counsel; and Mrs. Deborah S. Fulton, Board Secretary. Vice President Spradling presided.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Privett to approve the minutes of the open session meeting of June 22, 2010 [Attachment A]. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Bedell, Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF ELIMINATION OF THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION: ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM IN THE DONALD L. HARRISON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

President Dobbins asked Dr. Ron Rosati, Provost, to present the recommendation that the Board approve the elimination of the Bachelor of Science in Business Administrative: Administrative Systems Management program in the Donald L. Harrison College of Business [Attachment B].

At the December 17, 2009, Board of Regents meeting, the Board approved a process to address the anticipated budget shortfall for FY11 and FY12. The process included an
institutional review of academic activities, specifically directing the University to “review the viability of programs from trimming to eliminating.”

Utilizing the Program Review Process approved by the Board at its September 19, 2003, meeting, the Administrative Systems Management (ASM) program was reviewed. Detailed program review data, available for all programs on the Provost’s website, were used to evaluate the program. These data include: number of majors, number of student credit hours produced per faculty full-time equivalent, cost per major, cost per student credit hour taught, and number of graduates. Three-year trend data was also reviewed, and the performance of the program was compared to nationally-normed data. Data was provided in Attachment B showing enrollment and number of graduates for the Administrative Systems Management (ASM) program from 2007-2009. There were seven graduates in 2007; five in 2008; and four in 2009.

These steps were completed in the program review process:

- **Academic department review:** Departments were asked to evaluate the datasets relative to their programs and to complete a report addressing key issues.
- **Department chair review:** The Department Chair reviewed the data, reviewed the report from the department, and submitted an independent recommendation.
- **Dean review:** The Dean reviewed the data, reviewed the previous two recommendations, and submitted an independent recommendation.
- **University Faculty Advisory Committee for Academic Program Review:** A faculty committee conducted a detailed analysis of the program and submitted a recommendation.
- **Provost review:** The Provost studied the original dataset, considered recommendations from the department, the department chair, the Dean, and the faculty program review committee. After considering all recommendations, the Provost made a recommendation to the president.
- **President review and recommendation:** The President reviewed the data, considered recommendations, secured additional clarification and data, and will make an independent recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Using these data and information in the review report from the department and dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee for Academic Program Review evaluated the Administrative Systems Management (ASM) program and noted significant program problems, including:

- 70% drop in majors
- Low graduation rate
- Weakening external demand

Following their review of the ASM program, the Faculty Advisory Committee for Academic Program Review questioned the viability of the program and recommended referring the AD101 course to the Course Redesign Task Force, and retooling the BME
option. If the Administrative Systems Management major is eliminated, the AD101 course will be retained as a service course.

After reviewing the primary data and considering these recommendations, the Provost recommended that the program be discontinued. This recommendation is consistent with Governor Nixon’s recent mandate to review all programs with fewer than 10 graduates. If this recommendation is approved by the Board, additional steps will be taken to mitigate the impact on faculty and current students.

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and Regent Privett to approve the elimination of the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration: Administrative Systems Management program in the Donald L. Harrison College of Business. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Bedell, Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF ELIMINATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN THE DONALD L. HARRISON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

President Dobbins asked Provost Rosati to present the recommendation that the Board approve the elimination of the Administrative Assistant Certificate program in the Donald L. Harrison College of Business [Attachment B].

At the December 17, 2009, Board of Regents meeting, the Board approved a process to address the anticipated budget shortfall for FY11 and FY12. This process included an institutional review of academic activities, specifically directing the University to “review the viability of programs from trimming to eliminating.”

Utilizing the Program Review Process, approved by the Board at its September 19, 2003, meeting, the Administrative Systems Management (ASM) program was reviewed. Based on the review and recommendation of the Provost to eliminate the Administrative Systems Management program, the Provost requested that the Administrative Assistant Certificate program also be reviewed for viability. Detailed program review data, available for all programs on the Provost’s website, were used to evaluate the program. These data include: number of majors, number of student credit hours produced per faculty full-time equivalent, cost per major, cost per student credit hour taught, and number of graduates. Three-year trend data was also reviewed, and the performance of the program was compared to nationally-normed data. Detailed information on the number of graduates from 2007-2009 was provided in Attachment B. There was one graduate in 2007; three graduates in 2008; and 3 graduates in 2009.

These steps were completed in the program review process:

• Academic department review: Departments were asked to evaluate the datasets relative to their programs and to complete a report addressing key issues.
• Department chair review: The Department Chair reviewed the data, reviewed the report from the department, and submitted an independent recommendation.

• Dean review: The Dean reviewed the data, reviewed the previous two recommendations, and submitted an independent recommendation.

• University Faculty Advisory Committee for Academic Program Review: A faculty committee conducted a detailed analysis of the program and submitted a recommendation.

• Provost review: The Provost studied the original dataset, considered recommendations from the department, the department chair, the Dean, and the faculty program review committee. After considering all recommendations, the Provost made a recommendation to the president.

• President review and recommendation: The President reviewed the data, considered recommendations, secured additional clarification and data, and will make an independent recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Using the data and information in the review report from the department and dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee for Academic Program Review evaluated the Administrative Assistant Certificate (AAC) program and noted significant program problems, including:

• Low number of majors, ranging from 9 to 12
• Low graduation rate
• Weakening external demand

Following their review of the ASM program, the Faculty Advisory Committee for Academic Program Review saw several programmatic concerns, including the low numbers of majors and graduates, and low potential program growth. After reviewing the Dean’s comments, the Committee indicated “… the committee concurs with Dean McDougall that if the Administrative Systems Management major is eliminated, the Administrative Assistant Certificate program would not be viable.”

After reviewing the primary data and considering these recommendations, the Provost has recommended that the program be discontinued. This recommendation is consistent with Governor Nixon’s recent mandate to review all programs with fewer than 10 graduates. If this recommendation is approved by the Board, additional steps will be taken to mitigate the impact on faculty and current students.

