

UEC Minutes  
February 10, 2014

**Time:** 0800

**Place:** Hadley Hall

**Room:** 130

DISCUSSION ITEM	OUTCOME	RESPONSIBLE PERSON/ DEPARTMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTION	EXPECTED DATE
I. <b>Call to Order and Opening Comments</b>	President Carruthers opened the meeting			
II. <b>Follow Up Items from 01.27.14</b>	Airport interviews for DACC will take place on Thursday and Friday of this week Move admissions to PAC Expect audit on best practice of oversight to be done within 2 months Consultant contract for RFP on housing to flow this week with March time frame Fleet management RFP was released end of January Fleet analysis document done by Angela and will share at upcoming UAC Expressed concerns regarding the number of vehicles Bruce reported on policy manual and indicated a 3-6 month time frame with effort to separate policy from procedure Bruce and Lisa to visit with President	<i>B Woods</i>  <i>President's Office</i>  <i>B Woods</i>  <i>A Throneberry</i>  <i>B Kite / L Warren</i>	Copy to Kevin and Tina of the feasibility study on hotel  Call for a meeting of the Real Estate Committee  Work with President to establish task force to review property acquisition  Share fleet analysis at upcoming UAC  Meet with President on Policy Update	ASAP  ASAP
III. <b>Legislative Update</b>	The President briefed the group on his ongoing attempt to gain full cap outlay support. Further conversations included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion of HB 2 and the tabling action on Friday</li> <li>- Continued negotiation of the PED budget</li> <li>- Lottery bills being heard today (we support the LFC</li> </ul>			

UEC Minutes  
February 10, 2014

DISCUSSION ITEM	OUTCOME	RESPONSIBLE PERSON/ DEPARTMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTION	EXPECTED DATE
	<p>Recommendation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ASNMSU Student recommendation of back loading of funding has support from some</li> <li>- Discussion of SIC investment bill</li> <li>- Update to campus – regents and administration desire to meet with faculty at close of the session – will hold a convocation with faculty followed by reception</li> </ul>			
<p>IV. <b>Clear Agenda for the March 10, 2014 Regents Meeting</b></p>	<p>The group reviewed the draft agenda for the March meeting and commented on each agenda item.</p>			
<p>V. <b>Policy 4.30.10 – Hiring Definitions</b></p>	<p>This proposed policy is an amendment to hiring definitions. All we are doing is expanding the categories of employment to benefit laborers, students etc...and seasonal employment. It will be forwarded to UAC</p>			
<p>VI. <b>Policy 7.04 - Domestic Partners</b></p>	<p>This proposed policy amends the domestic partners policy to bring it into compliance with recent laws passed at the state and federal level. In addition it updated the policy to bring it in line with current format. The only content changes were the removal of details previously required for proof of domestic partners. Now flexible to adjust to state rules. It will be forwarded to UAC.</p>			
<p>VII. <b>Tuition Options</b></p>	<p>The President stated that there is growing political support for zero tuition increase. He reminded all that we are considering tuition linearization at 15 hrs full load. The President raised the idea of a set tuition rate for each incoming class. It would include 8 semesters at the set level and be reset with each incoming class.</p>	<p><i>B Woods</i></p> <p><i>A Throneberry</i></p>	<p>Place this topic on the next PAC Agenda</p> <p>Review and analysis of the proposal</p>	

