

Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"

---

1. **NSHE Alternatives to The Executive Budget:** *The Subcommittee reiterated its desire to understand the NSHE's total budget need for each year of the 2009-11 biennium and the impacts which would occur if that total budget need was not funded. In the hearing, the Subcommittee specifically directed that the NSHE develop, on a system-wide basis as well as for each of the twenty-five state supported operating budget accounts, alternatives to the funding recommendations contained in The Executive Budget.*

**Response - Introduction and Context:**

Mindful of the dialogue with the Committee at the hearing last Friday, we have attempted to be as specific as possible in our response to question 1.a. regarding the impact of funding the Nevada System of Higher Education at 2006 levels. We feel compelled to put that response, our understanding of the Committee's and staff's directions, and our response to question 1.b. in context.

First, we do not believe that it is possible to comply fully with the parameters set forth by the Committee. That is, we understood the initial direction to be to create a funding scenario at \$555 million, using the standard formula funding assumptions. The Committee then noted that we should be mindful about creating any disproportionate impact on any one campus within the System. Finally, the Committee suggested that we be mindful not to exacerbate access campus funding problems. This comment was made in the context of community colleges and understood to be primarily directed at the College of Southern Nevada. After analyzing the numbers, it has become apparent that we simply cannot accomplish these three things - - they are financially not possible at that funding level.

Our campuses started this budget process with different assumptions built into their budgets, including among other things, hold harmless funding from the last session of the Legislature for a number of campuses. Since the current budgets were built, enrollments have grown at different rates on every campus. As a broad generality, enrollments have risen at a greater level at the community colleges than the universities and, in particular, CSN has grown at a rapid pace. Since there is no caseload adjustment in a fixed general fund budget model, if we run the formula and allow dollars to follow students, the budget allocation decrease to UNLV from FY09 levels will seem disproportionate. Conversely, if formula distribution is ignored and even percentage distributions are assessed across the System, all institutions will be treated "proportionately" but, in fact, the historic underfunding of CSN will be greatly exaggerated because its enrollment growth will essentially be completely disregarded.

In providing the allocations among System budget accounts in the charts which accompany the response to question 1.a., we have followed the Committee's direction to use a formula distribution. In doing so, we by no means imply that a 25% cut to UNLV or a 32% cut to NSC is reasonable or sustainable - - to the contrary, it is not. It is, however, what the formula allocates. Similarly, to fund proportionally (and we assume that means take exactly equal reductions at all campuses) and to ignore growth seems to penalize the College of Southern Nevada. In addition to these specific instances, we believe it is clear from the impact

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

statements that a reduction to this level will cause irrevocable damage to the System and its institutions. Legislative concerns for disproportionate impact on any particular institution and for remedy of inadequate funding at one or more community colleges, combined with the mandate to fund institutions based on costs related to instruction of students cannot be accommodated in this significantly smaller budget scenario. Given the Committee's concerns with proportionality, we would be remiss if we did not note that this budget reduction is significantly greater - - in many cases, multiples greater - - than cuts to any other major state agency. Similarly, if the committee wishes to address the issues of caseload growth, equity or proportionality, those goals could be accomplished through the use of the portion of the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds not allocated exclusively to but available for funding education.

We note that the Committee questioned and staff requested the inclusion of additional fee revenue that might be generated from increases in addition to those already approved by the Board for the 2009-2011 biennium. We have attached to this response charts showing the revenues that would be generated from a 5% additional fee increase, which is consistent with testimony at the last hearing. This fee revenue could partially mitigate the impacts noted above. (For completeness we also note that these estimates are based on the assumption that each institution could achieve the current enrollment level, which may be true for those with modest cuts, but which is likely not true for those with large cuts.) However, as they have not yet been submitted to or approved by the Board, we have not included these amounts in the attached spreadsheets. We note also that not all of these funds would be available to backfill budget reductions. Again, this is consistent with testimony that a significant portion of any additional fee increase would be required for need-based financial aid to ensure fair access, a specific concern of the presidents, students and committee.