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and Regent Privett to approve the elimination of the Administrative Assistant Certificate program in the Donald L. Harrison College of Business. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Bedell, Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF RENAMING THE DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING EFFECTIVE FALL 2011 SEMESTER

President Dobbins asked Provost Rosati to present the recommendation that the Board approve the renaming of the Department of Accounting and Management Information Systems to the Department of Accounting effective Fall 2011 semester [Attachment B].

The Donald L. Harrison College is in the process of eliminating the Management Information Systems program from the Department of Accounting and Management Information Systems consistent with previous actions taken by the Board of Regents.

The following academic programs currently reside in the Department of Accounting and Management Information Systems:

1. Accounting
2. Administrative Assistant (a two-year certificate program)
3. Administrative Systems Management
4. Business and Marketing Education
5. Management Information Systems

As a result of continued analysis through the program review process, additional recommendations concerning programs in this department have been presented under separate cover to the Board of Regents for their consideration:

1. Discontinue the major in Administrative Systems Management (ASM) under the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration program.
2. Discontinue the Administrative Assistant Certificate (AAC) Program.

As a result of the elimination of the Management Information Systems program, the Department of Accounting and Management Information Systems passed by a majority vote a proposal to rename their department the “Department of Accounting,” and the Harrison College of Business College Council unanimously passed a motion supporting the proposal to change the name of the “Department of Accounting and Management Information Systems” to the “Department of Accounting.”

A motion was made by Regent Privett and seconded by Regent Limbaugh to approve the renaming of the Department of Accounting and Management Information Systems to the Department of Accounting effective Fall 2011. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Bedell, Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF OFF-SITE DELIVERY OF THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PSYCHOLOGY

President Dobbins asked Provost Rosati to present the recommendation that the Board approve the off-site delivery of the Bachelor of Science in Psychology [Attachment B].

Currently, the Bachelor of Science in Psychology is offered at the Southeast Missouri State University Cape Girardeau campus. A Fall 2010 Degree Program Interest Survey of current students at Sikeston, Kennett, Malden, and Perryville indicates that more than 50 students are interested in pursuing an undergraduate major in Psychology. To serve this need, Southeast Missouri State University proposes to offer the B.S. Psychology degree at the regional campuses (Sikeston, Malden, and Kennett), and the Perryville Higher Education Center (Perryville).

Initially, the B.S. in Psychology will be offered as a cohort program via ITV, with most courses originating from Sikeston. Classes will originate from the other regional campuses periodically throughout the semester. Based on initial offering of courses in the major in Fall 2010, at least 30 students will form the first cohort starting Fall 2011. Demand and expressed interest from students has led to the expectation of forming a second cohort of the same size in Fall 2013. Some attrition is anticipated, leading to projections based on 25 students for the second year, and 20 for the third and final year.

At this point in time, Southeast offers nine bachelor degrees at the regional campuses. Off-campus courses have been taught at the request of the regional campuses, coordinated through Extended Learning. Psychology and University Studies courses have been taught at all four regional campuses; face-to-face and interactive television (ITV) are the usual modes of instruction. Extended Learning has funded a full-time RNTT position dedicated to the regional campuses, in addition to other faculty and adjuncts, due to demand for Psychology courses at these locations.

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Todd to approve the off-site delivery of the Bachelor of Science in Psychology. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Bedell, Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR MEDICAL INSURANCE TO UNITED HEALTHCARE FOR THE PLAN YEAR BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2011, WITH TWO OPTIONAL ONE-YEAR RENEWAL PERIODS

President Dobbins asked Ms. Kathy Mangels, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Mr. Jim Cook, Director of Human Resources, to present the recommendation that the Board approve the recommendation to award contract for
medical insurance to United Healthcare for the plan year beginning January 1, 2011, with two optional one-year renewal periods [Attachment C].

The University issued RFP #5453 medical insurance services for the 2011 plan year in August 2010. Three bids were received and evaluated. Our current provider quoted a 6% increase in premium. The other two bidders proposed premiums less than rates being paid under the current contract. The recommendation is that the contract be awarded to United Healthcare. The employee premium bid for Plan A is 10.4% lower than the current year’s premium and Plan B is 15.6% lower. Details on the proposed rates and plan designs were provided in Attachment C-1.

The proposal from United Healthcare includes two plans with the same deductible and cost share levels as the current medical plans. The only major plan design change is the plans do provide for prescription co-pays after meeting the deductible in the Base Plan B and immediate prescription co-pays for the Accelerated Plan A. United Healthcare’s current network provides comparable coverage in the Cape Girardeau market, except only one local hospital in the network.

Vice President Mangels noted that last spring the Board of Regents asked that a benefits consultant be retained to evaluate employee benefits. As a result, J.W. Terrell was retained and evaluated all aspects of benefits provided to University employees. J.W. Terrell presented several recommendations to the Budget Review Committee’s Benefits Sub-Committee.

A motion was made by Regent Privett and seconded by Regent Todd to approve the recommendation to award contract for medical insurance to United Healthcare for the plan year beginning January 1, 2011, with two optional one-year renewal periods. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Bedell, Dickson, Privett, and Todd. Abstaining: Spradling and Limbaugh (due to their affiliations with Southeast Missouri Hospital). The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF CHANGES TO EMPLOYEE MEDICAL BENEFITS AND SICK LEAVE AND OTHER LEAVE BENEFITS FOR THE BENEFIT YEAR BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2011

President Dobbins asked Vice President Mangels and Mr. Cook to present the recommendation that the Board approve changes to employee medical benefits and sick leave and other leave benefits for the benefit year beginning January 1, 2011 [Attachment D].

At the March 26, 2010, Board of Regents strategic planning retreat the Board directed that a benefit consultant be retained to evaluate and recommend changes to the employee compensation/benefit package. A contract was awarded to J. W. Terrill Company who reviewed and analyzed the University’s current benefit plan offerings
against benchmarked employers for their family friendliness, cost effectiveness and competitiveness in the respective marketplace.

