

**Budget Committee**  
**Executive Summary Analysis of Operating Comparison**  
**October 25, 2011**

	<b>Positions 1984-1985</b>	<b>Positions 2011-2012</b>	<b>Change in Positions</b>	<b>Percentage Change</b>	<b>Head Count</b>
<b>Admin.</b>	<b>32 - 2</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>33% Increase</b>	<b>4105</b>
<b>Faculty</b>	<b>120 + 2</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10% Increase</b>	<b>4116</b>

Two positions that were considered administrative in 1984-1985 over the years have been moved to faculty position. So, for comparisons they are removed to compare positions.

Of the 13 positions that have increased in faculty, 8 are Endowed Chair positions, not existing in 1984-1985. The remaining five positions have been added to support expansion to Tinker, Idabel and McAlester. Another area of expansion in dollars is the business schools.

For the budget allocation, scholarships and waivers, and operations we have compared our success against Southwestern Oklahoma State University, East Central University, University of Central Oklahoma, Northern State University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, and Cameron University.

**Budget Allocation**

- ◆19% Scholarships and waivers are the highest of our peers.
- ◆1% Public Service equal to most of our peers.
- ◆11% SE Physical Plant, Highest has been ECU at 19%.
- ◆47% SE is next to last on instruction of our peers.
- ◆8% SE is in the middle of our peers for Institutional support.
- ◆6% SE at the lower end for academic support.

**Scholarships and Waivers**

- ◆Resident tuition waivers are moderate in comparison to our peers.
- ◆The majority of waivers given are out-of-state tuition waivers. This can be attributed to being a border school because the next closest one is NSU.
- ◆SE has excellent scholarship dollars in comparison to our peers.

**Operations**

- ◆Overall we are operating too high for our headcount administratively.
- ◆Our student services costs are higher than our peers.
- ◆Academic support is comparable to our peers.
- ◆Physical Plant needs additional monies SE is lower than our peers.
- ◆Instruction needs beefing up in comparison to our peers.
- ◆Our institutional reserve rollover is unacceptable and all employees need to be aware of the intuitional need to conserve where possible and be rewarded to do so by not expending all budget monies and be given a reward amount as rollover.

Overall SE has several unique programs: They are Aviation, Safety, Business (AACSB). Education was not listed as teacher education is a part of nearly all our peer's curriculum. Expansion of unique programs draws students. The majority of our transfer students come from MSC, GCC, and EOC. We have failed to promote what is unique about SE. It is hard to do this when we are still trying to find ourselves and who we are 26 years later.

From 1984-1985 to present SEs enrollment has remained stagnant, if not declined, because we are no longer just teaching at SE, our expansion has allowed us to retain our base headcount. Our overall headcount has remained at about 4,100. This is disturbing because we have increased out of state tuition waivers, expanded into other markets, Idabel, McAlester, and Tinker to only retain stagnant enrollment.

We have added 10 new administrative positions but we serve no more students. This administrative increase is 33 percent as compared to a 10 percent in faculty positions. A serious paring down in administrative positions should be considered or reassignment of duties and positions. Another area may be to target expensive, low enrollment programs. This will need to be carefully done because it is programs and that variety that ultimately bring students to SE.

It is easy for each side to look at the other and point. But the numbers are the facts and are not subject to we say, they say. What needs to happen is that hard choices need to be made for the longevity and the sustainability of SE. None of us will approve of all the decisions however we need to understand that we too must contribute to this process and that change must occur for SE to thrive.

Draft 10/15/11  
Budget Committee