We have attempted to provide a level of detail consistent with your request. We do note, however, that recommendations for curricular change and program deletion require specific processes to be followed on the campuses pursuant to Board of Regents Code which limit our ability to detail exact program or curricular changes.

We note that you have asked a separate question regarding financial exigency. That question will be answered independently within the timeline suggested by Legislative staff. However, in all likelihood it will be impossible for all of the campuses to meet the above (that is FY 2006 funding) reductions without such a declaration. As we testified earlier, that declaration and/or the reduction outlined in the impact statements can be expected to have serious potential accreditation ramifications.

Given our conclusion that budget reductions to the 2006 level are not sustainable, you have asked what level of funding will have to be restored to meet our core mission. While we will respond more specifically below, we believe the question belies a basic misunderstanding of the manner in which higher education serves the state and its student populations. Our core mission is to educate, create knowledge, and to serve our communities. We provide the skilled workforce which is the incubator to the state's economy - - more important in our current economy than ever before. We are not a modular commodity where you can choose two items from shelf 1 and three from shelf 2. Our core mission is enhanced with every dollar

**Nevada System of Higher Education**  
**Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing**  
**Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

of state funding provided and is similarly diminished as that funding decreases. Our comments with respect to core mission during this legislative session have been directed to the stewardship of these funds by the System and our insistence on protecting the missions stated above. As we have testified and provided data to this point, we have achieved budget reductions in much the same way that the State did. We swept cash accounts, we reverted one-time appropriations, we enacted temporary surcharges, we held positions vacant, we deferred maintenance, and, yes, we reduced staff. All of this was done to keep as many dollars as possible within the education, research and service functions that are core to the System. However, these reductions that eat away at the infrastructure of the campuses may make sense for one or two years, but cannot be sustained.

We believe the State should fund higher education at least to the level necessary to meet the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements set forth in the ARRA and qualify the state to receive almost \$400 million of badly needed federal funds. We think that is a sound business decision and, frankly, a good investment. Every dollar that is used to fund the MOE stays directly in Nevada education - - both K-12 and higher education - - and is matched with between \$1.25 and \$1.50 of federal funds. Moreover, if that level of base state funding is not provided, you will have constructed a budget for higher education truly built upon sand and one which will disintegrate in two years, leaving the System in an unsustainable budget hole. Using this funding model, we have attached a separate set of spreadsheets (1.b) that allocate those general fund and federal stimulus dollars. While we want to emphasize that the level of funding shown in that chart is totally insufficient, it will proportionately mitigate the destructive impact outlined in response to question 1.a. Pursuant to actions taken by the Board last year in responding to the Governor's request for a 14.12 percent budget cut plan, the attached spreadsheet is built only on FY09 actual enrollments rather than the more typical three-year rolling average. Using this assumption somewhat mitigates the disproportionate impacts on certain institutions. However, since we are again dealing with a fixed dollar budget model, that mitigation is achieved at the expense of institutions where enrollment growth is higher. NSHE Presidents provided details of the impact of the budget cuts necessary under the funding level at the 2006 level (1.a). In considering the impacts of the second set of spreadsheets, two points must be made. First, the cuts to the budget are still large. Any attempt to rewrite the answers to 1.a would be primarily in the matter of degree. One can assume the same impact with perhaps a slight relief when compared to the fiscal demands of the next biennium. Secondly, in no way does this level enable NSHE institutions to fulfill their core mission at the level and with the quality that you would like. It still means students will be turned away and even more will choose to leave Nevada for their higher education.

Finally, we close being mindful of the Committee's admonitions of the dire financial straits in which the state finds itself and the fact that we are all in the same boat. We couldn't agree more, and to the extent that we have emphasized in these remarks that funding levels contained in the Executive Budget for the System are simply untenable, it is only because the System started this legislative budget process with its end of the boat significantly lower in the water than virtually all others.