J. W. Terrill presented their recommendations to the Benefits Subcommittee of the Budget Review Committee (BRC) on September 16, 2010. The consultant’s findings indicated that the University has above average benefit plan designs compared to the market and very generous cafeteria plan funding and sick leave benefits. Southeast’s employer contribution for single coverage of 100% is 11.5% better than the other regional public universities and 10% - 15% better than employees in the educational sector throughout the United States.

The consultant recommended that the University consider family-friendly medical plan options that would encourage the expansion of younger, healthier members into the covered group and promote consumer driven health decisions. In order to save budget dollars, Terrill recommended reducing paid leaves for employees and implementing a paid time off (PTO) leave bank. In addition, the consultant indicated a need to reconfigure the university’s paid sick leave program and implement a short term disability plan.

The Benefits Subcommittee considered the data and recommendations of the consultant, along with the results of the health insurance bids received August 2010. The Benefits Subcommittee recommended to the BRC, who recommended to the President, that medical Plan B become the base health plan with the University continuing to provide 100% of the employee premium. Employees choosing to enroll in the Accelerated Plan A would pay a percentage of the additional premium, based on annualized total wages for the prior year (Medicare wages). Cafeteria plan dollars would continue to be provided at 50% of the plan deductible. Therefore, employees enrolling in the Base Plan B would receive $750 cafeteria plan dollars and those enrolling in the Accelerated Plan A would receive $250 cafeteria plan dollars.

A portion of the savings from reduced employee premiums would be used to supplement premiums for spouse, children and family in the Base Plan B. Supplementing dependent premiums should encourage additional enrollments in the University’s plan, helping long term to expand covered lives and reduce utilization. It is proposed to supplement monthly premiums in the Base Plan B by $75 for spouse, $100 for children and $200 for family.

The University currently subsidizes about $38,000 annually for pre-65 retiree premiums, based on 1% of premium for every year of service up to a maximum 20% subsidy. Because retiree premiums are reduced by over 40% under the new bid, it is the recommendation of the BRC that this subsidy be discontinued for any subsequent retirees and retained for current retirees. At the time the board materials were prepared, the President did not recommend retaining the subsidy for the current 22 retirees as the new rates are equal to current employee rates. However, additional information has been
obtained, and the President recommended that the Board continue the subsidy for the current 22 retirees, and that future retirees would not receive the subsidy.

Based on the consultant’s recommendation, a sick leave accrual system would be implemented. Current employees would have a starting bank of verified sick leave based on the past 10 years’ actual sick leave usage, up to a maximum of 1,040 hours. Staff would continue to receive 8 unverified sick leave days per year and faculty would accrue 6.64 days annually (10/12 of 8 days). Each year unused unverified sick leave would carry over into the employee’s verified sick leave bank. Upon retirement employees can receive up to six months of additional service credit under MOSERS for accrued sick leave with no cost to Southeast or the employee.

In addition, the BRC recommends implementing a short-term disability plan to be administered by a third party administrator. The current sick leave program provides 90 days sick leave at 100% pay followed by 90 days at 60% pay each year. It is recommended to implement a short-term disability program with a 30 calendar day benefit elimination period followed by short-term disability paid sick leave at 60% pay for five additional months. The long-term disability policy addressing disabilities after the 180 days will not be changed.

In order to formalize the current practice of paid hours for energy conservation, the current vacation accrual schedule would be combined with the total hours currently recognized as energy conservation (88 hours) to create a PTO system. Accrued PTO hours would be paid to employees upon separation up to the current maximum of 240 hours. Offices would continue to close during energy conservation periods and the appropriate leave hours would be automatically recorded for staff as PTO hours. Exceptions would have to be approved at the Executive level. Additionally, the current vacation buyback program would be eliminated.

The recommended changes for health benefits and sick leave and other benefits would take effect January 1, 2011. The proposed savings from implementation of all of the BRC recommended benefit changes total $1,150,934 (detailed in Attachment D).

Adoption of the proposed benefit changes would require an update of the applicable leaves section of the Business Policies & Procedures Manual. In addition, the bargaining units have negotiated leave provisions in their union agreements that will have to be renegotiated.

A motion was made by Regent Privett and seconded by Regent Todd to approve changes to employee medical benefits and sick leave and other leave benefits for the benefit year beginning January 1, 2011, as presented in Attachment D; further, pre-65 employees currently receiving a subsidy for their health insurance premiums would be “grandfathered” into the new program. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were:
Bedell, Dickson, Privett, and Todd. Abstaining: Spradling and Limbaugh (due to their affiliation with Southeast Missouri Hospital). The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF SCOPE AND PROJECT BUDGET FOR THE RENOVATION OF ACADEMIC HALL, RENOVATION AND ADDITION OF MAGILL HALL, COMPLETION OF MAJOR DEFERRED CAMPUS MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR PROJECTS, AND CONVERSION OF THE CAMPUS POWER PLANT TO NATURAL GAS FUEL SOURCE

President Dobbins asked Vice President Mangels and Ms. Angela Meyer, Director of Facilities Management, to present the recommendation that the Board approve the scope and project budget for the renovation of Academic Hall, renovation and addition of Magill Hall, completion of major deferred campus maintenance and repair projects, and conversion of the campus power plant to natural gas fuel source totaling approximately $58.3 million [Attachment E].

At the March 26, 2010, Board of Regents Retreat, the Board identified action items for the University to pursue in order to meet the budget challenges of the next five years. One of these action items was to review and prioritize major capital maintenance and repair needs of the campus and investigate possible funding sources to meet these needs. At the June 22, 2010, Board of Regents meeting, the Board considered the University’s capital needs and authorized resolutions intending to issue bonds to finance certain projects. The capital priorities identified by the Board at that meeting were renovation of the science facilities, upgrade of Academic Hall infrastructure, and major deferred maintenance and repair projects.

The Board also heard an update on an analysis of the university’s power plant operations at the June 22, 2010, meeting. The primary purpose of the assessment was to (1) evaluate the current operating condition of the system components, (2) determine the most cost effective operating scheme for the system, and (3) determine the most appropriate long-term strategy for the system.

