

**MINUTES OF THE OPEN BUDGET WORKSHOP
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of New Mexico State University held an Open Budget Workshop in the Regents Room, Educational Services Center, Las Cruces, New Mexico on March 11, 2013.

Chair Cheney called the meeting to order at 7:11 a.m.

Regents Present	Mike Cheney, Chair Isaac J. Pino, Vice Chair Vacant, Secretary / Treasurer Javier M. Gonzales, Member Kari Mitchell, Member Jordan Banegas, Member
Ex-officio Regents Present	Dr. Timothy Ketelaar, Faculty Senate Chair Breeana Sylvas, President ASNMSU
Officers of the University Present	Dr. Manuel Pacheco, President Dr. Jay Jordan, Executive Vice President / Provost
Chair NMSU Employee Council	Ms. Monica Dunivan
Other Presenters	Ms. Angela Throneberry, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance Ms. Anna Price, Chief Budget Officer

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Regent Pino moved and Regent Mitchell seconded to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

3. PRESENTATION OF BUDGET PROPOSAL – (Ms. Angela Throneberry, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance)

Dr. Manuel Pacheco mentioned that when he arrived on campus the following were things that NMSU needed to look at; low or no tuition increase, compensation issues, and ways in which we could garner efficiencies that would result in cost savings. He mentioned that there are 3 or 4 principles in the setting of a budget.

One challenge is as a land grant institution in recognizing the role NMSU plays in educating the diverse population of our State. The University is committed to providing the highest quality education and student experience at the lowest possible cost. The University is continuously looking for internal sources and operational efficiencies to help support budget priorities before turning to tuition and fee increases.

The second significant challenge we face is in managing through severe reductions in State Appropriations. Even with the new funding received for FY13, the Las Cruces campus received about \$28 million less than in 2009 and that was just 5 years ago. NMSU has been operating with a significantly lower amount of resources than in the past. This had to be taken into consideration in planning this year's budget.

The third challenge is the emphasis of the importance that must be placed in carefully managing resources and possible reductions. NMSU can face consequences of long-term negative impacts resulting from minimal dollar savings captured. For example, NMSU has an outstanding educational reputation and much of that is due to low student to faculty ratio. Eliminating classes changes our ratio and can have long-term implications.

NMSU looked at ways of economizing expenditures. For example, it is very difficult, in an isolated university, to make sure faculty and staff keep up to date with innovations going on around the country. NMSU needs to continue with travel expenses. With that being said, if travel were to be cut, our budget would be reduced by .9% and it would be detrimental to the quality of the institution.

The University operates in a lean fashion. Based on FY11 benchmark data, the university Instruction and General budget is funded at about 80% of the level of their peers. NMSU had done a good job at maximizing the cost for instructional purposes.

Dr. Pacheco then introduced Ms. Angela Throneberry, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance to present the propositions.

SVP Angela Throneberry introduced Ms. Anna Price, Chief Budget Officer, who also presented.

SVP Throneberry presented the following beginning with the background information in terms of the Budgeting and Reporting Process followed by the university.

The NM Higher Education Department has a manual, which outlines the accounting, budgeting and fiscal reporting process that must be followed for all institutions within the state (Section 21-1-33, NMSA 1978). That manual allows the university to report to higher education and make sure that it's a uniform process followed by all institutions in the state. As outlined in the manual, NMSU accounts for and reports according to their source of funds received and their subsequent uses. Funds with similar activities are combined into self-balancing fund groups.

NMSU has five Basic Fund Groups, which are as follows:

- Current Funds – Resources expendable for operating purposes.
 - Unrestricted: Expended in accordance with institutional guidelines
 - Restricted: Restricted for a specific purpose by external parties, contracts or legislation.
- Loan Funds – Resources available to lend to students
- Endowment Funds – Established by donor, requiring in perpetuity that the principal be invested and only interest income be spent.
- Plant Funds – Four subgroups
 - Unexpended Plant funds – For acquisition or construction of plant assets

- Renewals and Replacement funds – For renewal or replacement of plant assets
- Retirement of indebtedness funds – For retirement of University debt incurred for the acquisition or construction of plant assets
- Investment in Plant funds – To account for plant assets (land, buildings, equipment, improvements, construction in progress and library books)
- Agency Funds – Funds held by the University as custodian or fiscal agent for others.