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

- a. ***FY 2005-06 Scenario: The Subcommittee asked NSHE to construct a scenario that begins with state and/or Stimulus support equivalent to the NSHE's FY 2005-06 actual General Fund expenditures of \$555.5 million. Building upon the \$555.5 million amount, include the other revenue sources currently reflected in The Executive Budget. Please also revisit your assumptions regarding Operating Capital Investment revenues. Assuming no additional General Fund appropriations, and other revenues as recommended in The Executive Budget, please report the changes that the NSHE would propose to the Governor's recommended budget. The proposal should clearly delineate the following:***
- a.1. ***Identify, by priority order, which programs will be added back to the Governor's budget and conversely, which current programs or types of programs will be cut at this particular funding level. Report whether enrollment limitations would be required. Please specifically comment on whether funding for the INtegrate project would be accommodated in this plan.***

**Response:**

The following two schedules are in response to the Subcommittee's request to provide a funding scenario for the NSHE institutions equivalent to NSHE's FY 2005-06 actual General Fund expenditures of \$555.5 million and other revenue sources included in the Executive Budget.

The FY 2005-06 \$555.5 million General Fund expenditure level equates to an 18.76% reduction in General Fund Appropriations from the FY 2008-09 Legislative Approved General Fund Appropriation of \$683.8 million. The 18.76% reduction is applied to all NSHE appropriation areas in determining State support for the NSHE budgets within the \$555.5 million state support for FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11. Other revenues, i.e. student fees, etc. are projected at \$211.6 million and \$225.2 million for each year of the biennium respectively for a total NSHE budget of \$767.1 million for FY 2009-10 and \$780.6 million for FY 2010-11.

The NSHE funding formula was used to determine the expenditure level of each appropriation area based on student enrollment projections using a three year weighted average growth rate over the FY 2008-09 annualized student full time equivalent enrollments. The non-formula budgets (appropriation areas other than universities and colleges) are budgeted at the 18.76% reduction in state support from the FY 2008-09 funding level plus other projected revenues. The formula budgets (universities and colleges) are funded utilizing the funding formula at 70.82% in FY 2009-10 and 69.96% in FY 2010-11.

NSHE Allocation of a 18.76.% General Fund Budget Reduction for the 2009-2011 Biennium