Based on the Board’s direction on June 22, 2010, to further analyze the scope and estimated cost of these priority projects, a request for qualifications for architectural/engineering (A/E) services was issued by university administration for each project. In addition, an ad hoc committee of the Board was formed to consider these capital needs and financing options and make recommendations to the President. The ad hoc committee is chaired by Regent Doyle Privett and includes representation from all employee groups and student government (Attachment E-1).

During summer 2010, the A/E consultants selected for each project worked with Facilities Management staff to analyze building and infrastructure conditions and compiled recommendations and cost estimates. Each consultant presented their final
recommendations to the ad hoc committee on October 14, 2010. The ad hoc committee considered each project in relation to potential catastrophic consequences if identified needs were not addressed in the near term.

Representatives of the Lawrence Group, The Clark Enersen Partners (Science & Research Design Group), Bond Wolfe, and 8760 Engineering presented their proposals for renovations and upgrades to the facilities (details provided in Attachment E.)

The proposed renovation of Academic Hall is intended first and foremost to replace failing infrastructure. The last major infrastructure upgrade occurred in 1975 and the systems installed at that time are at the end of their useful life. The scope of this project will include full replacement of the mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and fire protection systems. The slate roof will be replaced and the dome re clad to stop water infiltration that is affecting the interior of the building. The elevator will be relocated and replaced to meet ADA requirements.

Another major element of the proposed Academic Hall renovation will be the implementation of a “one stop” student services area. The physical space currently dedicated to student services is misaligned with its needs as well as current functions. Enhancing the student experience will require shifts in departmental allocations, relocation of the IT department and a complete renovation of the first level of the building.

The total proposed project budget for the renovation of Academic Hall is $22,782,818 (see Attachment E-2, page 2). This cost estimate includes extending stairwell and elevator access, along with infrastructure, to the dome area. The project does not include a build out of the interior dome space. The cost estimate is based on a complete evacuation of the building during the construction phase.

Magill Hall was opened in 1960 as the primary science facility for the University. The existing building is comprised of four levels containing 64,450 gross square feet. The building has undergone some modifications over the last 50 years, but the most significant have occurred within the last four years. These include the renovation of three chemistry laboratories, two physics laboratories and two biology laboratories partially funded from a federal grant.

The goal of the proposed project is to renovate Magill Hall in its entirety. Many of the existing systems have outlived their useful life and now require replacement, including the mechanical and electrical systems within the building. Exterior renovations will include window replacement, masonry restoration and roof replacement. The exterior walls of the facility are currently un-insulated and will be furred out and insulated as part of this project. The exterior improvements along with installation of energy efficient mechanical system will have a significant impact on the thermal performance of the building and will result in a significant reduction of operational costs for the facility.
The complete interior renovation of the facility will provide the opportunity to accomplish two significant goals. First, it will allow for the complete remediation of all hazardous materials within the facility, both the Americium 241 contamination and the abatement of all asbestos containing materials. Secondly, the renovation will provide the opportunity to reorganize the current floor plans and group spaces by department. This will provide opportunities for shared equipment, shared storage and preparation rooms and a collaborative environment for both faculty and students.

In order to facilitate the renovation process and solve the need for new mechanical space, the project includes an addition to the north of Magill Hall. The three-story addition will house the mechanical space for new air handling equipment, in addition to a computer laboratory and two lecture classrooms. The construction of this addition will be the first phase of the project, which will provide swing space during the remaining two phases of construction.

The total cost of the Magill Hall renovation project is estimated at $17,952,593 (see Attachment E-3, Page 2.1). The cost estimate is net of two federal grants awarded to the University which provide $2,199,116 in construction funds for these renovations. Based on the phasing plan, the construction period for the project is estimated at two years.

Like Magill Hall, many of the university buildings date to the late 1950’s and 1960’s. Consequently, most of the systems serving these buildings have reached or exceeded their normal expected service life. Many of the mechanical systems have been replaced or upgraded as necessary to keep them operational, but the unit casings are beginning to fail, requiring full replacement. Piping systems in many buildings are showing considerable corrosion and early signs of failure. Electrical service is outdated and undersized for current needs in many buildings.

Deferred maintenance projects were reviewed and categorized into HVAC, electrical, plumbing and exterior envelope issues. Projects were prioritized as to (1) items well beyond their useful life which present a significant safety hazard and should be addressed in the next 1-3 years, (2) items which require considerable maintenance, but may continue to be maintained without concern of imminent failure for the next 3-5 years, and (3) items that are aging but failure is not imminent and can be addressed in the next 5-10 years.

Memorial Hall was identified as a swing space during the Academic Hall renovation, and a potential permanent home for the Information Technology department. Therefore, deferred maintenance needs for Memorial Hall were identified as a priority 1 project which would need to be completed prior to Academic Hall construction.
Cost estimates were prepared for all three priority levels of deferred maintenance projects. Individual projects less than $250,000 in scope were considered to be maintenance projects that should be funded through the university’s annual maintenance and repair budget allocation instead of capital financing. Priority 1 projects totaling $6,125,563 were identified for construction within the next 3 years. A budget allocation of $2,945,000 was identified for necessary upgrades and renovations to Memorial Hall to serve as transition space and priority 2 projects totally $3,525,363 were identified for construction in the next 3-5 years (see Attachment E-4, Page 2.1, 2.2).

The central boiler plant serving the Southeast Missouri State University campus was originally constructed in 1949. Today, only one operable coal boiler, installed in 1963, remains generating high pressure steam solely for campus use. The present plant has no back-up boiler. A failure of the single, aging coal boiler during cold weather would have significant consequences for the University.

The current plant operation provides no incentive to save heating energy in the campus buildings or the boiler plant. The boiler plant cannot reduce load to the operating conditions required for six to eight months of the year, so additional steam is produced which is either wasted through false load generators or used in a steam absorption chiller providing campus cooling through an inefficient process. In addition, the boiler plant still produces high pressure, high temperature steam that was required for the turbine/generation system even though that system is no longer operable. Less than half of the steam produced goes towards the plant’s primary mission of heating the campus.