Current Funds – I & G Budget

- Instruction – Expenditures for activities that are part of the instruction program
- General – Expenditures which provide support for the instruction program and are reported in the following separate categories:
 - Academic Support
 - Student Services
 - Institutional Support
 - Physical Plant

Current Funds – Non-I & G Budgets

- Student Social and Cultural
- Research
- Public Service
- Intercollegiate Athletics
- Internal Service
- Student Aid
- Auxiliary Enterprises
- Independent Operations

The above background information relates to NMSU's Current Year Budget FY 13.

The Budget Approval Form submitted to the NM Higher Education Department represents the expenditure level at which the Higher Education department requires the board's approval. The form provides both the current funds and the plant funds by campus and in total. The FY13 Approved Expenditure Budget for NMSU is \$677 million. The Las Cruces campus represents \$556 million or 82% of the total budget with the community colleges making up the remaining 18%. The FY13 Expenditure Budget for Las Cruces consists of \$495 million for Current Funds and \$61 million in Plant Funds.

The FY 2013 Current Funds Budget for Las Cruces consists of \$300 million in Unrestricted Funds and \$196 million in Restricted Funds. The FY13 Unrestricted current Funds Budget is broken down into two functions. I & G represents the largest portion at \$176 million or 59%. Instruction receives 58% of the \$176 million approved for I & G.

The total approved Budget for Operating Unrestricted I & G represent 26% of the total budget of \$677 million.

The Las Cruces Unrestricted I & G Budget is the specific budget impacted by the sources and priority uses that will be discussed.

Ms. Throneberry discussed the Expenditure Categories for I & G FY 13 budget and the FY 12 Actuals. For FY 13 total I & G Expenditures equal \$176 million and Salaries and

Fringe represent 76% of that amount. This helps bring to light the challenge faced by the university in managing the 19% reduction in state appropriations from FY09 – FY12. Even with the increase in I & G State appropriations, NMSU currently receives about \$17 million fewer I & G dollars from the state than in FY09. Bottom line, additional expenditure reductions of any significance simply can't be accomplished without impacting positions.

Supplies and expenses make up the second largest category in I & G Expenditures and include items such as Bad Debt Expense, Library books and periodicals, leases and rentals, advertising, telephone and printing. The unallocated represents funds that are held central pending final distribution to established processes such as budget hearings. Although travel expenses represent only 1% of budget, it is an area reduced over the last few years. The FY travel expense is about 8.5% less than the average expense for the prior five years.

SVP Throneberry presented on Benchmark Data & Efficiencies. External Benchmark Data Sources and compare NMSU to our Peers. The Benchmark Data is only available through FY 11 from NMSU Peers, but have also elected to include data for FY 12 for NMSU only. NMSU Las Cruces proportionally allocates more of I & G budget to instruction than their peers and NMSU has consistently done that over the four year benchmark period. NMSU allocates a lower percentage than the peer average to academic support but seem to have made a slight improvement over the reported period. Student Services reflects another area where the university has increased the proportional share over the last four years and are now in line with their peers. And with the exception of one year, Institutional Support has been a higher percentage than their peers, although the gap appears to be shrinking. In the Plant O & M, the increase in percentage partly reflects some strategic investments in reducing deferred maintenance and making facility improvements such as classroom upgrades.

The next schedule normalizes the I & G Investment by calculating expense per student full time equivalency. Across all I & G categories and in total NMSU invests a lower dollar per student FTE than their peers. In total, NMSU's investment is about 80% of their peers. Although NMSU has experienced reductions in state appropriations, NMSU has remained at a comparable level of about 80% funding in comparison to peers over the past four years. This is NMSU's budgeting philosophy and commitment to provide the highest quality education and student experience at the lowest possible cost. As NMSU moves forward, it is critical to continue to make necessary financial investments and carefully manage existing resources to retain a level of excellence and remain competitive. NMSU has made strategic budget reductions over the last several years to help address the multiyear reduction in state appropriations. In addition, numerous efficiency measures and cost containment efforts have allowed the university to reallocate our critical resources. Following are a few efficiencies we have highlighted:

Internal Operating Efficiencies

- Dr. Jordan recently reassigned three advisor positions to the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Dr. Jordan redefined an existing position to create the Accreditation Outcomes Assessment and Academic Program Review Department using existing resources
- Executive Vice President and Provost
- Fleet Reduction Program – Reduction of 255 vehicles to date for an estimated annual savings in maintenance, insurance and fuel cost of \$500,000 annually

- Chilled Water Plant – Expected minimum savings of \$350,000 per year by reducing electric demand during the summer months.
- Benefit Dependent Verification Review – Resulted in \$270,000 in annual savings
- Refunding of Series 2002, 2003, 2004B – NPV savings estimated at \$6 million
- Systems Automation – Efforts will automate over 50,000 manual transactions resulting in operational efficiencies and cost savings
- Energy Performance Contract – Capture energy savings to fund project and invest in physical plant

Although many efficiencies have been achieved, there's more work underway. Dr. Jordan is working with the college deans to implement an academic review effort. Administration and Finance will initiate an administrative review to include analysis of staffing levels in span of control.