Budget Account	Budget Account Desc	FY09 GF Without COLA	FY 09 COLA	ANNUAL REDUCTION RATE				Annual GF Target FY2010	18.76 % Annual Reduction for FY2010	18.76 % Annual Reduction for FY2011	Annual GF Target FY2011
				Total FY09 GF Plus COLA Funding	18.76 % Annual Reduction for FY2010	Annual GF Target FY2010	18.76 % Annual Reduction for FY2011				
2977	NSHE - SPECIAL PROJECTS	2,751,729	13,805	2,765,534	518,818	2,246,716	518,818	2,246,716			18,760,121,956%
2980	NHSE - UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA - RENO	136,590,971	7,561,965	144,152,936	27,043,267	117,109,669	27,043,267	117,109,669			
2982	NHSE - SCHOOL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES	34,753,277	1,579,762	36,333,039	6,816,122	29,516,917	6,816,122	29,516,917			
2983	NHSE - INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS - UNR	6,902,237	151,976	7,054,213	1,323,379	5,730,834	1,323,379	5,730,834			
2985	NHSE - STATEWIDE PROGRAMS - UNR	8,509,466	382,575	8,892,041	1,668,158	7,223,883	1,668,158	7,223,883			
2986	NSHE - SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION	5,622,271	244,744	5,867,015	1,100,659	4,766,356	1,100,659	4,766,356			
2987	NSHE - UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA - LAS VEGAS	172,988,843	10,150,783	183,139,626	34,357,217	148,782,409	34,357,217	148,782,409			
2988	NSHE - INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS - UNLV	9,103,052	153,715	9,256,767	1,736,581	7,520,186	1,736,581	7,520,186			
2989	NSHE - AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION	9,249,670	436,758	9,686,428	1,817,186	7,869,242	1,817,186	7,869,242			
2990	NSHE - COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE	9,410,306	565,964	9,976,270	1,871,560	8,104,710	1,871,560	8,104,710			
2991	NHSE - SYSTEM COMPUTING CENTER	23,162,289	676,061	23,838,350	4,472,104	19,366,246	4,472,104	19,366,246			
2992	NSHE - UNLV LAW SCHOOL	9,126,630	511,744	9,638,374	1,808,171	7,830,203	1,808,171	7,830,203			
2993	NHSE - NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM	50,904	0	50,904	9,550	41,354	9,550	41,354			
2994	NSHE - GREAT BASIN COLLEGE	16,997,300	826,047	17,823,347	3,343,682	14,479,665	3,343,682	14,479,665			
2996	NHSE - UNIVERSITY PRESS	916,397	34,856	951,253	178,456	772,797	178,456	772,797			
3001	NSHE - STATEWIDE PROGRAMS - UNLV	1,458,566	68,716	1,527,282	286,520	1,240,762	286,520	1,240,762			
3002	NSHE - DENTAL SCHOOL - UNLV	8,431,499	615,899	9,047,398	1,697,303	7,350,095	1,697,303	7,350,095			
3003	NSHE - BUSINESS CENTER NORTH	2,550,450	131,381	2,681,831	503,115	2,178,716	503,115	2,178,716			
3004	NSHE - BUSINESS CENTER SOUTH	2,171,463	109,768	2,281,231	427,962	1,853,269	427,962	1,853,269			
3005	NSHE - NEVADA STATE COLLEGE AT HENDERSON	17,670,035	475,881	18,145,916	3,404,196	14,741,720	3,404,196	14,741,720			
3010	NSHE - DESERT RESEARCH INSTITUTE	9,795,172	345,191	10,140,363	1,902,344	8,238,019	1,902,344	8,238,019			
3011	NSHE - COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA	97,672,554	5,221,576	102,894,130	19,303,064	83,591,066	19,303,064	83,591,066			
3012	NSHE - WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	21,251,842	1,106,975	22,358,817	4,194,541	18,164,276	4,194,541	18,164,276			
3018	NSHE - TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	41,002,040	2,184,075	43,186,115	8,101,768	35,084,347	8,101,768	35,084,347			
3221	NSHE - HEALTH LABORATORY AND RESEARCH	2,046,391	83,006	2,129,397	399,477	1,729,920	399,477	1,729,920			
	TOTALS	650,185,354	33,633,223	683,818,577	128,285,199	555,533,378	128,285,199	555,533,378			