To address the issues in the boiler plant, two options were identified. The first option is to convert the existing coal plant to natural gas firing by the addition of four natural gas boilers and abandoning the one remaining coal boiler. The second option is to provide two new back-up natural gas fired boilers but retain the one coal fired boiler. The coal fired boiler would be operated from November through March when building space heating is required, and the natural gas boilers would be operated the remaining portion of the year during warmer temperatures. Emissions requirements are becoming increasingly stricter and will eventually preclude the operation of the coal fired boiler without significant and expensive modifications. The consultant also estimates that environmental pressures will continue to increase for the University to reduce the carbon impact of their operations, with coal firing being the most obvious first target.

The estimated operating cost of the current central plant for FY11, based on known increased coal purchase cost, is $2.366 million. The projected operating cost if a complete conversion to natural gas firing boilers was completed is $2.485 million, as compared to $2.491 million if the coal fired boiler was retained and back-up natural gas boilers were installed. The replacement of the absorption chiller at the north chiller plant with an electric centrifugal chiller would reduce the annual operating costs by approximately $134,000 per year for either option.
The consultant recommended the University move forward with the replacement of the existing coal fired boiler with a natural gas fired boiler plant with fuel oil as the back-up fuel source. This option has an estimated project cost of $6,080,600. In addition, the absorption chiller at the North Chiller Plant should be removed as soon as funds are available to improve summer operations and reduce the University’s exposure to the variations in natural gas prices in this inefficient process of providing chilled water to the campus. The replacement of the absorption chiller is estimated at $847,000, but would have an estimated energy payback on investment of less than five years (see Attachment E-5, Page 3).

The ad hoc committee considered the current condition assessment for each project, along with the potential risk if deficiencies are not addressed in the near term. The committee recommended that renovations as proposed for Academic Hall and Magill Hall be completed, along with priority 1 level deferred maintenance projects including a renovation of Memorial Hall for transition space. In addition, the committee felt the unavoidable need for back-up boiler capacity at the central heating plant and the impending external pressures to move away from coal as a fuel source warranted a full conversion to natural gas. The committee also recommended the replacement of the absorption chiller at the North Plant because of its operating inefficiency and the relatively short return on investment period. The total cost of projects recommended by the committee is $56.7 million (see Attachment E-6).

The President considered the committee’s recommendations and information from the consultants, and recommends to the Board that while financing costs are unusually low, the University should complete priority 1 and priority 2 deferred maintenance projects. In addition, the majority of interior renovations to Memorial Hall should be completed with one-time local funds. Therefore, the President recommends a total of $55.3 million of project funds to be financed. The President estimated that $3 million in private gifts could be obtained towards the renovation of Academic Hall, the University’s landmark structure, and Magill Hall.

Current bond financing rates indicate an annual debt service payment of $58,000 for every $1 million of bonds issued. Based on the total recommended project scope to be financed of $55.3 million, the university would incur annual principal and interest payments of approximately $3.21 million. Potential funding sources include maintenance and repair and utility budget dollars currently used for principal and interest payments on the 2002 Performance Contract, which will be retired in FY12, auxiliary contributions for central plant and utility distribution upgrades that would benefit their facilities and the general fee dedicated to maintenance and repair.

Discussion was held, and Regent Privett recommended that the Board take the President’s recommendation to address campus needs as presented in Attachment E-6 totalling $58.3 million. Members of the Board asked if other campus needs could be considered and if the full $58.3 million could be covered by a bond issuance since bond
rates are extremely favorable. If bonds are issued for $58.3 million, a recommendation on additional projects that could be addressed through the bond proceeds will be brought back to the Board in December.

The projects would need to be coordinated in terms of bidding and construction to ensure there are adequate vendors to complete work within the various skilled trades and the University does not lose purchasing benefits due to market saturation. Attachment E-7 is the project timeline for the bond funded projects. The broad scope of projects will affect many buildings on campus and will require an adequate lead time to plan transitional spaces and complete moves of personnel and equipment. It is anticipated that programming and design would begin immediately and the first phases of construction on transitional spaces would begin summer 2011. Phase one addition to Magill Hall could begin during the Fall 2011 semester and renovations to Academic Hall could begin January 2012. The first phase of a conversion of the central heating plant would be the installation of natural gas boilers capable of providing back-up boiler capacity, which would be complete by Fall 2011.

President Bedell disconnected (via teleconference) from the meeting.

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Todd to approve the scope and project budget for the renovation of Academic Hall, renovation and addition of Magill Hall, completion of major deferred campus maintenance and repair projects needed within the next five years, and conversion of the campus power plant to natural gas fuel source totaling approximately $58.3 million. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION TO PURSUE FUNDING THROUGH THE MISSOURI HEALTH AND EDUCATION FACILITIES AUTHORITY (MOHEFA) TO FINANCE CAPITAL PROJECTS THROUGH THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS

President Dobbins asked Vice President Mangels to present the recommendation that the Board authorize the administration to pursue funding through the Missouri Health and Education Facilities Authority (MOHEFA) to finance capital project funds through the issuance of bonds [Attachment F].

The mission of the Missouri Health and Education Facilities Authority (MOHEFA) is to provide access to the capital markets in an effort to lower the cost of health and educational services in Missouri by providing financing alternatives for Missouri public and private, non-profit health and educational institutions. Missouri statutes authorize educational institutions to issue revenue bonds for revenue-producing auxiliary systems such as the residence hall system, parking system, etc. Loan financings
for educational and general capital projects must be issued on behalf of an educational institution by either MOHEFA or the Missouri Development Finance Board (MDFB).

The University anticipates the need for capital financing to fund proposed infrastructure improvements to Academic Hall, upgrade of science lab facilities, boiler updates at the campus power plant, and major deferred maintenance projects throughout campus. On June 22, 2010, the Board of Regents authorized resolutions indicating their intent to issue bonds to finance these projects and authorizing administration to pursue certain actions to analyze the structure and financing of such an issue.