SVP Throneberry reviewed the budget sources and priority needs for FY 14 budget. The I & G state appropriations are determined through a funding formula. The Higher Education Department recently introduced a new formula which was first used in FY 13.

The formula starts with an adjusted FY 13 I & G appropriation which is the base funding. The instructional workload component provides funding based on the change in the three year rolling average of student credit hours completed. The Performance Measure component provides additional funding for three separate measures: Institutional Awards, which is based on change in total awards issued; Workforce Incentive, which is based on total awards earned in science, technology, engineering, math, and allied health for same academic years; Incentive for Financially At-Risk Students is based on the change in total awards earned by Pell Eligible students. The last component, Institutional share which is an adjustment factor based on the change in funding of Land and Permanent Fund Revenue used for four year institutions and change in mill levy revenue used for two year institutions.

SVP Throneberry presented us with a summary of FY 14 House Appropriation Finance Committee recommendations for NMSU. As final appropriations will not be known until the conclusion of the legislative session and the governor's signature on HB 2, this presentation was based on the HFC recommendation.

The below change represents the new funding from the formula for each of the campuses:

Las Cruces – 102,700
 Alamogordo Branch – 365,700
 Carlsbad Branch – (110,800)
 Dona Ana Branch – 1,439,200
 Grants Branch – 53,800

Overall the Las Cruces campus did not perform as well as should have based on receiving less of the proportional share of the total formula distribution in comparison to our base funding.

Input is received from University Budget Committee, Student Fee Review Board, Faculty Senate Chair, and AFSCME Local 2393 and has been considered in establishing the budget priorities.

The University Budget Committee is advisory to the President and it includes representation from the Dean's Council, Faculty Senate, ASNMSU, and Employee Council. Their top three priorities are Faculty and Staff compensation, Graduate Program Enhancements and Improvement in Funding Formula Performance Measures.

The Student Fee Review Board is charged with providing input to the President regarding changes in the amount and use of required student fees.

Faculty Senate Chair proposed an increase in faculty salaries by 3% for three consecutive years.

AFSCME Local 2392 (for Bargaining Unit Employees) provided the University Budget Committee with their top four priorities; 2% pay increase, bring all employees hired before 7/1/11 up to 10% above entry level, an insurance premium holiday for two months, and one paid personal day.

The FY14 Budget Priorities include both Required Increases and Institutional Priorities under consideration.

Required Increases

- ERB Swap of 1.5% - Effective July 1, 2013
- ERB Contribution Increase of .75% - Employer Contribution
- Compensation of 1% (If State Funding provided)
- Health Premium Increase of 15% (Estimated per State Risk Management)

Institutional Priorities

- Phase I of Faculty Salary Enhancement Plan - \$1,317,200
- Faculty Promotion and Tenure - \$241,200
- Enrollment Management (Scholarships, tutoring Services and Advisors) - \$800,000
- Required Fee Recommendation - \$516,200
- Graduate Student Support - \$250,000
- Additional 1% Compensation for Faculty and Staff - \$1,547,800

Dr. Pacheco commented that it was not reasonable to try to look at faculty compensation as a total figure but rather as a phased in process. They felt it was reasonable of using +/- 10% from the mean as being a reasonable goal for us to shoot for.

SVP Throneberry mentioned about a recent change initiated by Dr. Jordan that allows vacant faculty lines to remain with the college. Previously the College retained one half of the vacant line and the other half was pulled to the central pool, for distribution by the Provost. Use of the central pool included funding the annual cost for faculty promotion and tenure. Funding this institutional priority allows colleges to retain the full position funding to fill faculty vacancies. The new funding formula outcome performance measures emphasize the need and the expectation for the university to focus on retention and graduation. The Enrollment Management Priority of \$800,000 directly supports our students and funds the key services to help them succeed. The Required Fee Recommendation includes \$463,200 based on the recommendation received from the Student Fee Review Board, plus an additional \$53,200 compensation adjustment. The Student Fee Review Board increased the allocations which includes student media and athletics. ASNMSU Student Activity also receives an indirect increase in fee allocation. Graduate Student Support of \$250,000 combined with last year's

funding would be adding a total of \$500,000 to help attract and retain valuable graduate students. Lastly, Faculty and Staff Compensation remains a priority for the university so an additional 1% compensation increase was included for consideration.