2009-2010									
	GF	Other					Other		
	Target	Revenues Base	Total Budget	Funding at 70.82%	Adj to GF Target	GF Appropriation	Revenues Base/Maint	Total Budget	
UNR	117,109,669	53,504,534	170,614,203	166,342,219	(4,271,984)	112,837,685	53,504,534	166,342,219	
UNLV	148,782,409	88,013,743	236,796,152	225,477,349	(11,318,803)	137,463,606	88,013,743	225,477,349	
CSN	83,591,066	35,335,533	118,926,599	130,535,163	11,608,564	95,199,630	35,335,533	130,535,163	
GBC	14,479,665	2,756,959	17,236,624	20,011,509	2,774,885	17,254,550	2,756,959	20,011,509	
TMCC	35,084,347	10,731,228	45,815,575	47,674,105	1,858,530	36,942,877	10,731,228	47,674,105	
WNC	18,164,276	3,350,401	21,514,677	22,227,616	712,939	18,877,215	3,350,401	22,227,616	
NSC	14,741,720	2,625,253	17,366,973	15,002,044	(2,364,929)	12,376,791	2,625,253	15,002,044	
DRI	2,973,729		2,973,729	3,057,433	83,704	3,057,433	0	3,057,433	
NFB			0	917,095	917,095	917,095	0	917,095	
	434,926,881	196,317,651	631,244,532	631,244,533	1	434,926,882	196,317,651	631,244,533	
SA	4,766,356	111,460	4,877,816	4,877,816	0	4,766,356	111,460	4,877,816	
SP	2,246,716		2,246,716	2,246,716	0	2,246,716	0	2,246,716	
SCS	19,366,246		19,366,246	19,366,246	0	19,366,246	0	19,366,246	
UP	772,797		772,797	772,797	0	772,797	0	772,797	
SOM	29,516,917	3,005,960	32,522,877	32,522,877	0	29,516,917	3,005,960	32,522,877	
ICR-R	5,730,834		5,730,834	5,730,834	0	5,730,834	0	5,730,834	
SW-R	7,223,883		7,223,883	7,223,883	0	7,223,883	0	7,223,883	
CES	8,104,710	1,829,188	9,933,898	9,933,898	0	8,104,710	1,829,188	9,933,898	
AES	7,869,242	1,389,398	9,258,640	9,258,640	0	7,869,242	1,389,398	9,258,640	
SHL	1,729,920		1,729,920	1,729,920	0	1,729,920	0	1,729,920	
ICA-LV	7,520,186		7,520,186	7,520,186	0	7,520,186	0	7,520,186	
LS	7,830,203	3,998,231	11,828,434	11,828,434	0	7,830,203	3,998,231	11,828,434	
SW-LV	1,240,762		1,240,762	1,240,762	0	1,240,762	0	1,240,762	
DS	7,350,095	4,751,716	12,101,811	12,101,811	0	7,350,095	4,751,716	12,101,811	
BCN	2,178,716		2,178,716	2,178,716	0	2,178,716	0	2,178,716	
BCS	1,853,269		1,853,269	1,853,269	0	1,853,269	0	1,853,269	
NDSL	41,354		41,354	41,354	0	41,354	0	41,354	
DRI	5,264,290	148,486	5,412,776	5,412,776	0	5,264,290	148,486	5,412,776	
	120,606,496	15,234,439	135,840,935	135,840,935	0	120,606,496	15,234,439	135,840,935	
	555,533,377	211,552,090	767,085,467	767,085,468	1	555,533,378	211,552,090	767,085,468	

2010-2011									
	GF Target	Other Revenues Base	Total Budget	Funding at 69.96%	Adj to GF Target	GF Appropriation	Other Revenues Base/Maint	Total Budget	
UNR	117,109,669	56,684,568	173,794,237	169,625,939	(4,168,298)	112,941,371	56,684,568	169,625,939	
UNLV	148,782,409	92,119,492	240,901,901	226,415,902	(14,485,999)	134,286,410	92,119,492	226,415,902	
CSN	83,591,066	39,276,746	122,867,812	136,056,463	13,188,651	96,779,717	39,276,746	136,056,463	
GBC	14,479,665	3,088,685	17,568,350	21,015,326	3,446,976	17,926,641	3,088,685	21,015,326	
TMCC	35,084,347	11,768,793	46,853,140	48,904,011	2,050,871	37,135,218	11,768,793	48,904,011	
WNC	18,164,276	3,594,390	21,758,666	22,414,314	655,648	18,819,924	3,594,390	22,414,314	
NSC	14,741,720	2,976,644	17,718,364	16,088,721	(1,629,643)	13,112,077	2,976,644	16,088,721	
DRI	2,973,729		2,973,729	3,009,526	35,797	3,009,526	0	3,009,526	
NFB			0	905,997	905,997	905,997	0	905,997	
	434,926,881	209,509,318	644,436,199	644,436,199	0	434,926,881	209,509,318	644,436,199	
SA	4,766,356	111,460	4,877,816	4,877,816	0	4,766,356	111,460	4,877,816	
SP	2,246,716		2,246,716	2,246,716	0	2,246,716	0	2,246,716	
SCS	19,366,246		19,366,246	19,366,246	0	19,366,246	0	19,366,246	
UP	772,797		772,797	772,797	0	772,797	0	772,797	
SOM	29,516,917	3,175,716	32,692,633	32,692,633	0	29,516,917	3,175,716	32,692,633	
ICR-R	5,730,834		5,730,834	5,730,834	0	5,730,834	0	5,730,834	
SW-R	7,223,883		7,223,883	7,223,883	0	7,223,883	0	7,223,883	
CES	8,104,710	1,847,346	9,952,056	9,952,056	0	8,104,710	1,847,346	9,952,056	
AES	7,869,242	1,389,398	9,258,640	9,258,640	0	7,869,242	1,389,398	9,258,640	
SHL	1,729,920		1,729,920	1,729,920	0	1,729,920	0	1,729,920	
ICA-LV	7,520,186		7,520,186	7,520,186	0	7,520,186	0	7,520,186	
LS	7,830,203	4,308,192	12,138,395	12,138,395	0	7,830,203	4,308,192	12,138,395	
SW-LV	1,240,762		1,240,762	1,240,762	0	1,240,762	0	1,240,762	
DS	7,350,095	4,751,716	12,101,811	12,101,811	0	7,350,095	4,751,716	12,101,811	
BCN	2,178,716		2,178,716	2,178,716	0	2,178,716	0	2,178,716	
BCS	1,853,269		1,853,269	1,853,269	0	1,853,269	0	1,853,269	
NDSL	41,354		41,354	41,354	0	41,354	0	41,354	
DRI	5,264,290	148,486	5,412,776	5,412,776	0	5,264,290	148,486	5,412,776	
	120,606,496	15,732,314	136,338,810	136,338,810	0	120,606,496	15,732,314	136,338,810	
	555,533,377	225,241,632	780,775,009	780,775,009	0	555,533,377	225,241,632	780,775,009	