Because the capital projects being considered are education and general facilities, administration anticipates the need to pursue issuance of bonds through MOHEFA and has made initial application to their Board. The application does not authorize the sale of bonds, nor commit the University or MOHEFA to a determined dollar amount of issuance. The Board of MOHEFA and the University Board of Regents must both authorize a final pricing and sale of bonds.

It is anticipated that a sale of bonds would occur prior to December 31, 2010, in order to take advantage of the federal Build America Bonds (BAB’s) program. Through this program, the federal government provides 35% of the annual interest expense on certain taxable, governmental bond issuances. Based on the underwriter’s recommendation of a 30-year financing of traditional tax-exempt bonds and BAB’s, annual debt service on a $55.3 million issue is estimated at $3.21 million (see Attachment F-1).

The Facilities Management Ad Hoc Committee considered potential funding sources to finance this annual debt service payment. The University is currently realizing approximately $150,000 annual budget savings since ceasing co-generation at the central plant in FY09. In addition, local and state maintenance & repair dollars and utility budget dollars have been used since FY02 for debt service on the 2002 Installment Contract Certificates. These bonds were used to finance energy improvement projects across campus and will be retired in FY12. A total of $700,000 ($350,000 + $350,000) has been identified from these funds.

The upgrades to the central power plant and deferred maintenance projects enhancing HVAC and electrical distribution will benefit not only the E&G buildings on campus, but auxiliary buildings. It is proposed that $150,000 be contributed annually from auxiliary enterprises who maintain facilities on campus. It is also anticipated that the conversion of the power plant to natural gas firing boilers will result in additional operations, equipment and potentially personnel budget savings beyond the scope of the consultants’ analysis. Therefore, an additional $125,000 was proposed from power plant/utility budgets.

The current general fee charged to students includes $3.00 per credit hour for maintenance and repair. When this fee was originally approved by the Board, it was to be
implemented $1.00 per credit hour per year, beginning in Fall 2007 and fully implemented at $6.00 per credit hour in Fall 2012. Because of the Governor’s desire to not increase fees charged to students over the last two years, the implementation of this general fee is behind the approved schedule. The fee will generate $1.2 million annually when fully implemented.

The Ad Hoc committee considered the addition of $5.00 per credit hour to the existing maintenance and repair general fee (total of $11.00) in order to generate $1 million which would be needed to finance all of the capital projects. It was the recommendation of the committee that if possible, a general fee increase should be a phased implementation since it is likely that increases to the incidental fee may be necessary for FY12 in order to meet general operating budget needs of the university. If the Board were to approve such a fee, the approval of this fee increase would be considered at the December 2010 Board meeting.

Consequently, a total of $3.325 million of potential funding sources for debt service was identified. This provides a contingency if annual utility budget savings are less than anticipated, and allows for slight enrollment fluctuations in the revenue estimate from general fees.

Mr. Brian Kelly, Student Representative to the Board, and Mr. Ben Hooe, Student Government Vice President and member of the Facilities Management Ad Hoc Committee, addressed the Board concerning the possibility of an increase to the incidental fee. Both agreed that students need more information to understand the necessity for capital financing to fund proposed infrastructure projects. Vice President Mangels and Ms. Angela Meyer, Director of Facilities Management, will work with Student Government to provide adequate information in order for Student Government to evaluate the projects and possible fee increase.

In addition, this matter will be discussed with the Southeast Missouri University Foundation Board at their upcoming meeting to explore options for support of these projects.

Discussion was held about the amount of the issuance of bonds. Vice President Mangels indicated the underwriters evaluated the University ability for debt service, and bonds could be issued for $58.3 million. It was agreed that the bond rates are extremely favorable, and it is an appropriate time to upgrade critical infrastructure, deferred maintenance, and other capital project needs. Therefore, there was consensus to approve financing $58.3 million rather than $55.3.

A motion was made by Vice President Spradling and seconded by Regent Limbaugh to authorize the administration to pursue funding through the Missouri Health and Education Facilities Authority (MOHEFA) to finance $58.3 million capital project funds through the issuance of bonds. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.
CONSIDERATION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION TO PURSUE REFINANCING OF THE SERIES 2002 SYSTEM FACILITIES REVENUE BONDS IF NET PRESENT VALUE SAVINGS EXCEED 3.0%

President Dobbins asked Vice President Mangels to present the recommendation that the Board authorize the administration to pursue refinancing of the Series 2002 System Facilities Revenue bonds if net present value savings exceed 3.0% [Attachment G].

On April 1, 2002, the University issued $6,645,000 System Facilities Revenue bonds to fund parking improvements on campus. Bond proceeds were used to construct a parking garage off Sprigg Street at the Towers residence hall complex. Funds were also used to purchase property along Broadway (part of the First Baptist Church property) and make parking improvements for commuters and residents on the south end of campus.

Debt service payments on the Series 2002 bonds are funded by the university parking and transit auxiliary. As the number of parking spaces on campus has expanded, the revenue recognized from fines has decreased. A reduction in the annual obligation for debt service would prevent the need to increase parking permit rates to meet the annual operations budget needs of the parking system.

Bonds in the principal amount of $5,615,000 remain outstanding as of June 30, 2010, on the Series 2002 issue. Industry standards recommend refinancing if net present value debt service savings meet or exceed 2.5% – 3.0%. Current estimates of a 20-year refinancing indicate net present value savings of $570,000, or 10.23%. This refinancing could potentially save the parking auxiliary between $36,000 and $40,000 annually in debt service payments (see Attachment G-1).

Refunding bonds would not be issued without approval of final pricing and terms by the Board of Regents.

A motion was made by Regent Dickson and seconded by Regent Limbaugh that the Board authorize the administration to pursue refinancing of the Series 2002 System Facilities Revenue bonds if net present value savings exceed 3.0%. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

The following items [Attachments H-K] were presented as consent agenda items:

- Approval of Policy changes to the Business Policy and Procedures Manual for Grants & Related Contracts and Retention of Records [Attachment H];
• Supplemental Charter School Contract and one-year extension of the current charter agreement with the Lift for Life Academy [Attachment I];
• Resolution of Honor for the Southeast Volleyball Team [Attachment J]; and
• Governing Board Certification Form for Academic Year 2010-11 for Submission to the Ohio Valley Conference [Attachment K].