UEC Minutes  
February 10, 2014

DISCUSSION ITEM	OUTCOME	RESPONSIBLE PERSON/ DEPARTMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTION	EXPECTED DATE
	<p>The linearization would also include the provisions that anything above 15 SCH a freebie.            President seeking review and analysis of this proposal. Angela has folks from A&amp;F work with SAEM . Group meeting today. Provost and President need to speak to chair of the Faculty Senate. Apply same for UG and G students.            Timing important. Tuition and fees to be presented Apr 3 to BoR            Goal is to drive them thru the process in a timely manner. Greg mentioned the challenge of full time for graduate students if they are on a TA.            Kevin mentioned the use of coops and internships. That will push them out beyond the 8 semesters. Angela thinks there would be a lot of parents that would jump at this. Could see a tremendous positive impact upon enrollment. Bruce stated that Illinois has lengthy time doing this. NAU also does this.</p>	<p><i>President's Office</i></p>	<p>Arrange for President and Provost to meet with the faculty senate</p>	
<p>VIII. <b>Annual Strategic Planning Update for 2013 for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management</b></p>	<p>Discussion of this issue was postponed due to Bernadette's absence from today's meeting.</p>			
<p>IX. <b>Administration Program Review</b></p>	<p>Administrative Program review was discussed. The Provost has asked what steps we are considering to create a vehicle for the periodic review of administrative functions akin to the academic program review. Vision 2020 makes provisions</p>	<p><i>Natalie Kellner</i></p>	<p>Review and provide best practices for administrative review process and protocols</p>	

UEC Minutes  
February 10, 2014

DISCUSSION ITEM	OUTCOME	RESPONSIBLE PERSON/ DEPARTMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTION	EXPECTED DATE
	<p>for review of programs both academic and administrative. Progress is being made on the academic program review. Provost wants progress on admin side of house. What is required or desired to conduct review of admin functions? Student success, finance, advancement etc... review every five years – quality customer satisfaction resources etc.... Angela believes it is beneficial and will review those colleges that might be already undertaking such steps. Also discussed the need to blend such steps into strategic plans. President thinks all have a strategic plan aligned and if we are to review annually then what is the purpose of the review each five years? What is different? Began as academic program reviews but extension makes sense but what are you reviewing? On academic side the review is against peer institutions. Perhaps this is a different perspective that five year review might bring. President looking at the peer review metrics as an ongoing issue.</p>	<p><i>TBD ☺</i></p>	<p>Add to Retreat Agenda the discussion of efficiency and kinds of activities underway to determine efficiency</p>	
<p>x. <b>Higher Education Authorization Act</b></p>	<p>Discussion of Higher Ed Authorization Act – Chief Lopez briefed the group on the need for the establishment of a process to insure compliance with federal requirements found in this act addressing education regarding consumption of alcohol. A recent review has revealed that the federal gov't has multiplicity of requirements and we need to insure compliance activities are in place. What kind of committee are we looking at? Desire to center educational programs in one place. Discussion of how to promote safe and proper consumption – responsibility to educate President wants to bring this back to forefront of the institution.</p>	<p><i>Greg Fant</i></p>	<p>Discuss and recommend the make - up and establishment of a committee / task force to respond to the requirements found in the Higher Ed Authorization Act.</p>	

UEC Minutes  
February 10, 2014

DISCUSSION ITEM	OUTCOME	RESPONSIBLE PERSON/ DEPARTMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTION	EXPECTED DATE
	<p>While the Chief was present the President asked him to update the group on the body recently found – a recovered cell phone has lead to a tentative id – homeless person who has long been in the area. Awaiting DNA analysis Autopsy reveals no indication of any force or injury that caused the death. Still awaiting the final results. Appears to be a mattress fire caused by smoking Once investigation is completed the results will be released.</p>			
<p>XI. <b>Proposed land development at base of A Mountain</b></p>	<p>Ben Woods briefed the group on the pending development of lands, not owned by NMSU, located at the base of A Mountain. The Presidents Office has received numerous requests asking for the NMSU position. The land under consideration for development is owned by a third party. The university owns the lands surrounding this parcel. The parcel is located at the intersection of Dripping Springs and Sonoma Ranch. The discussion led to the decision that NMSU will not take a position on the development of these privately held lands.</p>			
<p>XII. <b>Upcoming Events</b></p>	<p>No events were briefed.</p>			
<p><b>Next Meeting : February 24, 2014</b></p>				