Dr. Pacheco wanted to give credit to those who worked with the Student Fee Review. This group came in with recommendations that were reasonable and appropriate. Some changes were made at the outset and the way that it was presented, pleased Dr. Pacheco.

SVP Throneberry stated that State Appropriations and Tuition and Fees represent about 90% of the I & G Revenue Sources for the Las Cruces Campus. Remaining sources include Land and Permanent Fund, Gifts, Sales and Services, and Indirect Cost Recovery. New sources for FY 14 are the State Appropriations, which will include the funding formula funds, plus an additional allocation for Educational Retirement Board increases and a 1% compensation increase. The Compensation Funding amount represents about 67% of that total cost.

The next two items are internal sources generated from assessment of institutional support and use of an existing expenditure pool. The final revenue source of Tuition and Fees is being evaluated based on priority and overall impact of tuition and fee rates.

SVP Throneberry then presented on Tuition and Fee Rates and the amount needed to fund each of three priority groups.

- Priority 1 – blended rate increase 0%
 - Required Increases
 - Faculty Promotion and Tenure
 - \$275,500 towards Faculty Salary Enhancement Plan – Phase I
- Priority 2 – blended rate increase 2.4%
 - Remainder for Faculty Salary Enhancement Plan – Phase I
 - Required Fee Recommendation
 - Enrollment Management
- Priority 3 – blended rate increase 4.2%
 - Graduate Student Support
 - Faculty and Staff Compensation; additional 1%

SVP Throneberry reported on Tuition and Fees as compared to NMSU Peer institutions. NMSU ranks in the lower half of the schedule for current year rates. The rates show \$6,041 for In-State and \$19,068 for Out-of-State currently. The rates would go up with the 2.4% blended increase to \$6,186 and \$19,526 and with the 4.2% blended increase to \$6,295 and \$19,869 respectively.

In closing, SVP Throneberry stated that NMSU takes seriously their responsibility to provide the citizens of the State of New Mexico with access, affordability and excellence in education. NMSU is extremely efficient in comparison to peers in both expenditure levels and affordability. The Proposal targets investment and instruction and student service areas. An increase financial investment is critical to protect quality and advance in today's competitive environment. The input received from the board this morning combined with the final outcome of the legislative session will be used to develop our final proposed tuition and fee rates and budget guidelines for FY 14 that will be presented at the April Board Meeting. Also included in the packets are additional rates that will be presented at the April Board Meeting.

Regent Gonzales wanted to know how the lottery scholarship plays into funding tuition costs.

SVP Throneberry replied that the lottery scholarship does provide for the tuition portion of the tuition and fee rates for students depending on eligibility. The lottery scholarship becomes effective, if the student enrolls, immediately after graduating from a New Mexico High School and the funding starts the second semester but we provide funding for that first semester. It would cover the tuition portion of the tuition and fees, as it stands now.

SVP Throneberry then presented a summary on the rate adjustments currently being considered for each of the community colleges using preliminary inputs based on the HFC recommendation. The proposed rates do not incorporate the impact of a compensation increase above the 1% provided by the state. Alamogordo reflects an increase ranging from 1.1% to 1.4%. Although Carlsbad reflects the highest increase range of 2.3% to 4.8%, their resident rates remain the lowest of all community colleges. Dona Ana anticipates an increase ranging from .5% - 1.6% and Grants does not expect to increase their rates.

SVP Throneberry then presented on the following Auxiliary Services FY 14 Rate Requests:

- Housing Rates – No change in rates
 - Proceed with the next step of the approved Housing Master Plan to replace Monagle with a phase approach to better align housing inventory with current demand and reduce associated operation costs for FY14
 - Focus on improving recruitment and retention of housing residents
- Meal Plan Rates – Request for increase will range from 3.28% to 3.43%
 - Contractual agreement with Sodexo allows for rate adjustment associated with the cost of business based on Producer Price Index (PPI) and other operational costs
- Parking Permit Rates – No change in rates
 - Transportation and Parking Services (TPS) Master Plan will be presented to Board of Regents later this year as part of annual presentation of Campus Master Plan
 - Anticipate rate adjustment in FY15 to support plan implementation

Regent Gonzales wanted to know what percentage of students use the lottery scholarship and if that rate is increasing or decreasing.