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Todd to approve the above-listed consent agenda items [Attachments H-K]. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

REPORT ON REVISION OF FACULTY HANDBOOK

President Dobbins asked Dr. Ron Rosati, Provost, and Dr. Sophia Scott and Dr. Susan Swartwout, Co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Handbook Revision, to present a report to the Board on the revision of the Faculty Handbook [Attachment L].

At their March 25, 2010, meeting, the Board of Regents directed President Dobbins, working with the Faculty Senate, to review the Faculty Handbook and recommend changes to ensure that the Faculty Handbook conforms with current Board policies and directives.

To address the Board’s mandate, an Ad Hoc committee was formed from members of Academic Council and Faculty Senate. The charge of the committee was to review the entire Faculty Handbook and to fast-track the review of the Faculty Handbook concerning: program restructuring and review; program discontinuation or reduction with/without financial emergency; and retrenchment.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee include: Co-chairs: Sophia Scott, Faculty Senate Chairperson, and Susan Swartwout; Administrative representative; Fred Janzow; Academic Council representatives: Walt Lilly, Heather McMillan and Claudia Ruediger; Faculty Senate representatives: Rick Althaus, Walt Paquin, Kevin Dickson and Janice Ward; and Chairperson’s representative: Hamner Hill.

The process for the Faculty Handbook revisions by the Ad Hoc Committee was reviewed and presented in detail in Attachment L.

Many discussions and revisions were dedicated to the retrenchment and academic restructuring chapters. Consequently, the academic program review section was not completely finalized and needs additional revisions.
Discussion was held concerning retrenchment and academic restructuring, and it was noted that, if an academic program were to be eliminated, it would be critical to assist and advise any affected students so that no undue hardship is placed on students.

It was noted that the Ad Hoc Committee members have given many hours to develop and revise these sections of the Faculty Handbook. President Dobbins commended the committee for doing an outstanding job on this very important project.

Board members were asked to notify the President if they had additional input or concerns since the committee will be working to present the final draft to the Board at their December meeting.

**UPDATE ON BALANCING OF BUDGET**

President Dobbins asked Vice President Mangels and Provost Rosati to present an update on balancing of the budget [Attachment M].

After the March 26, 2010, Board strategic planning retreat with Dr. Bill Weary, the University's budget goal for FY11 and FY12 of $7.8 million was adjusted to a five year budget goal of $20 million. At the end of fiscal year 2010 the University had identified $7,042,504 towards that goal. This included operating budget cuts at the division level, restructuring of fees other than incidental fees such as late fees and special program fees, restructuring of non-merit scholarships and a planned incidental fee increase for FY12.

During the Summer 2010 semester a new compensation system for faculty teaching summer courses was implemented. As a result of this new system the University was able to offer courses which have a small number of students as opposed to simply canceling courses which do not meet enrollment standards. Faculty teaching these low-enrolled classes had their salary tied to the enrollment in the class. If enrollment in an undergraduate class was reduced below 12 students but remained above six students the class was still offered but faculty salary was reduced commensurately. As a result the University was able to offer classes with low enrollment in a manner that also allowed the University to meet its financial obligations. This system was developed last year cooperatively between various units on campus including the Faculty Senate, department chairpersons, and deans.

Summer 2010 was also the first summer term in which Federal Pell Grant funds were available to students. These factors, along with an increased offering of course sections (41 more sections than summer 2009), led to an increase in the net revenue recognized from the summer semester (see Attachment M-1). Budget Review Committee (BRC) compared the net revenue for summer 2010 to the previous two years' average net
revenue and recommended an increase to the revenue budget expectation of 90% of the increase, or $540,000 for FY12. Potential increases to the incidental fee revenue budget from the fall/spring academic year enrollments will be considered by BRC after the Spring 2011 census date.

The Benefits Subcommittee of Budget Review presented their recommendations for changes to medical benefits and leave benefits to BRC on October 8, 2010. BRC recommended to the President their proposal which continued to provide comparable medical and leave benefits, added family friendly benefits and enhancements for those contemplating retirement while saving the university $1,150,934 in operating dollars. These changes would take effect with the new plan year beginning January 1, 2011, and provide base budget savings beginning in FY12.

Provost Rosati noted that work continues by various subcommittees related to academic program review, semester credit hour generation and course redesign. Charts provided in Attachment M-2 indicate the progress that has been made in Academic Affairs towards these substantial initiatives. Mean class size has increased from 20.96 for Fall 2009 to 22.45 in Fall 2010 and salary cost per student credit hour has decreased from $232 per student credit hour to $222 per student credit hour for the same period. The results of these initiatives will be analyzed by BRC as they consider future enrollment data.

The amount identified through budget balancing efforts by the end of FY11 is $8,733,438 and has exceeded the original project needs for balancing FY11 and FY12 budgets (Attachment M-3). Unfortunately, it appears that the revenue and expense projections for the State of Missouri will require $600+ million of total appropriation reductions for state agencies. The University has been notified that with a $600+ million shortfall, the higher education portion of this shortfall could result in an appropriation reduction for Southeast of between $7-9 million. Consequently, the University will need an additional $4.2-$6.2 million in addition to the $7.8 million to balance the FY12 budget, and this figure does not include any employee salary increases.

Members of the Board expressed appreciation for the hard work of all who have come together to look at all aspects of the University in order to increase efficiencies and identify funds to help balance the budget for FY11 and FY 12.

**APPROVAL OF NAME CHANGE FOR THE CAPE GIRARDEAU PARTNERSHIP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

President Dobbins presented a report on the Cape Girardeau Partnership for Higher Education [Attachment N]. The initial meeting of the Cape Girardeau Partnership for Higher Education Advisory Committee was held on June 22, 2010. Officers were elected as follows: Mr. Wayne Smith, Chair; Ms. Kathy Swan, Vice-Chair; and Ms.
Mary Burton-Hitt, Secretary. On July 7, 2010, the officers met and agreed that a Marketing Sub-committee would be essential to the task of renaming the higher educational entity, branding the entity, and promoting and raising awareness for the entity. Mr. Mike Smythe, was asked to chair the sub-committee.

The Advisory Committee met on August 26, 2010, and Mr. Smythe reported that the sub-committee had met on August 2. He reported that the sub-committee members agreed that it is important to find a way to market the partnership, but, since no taxing district has been established, the partnership can not be called a community college. Therefore, the sub-committee focused on what might be a more appropriate name for the partnership and offered three potential names: Great River College Center (first choice); Great River Educational Center; and Great River Center for Education. The sub-committee members felt that the name “Great River College Center” could easily be transitioned to Great River Community College if at some point the center became a community college through a taxing district.

The Advisory Committee unanimously voted to accept the Marketing Sub-Committee’s recommendation of “Great River College Center” as the new name for the Cape Girardeau Partnership for Higher Education.

It was noted that this recommendation must be submitted to the presidents of Mineral Area College, Three Rivers Community College, and Southeast Missouri State University. Per bylaws of the Advisory Committee, any recommendations must be approved by respective boards of the institutions in the partnership. A letter from Mr. Wayne Smith, Chair of the Advisory Committee, was provided in Attachment N which conveys this recommendation.

A motion was made by Regent Privett and seconded by Regent Limbaugh to approve the name change for the Cape Girardeau Partnership for Higher Education to “Great River College Center.” A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

**PRESIDENT’S REPORT**

**REPORT ON ARTICULATED PROGRAM AGREEMENT BETWEEN LOGAN COLLEGE OF CHIROPRACTIC AND SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

Southeast Missouri State University and Logan College of Chiropractic in St. Louis signed an articulation agreement, laying the groundwork for a 3+3 program that will facilitate the path for Southeast students wishing to enter the chiropractic profession. A copy of the agreement was presented in Attachment O.
Under the program which begins with the fall 2010 semester, Southeast students wishing to pursue a chiropractic degree will complete three years of coursework at Southeast Missouri State University and then transition to Logan College of Chiropractic to complete an additional three years of classes. After completing the first year of coursework at Logan, students in the program will be awarded a Bachelor of Science degree in biology with a minor in chemistry from Southeast.

PROGRESS REPORT ON CONTRACTS AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

Members of the Board were provided with a progress report on contracts and Facilities Management projects in Attachment P. No questions were asked.

REPORT ON ACADEMIC PROGRAMS APPROVED BY THE COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Based on prior Board of Regents approval, the following new academic programs were approved by the Coordinating Board of Higher Education [Attachment Q]:

- Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE): Agricultural Education
- Bachelor of Science in Commercial Photography
- Master of Arts in Career Counseling
- Master of Arts in Public History

The following changes to current academic programs were approved by the Coordinating Board of Higher Education:

- BS/BA in Chemistry – Addition and Deletion of Options
- MS in Criminal Justice – Addition of Options
- Master of Music Education (MME) – Deletion of Program

REPORT ON 2010-2011 ACADEMIC REACREDITATION SCHEDULE

The following academic programs are scheduled for reaccreditation visits during the 2010-11 academic year [Attachment R]:
Donald L. Harrison College of Business:

Business Programs
Accrediting Agency: AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business)
Accreditation Visit: October 17-19, 2010

College of Education:

Education Programs
Accrediting Agency: NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education)
Accrediting Agency: MoSTEP (Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs)
Accreditation Visit: Concurrent Visits – October 2-6, 2010

College of Health and Human Services:

Communication Disorders
Accrediting Agency: ASHA (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association), Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
Accreditation Visit: Spring 2011

Nursing, BSN and MSN
Accrediting Agency: CCNE (Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education)
Accreditation Visit: October 4-6, 2010

Social Work, BS
Accrediting Agency: CSWE (Council on Social Work Education)
Accreditation Visit: September 20, 2010

College of Liberal Arts:

Mass Media (BA/BS Mass Communication)
Accrediting Agency: ACEJMC (Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications)
Accreditation Visit: Oct 31-Nov 3, 2010

Music
Accrediting Agency: NASM (National Association of Schools of Music)
Accreditation Visit: October 25-26, 2010
INFORMATIONAL REPORT ITEMS

Members of the Board were provided with the additional informational report items in Exhibit A as follows: 2010-2011 University Speaker Series brochures; Engage in 8! (Activities Schedule, First 8 Weeks, Fall 2010); DegreeWorks – Finish in 4!! (New Web-based Academic Progress Monitoring Tool); 2009 Public Safety & Transit Annual Report; Southeast Magazine (Fall 2010); 2010-2011 The Year of University Teamwork [President Dobbins’ State of the University Address]; 2011-2012 Budget Requested Submitted to the Department of Higher Education; and FY11 & FY12 Biennium Capital Budget Request Submitted to the Department of Higher Education.

CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO RECESS THE OPEN MEETING

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Todd to recess the open meeting. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Privett to go into closed session for consideration of the following:

A. RSMo 610.021.1 -- pertaining to legal actions, causes of action or litigation
B. RSMo 610.021.2 -- pertaining to lease, purchase or sale of real estate
C. RSMo 610.021.3 -- pertaining to the hiring, firing, disciplining or promotion of personnel
D. RSMo 610.021.14 -- pertaining to records which are protected from disclosure by law

A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

The open meeting recessed at 3:39 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO RECONVENE THE OPEN SESSION MEETING

A motion was made by Regent Limbaugh and seconded by Regent Todd to reconvene the open session meeting. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.
The open session reconvened at 4:06 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

President Dobbins announced that, during the closed session, the Board approved routine faculty and non-faculty items.

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING

A motion was made by Regent Todd and seconded by Regent Limbaugh to adjourn the meeting. A roll call vote was taken. Voting in favor were: Spradling, Dickson, Limbaugh, Privett, and Todd. The motion carried.

The open meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

________________________________________
Deborah S. Fulton
Secretary to the Board of Regents

APPROVED:

________________________________________
Donald B. Bedell, President
Board of Regents
Southeast Missouri State University