Ms. Judy Bosland responded that in Spring 2013 there were approximately 3,800 student on the lottery scholarship at NMSU Las Cruces. That is approximately 30+% of all students that are on the lottery scholarship. Many students have lost it or it has expired on them. There has been an increase in first time freshmen who have become eligible for the lottery scholarship. For the last three years, 72% of the initially eligible freshmen receive the lottery scholarship.

Regent Gonzales wanted to know if the input received was from faculty, staff and students.

SVP Throneberry responded that yes the input was received from faculty, staff and student groups and they are represented in the packet presented.

Regent Gonzales wanted to know if there was a method to which Faculty Senate communicates to faculty. He had heard in Santa Fe that faculty do not have input in the budget process.

Dr. Ketelaar responded that Faculty Senate has had input through the process. They get a briefing in the middle of the year and then are allowed to sit in on the budget discussions and formation of priorities. Where he would like improvement is early on in the budget process to give faculty a better sense of the budget process and to communicate their priorities. He thinks the nature of that input could be improved.

Regent Gonzales stated that what he is hearing from the legislators is that faculty have communicated to them that they are not getting any input.

Dr. Ketelaar responded that that is reflecting that faculty could have more input.

President Pacheco mentioned that input was received from Faculty Senate and faculty regarding faculty salaries when he first arrived on campus. He mentioned that this Budget Workshop should be started earlier in the year to keep NMSU constituencies informed of the parameters of the budget process.

Regent Cheney stated that he has had several meetings with Dr. Ketelaar and asked Dr. Ketelaar to share with the regents how they are working toward for the greater good of the university.

Dr. Ketelaar responded that he has the greatest respect for the Board of Regents. He also appreciates being able to seek ways for Faculty Senate to have more input. He wanted the Budget process to occur earlier in the summer. He thinks this process could be improved by having this process earlier where he feels his input would be more valuable.

Regent Cheney mentioned that there are ways to improve and enhance the process but would also like to recognize the relationship that has been building with Faculty Senate.

Regent Pino responded to Dr. Ketelaar's statement about possibly creating a timeline as to how this occurs relating to the budget. He keeps hearing about wanting to input earlier in the process, but the fact is no one knows months in advance. Input comes from Higher Education, LFC, DFA and that starts to come together in January or February. As was noted this morning, nothing more can happen until after the legislature is over with. There is a window in which budget becomes a priority here on campus. The fundamentals as to how we will look at the budget are things that can be discussed through the course of the year. To get down to the actual numbers and percentages and what can be allocated and considered is a much shorter process due to the legislative process. This is not a last minute effort and is not an effort to stonewall, but this is the way the process works.

President Pacheco responded that much of the information received here at this process was not available this past weekend. The personnel from Administration and Finance worked all weekend to put this all together. This is an extremely dynamic process. The only thing that can be put together throughout the year are principles that can be

followed and 'what if' types of situations. Much of the information heard this morning is still subject to change. The information presented this morning is the best that they can do with what was given, but can still change at any time. He mentioned that the faculty processes move very slowly and it is not possible to take all of this into account. Higher education personnel have to live with an extremely high level of ambiguity. The facts will not be available to make decisions until the last minute, we need to keep with the general, broad principles that we are trying to accomplish and then plug in the numbers at the appropriate time and stay true to those principles.

Regent Cheney thanked Dr. Pacheco for explaining the process.

Ms. Throneberry mentioned that the numbers presented today were not the latest and there were some HFC recommendations for reductions to the Las Cruces campus that were not taken into account with the presentation.

Regent Cheney mentioned that anytime we talk about our numbers we are talking about resources. There are three basic areas, which are research dollars, appropriation, and tuition and fees. These numbers are for discussion purposes. If these get printed or shared by anyone by saying this is what is going to happen this year, they are mistaken.

Regent Gonzales stated that faculty and staff are critical elements in moving the university forward. He feels that we need to stay focused on compensation for the staff. He wanted to know where the priorities are for increasing graduation rates, retention rates, making sure that scholarships are more available for students in need or are proving themselves, and making sure we are investing in having work force ready students. How are we addressing some of these basic but yet important needs to students that are arriving on campus? If a student were to look at our budget priorities, they would not find anything for students on this list.

President Pacheco responded that he was proud that this question is being more addressed now than when he was here three years ago. A part of this is the priorities that are being emphasized statewide. The state has been working to define what success is for institutions. With prompting from other agencies, we have been hard at work during this last year trying to define three critical elements; focusing on outcomes rather than on inputs in terms of our students, focusing on how to take at risk students and improve their opportunities to succeed in higher education and there is a third one that is being addressed. These discussions have gotten to the point of being heated because they are not complete. This does not take into account the full mission of New Mexico State University. This coming year they will be looking at what markers that they need to look at for success for a research university such as NMSU. This was not done this past year. We are not being recognized for being a university for everything that we do. We were looked at the same as two year universities and other four year universities, but nothing that is part of our mission was looked at.

Regent Cheney mentioned that NMSU has a good reputation as a research institution.

Regent Mitchell asked SVP Throneberry about the overall budget and it showing an increase from FY 09.

SVP Throneberry commented that the overall budget has increased, which is the current funds and plant funds combined. In terms of the sources of funding we have received for the I & G portion of the budget, those funds themselves from the state have

declined since FY 09 – FY 12. We experienced an increase in the state appropriations in FY 13.

Regent Mitchell mentioned that enrollment had proportionately dropped over this same period of time and if there is a correlation with the reductions and the reduction of students. Regent Mitchell wanted to know the variance of this impact.

Ms. Price responded that enrollment had not dropped during that time period, but has dropped the last two fall semesters.

Regent Mitchell mentioned that we are still slightly above from that time period.

Ms. Price agreed.

Dr. Pacheco mentioned that the \$677 million overall budget includes the community colleges. The community college budgets have increased, while the NMSU budget has decreased and that decrease needs to be taken into consideration of the overall perspective and that's what accounts for the budget decrease of NMSU. The decrease has been on the main campus.

Regent Mitchell commented that we should be looking at how long our students take to graduate and how much they are spending on their overall tuition. While looking at the comparison of our peer institutions, we look like a better value, but if it is taking students longer to graduate, that may not be the case.

SVP Throneberry stated that we have invested \$1 million in enrollment management, which covered scholarships, part-time instruction and also some student services. The proposal today shows \$800,000 that is direct support for enrollment management for scholarships, advisors, and tutoring services. These services will allow our students to be successful and allow them to graduate in a shorter period of time. This allows us to be successful in terms of the funding formula, because the funding formula awards funds based on student credit hours, and performance measures, which are now emphasized in the formula, and is a direct correlation to our graduation rates. If we can increase and improve our graduation rates it returns the investment back to the university which in turn returns it to the students in terms of them graduating in a shorter period of time.

Dr. Ketelaar mentioned that investment of faculty is a direct investment of students and gave a few examples.

Dr. Jordan mentioned about four desires: for students to get their degrees quickly, have less debt, get a good paying job preferably in southern New Mexico, and economic development for southern New Mexico.

Regent Mitchell mentioned the need to look at employability and take a holistic approach to how we do that while taking a look at our overall economic wealth.

Dr. Jordan mentioned that we have recognized a need for a two-year technician level personnel to get a four year degree in engineering technology, which has to do with Sandia National Labs. The engineering technology department has put forth a proposal to do a 2 year to 4 year completion program and have made arrangements with Central New Mexico Community College to take their two year technician degree and for us in

the Albuquerque Center to finish their four year degree to fill some of those jobs up in Albuquerque. We have also done the same thing with HRTM teaming with CNM, which has a great culinary program. A number of establishments have several openings for these students in the northern part of the state.

Regent Mitchell challenged the faculty to get the discussions going with increasing graduation rates. To the point of being transparent and to having a fully engaged conversation, we need to have faculty own the graduation rates. Faculty has that direct line with students. She asked faculty to join this conversation with us to have this same desired outcome.

Breeana Sylvas asked, based on the recommendation from HFC, what would be the percentage of increase in tuition.

Ms. Price mentioned for Priority 2, the tuition increase would be 2.3% with a fee increase of 2.8% for a blended rate of 2.4%. For Priority 3, the tuition increase would be 4.5% with a fee increase of 2.8% for a blended rate of 4.2%.

Dr. Ketelaar thanked Dr. Pacheco and Dr. Jordan for their help during this process.

Regent Banegas thanked Breeana Sylvas and the Student Fee Review Board for their dedication to this process.


Regent Cheney thanked SVP Throneberry and Ms. Price for their hard work on this workshop. He also thanked Dr. Pacheco for his leadership.

4. OTHER / COMMENTS

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no more business the Board of Regents adjourned at 8:45 a.m.

Minutes recorded by Carolyn Aragon.



Mike Cheney, Chair
Board of Regents

Vacant, Secretary / Treasurer
Board of Regents