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

Funding for the iNtegrate project would not be accommodated within this \$555.5 million plan. We recommend that federal stimulus dollars be used to fund \$10 million that was reverted to the state in the last biennium.

The attached information summarizes the impact of funding at each of the NSHE institutions. These summaries are written by each President and characterize for each institution the nature of the cuts. We are not able to identify programs "added back to the Governor's budget" since a detailed budget for that scenario has not been constructed. Rather, as requested, we provide you with the cuts that bring NSHE total budget to the NSHE's FY 2005-06 actual (\$555.5 million) showing funding for each of the twenty-five state supported operating budget accounts.



**University of Nevada, Las Vegas**  
**2009-2011 Biennial Budget Impact Plan/Proposal**

**Background/Context**

The State of Nevada has always worked hard to provide adequate funding for the institutions of higher education. UNLV is appreciative of the support that we have received from the state over the years, including this current biennium where we were spared some of the overall cuts that the state had to make in its budget. Higher education has never been overfunded in Nevada and by most metrics available Nevada has not ranked high in these categories. The proposed state GF reduction for UNLV, off the FY09 legislatively approved is \$51.6M per year, of which \$45.7M is for the formula funded appropriation. The entire annual state funded salary and benefits for all UNLV faculty is \$97.2M, therefore even these reduction levels, while lower than those recommended by the Governor, are dramatic and very significant. As noted below, it is possible that these levels of cuts could have impacts on our current FTE levels in the area of 1/4th, and this would add another \$22M per year in required budget reductions, and this would be multiple times more than any net increase in revenue due to an additional 5% increase in registration fees (estimated net is \$2.5M in FY10, with 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the gross revenue going to financial aid, but these estimates assume FY09 enrollment levels).

Approximately 77% of our total expenditures are in salary and benefits and an additional 9% are fixed costs for such things as utilities, facilities operating, leases and property insurance. The remaining funds are basically department operating budgets required to offer goods and services to our clients – mostly students. Therefore, there are limited possible options for major reductions that do not have significant impact on existing employees, and therefore direct impact on students. This is especially true since the existing cuts have already taken most all the flexibility out of our budgets (e.g. we have already gone to cleaning offices and emptying trash just once a week and most all one-time opportunities have been captured) – there are few options left other than elimination of faculty and staff. At the same time some of our fixed costs continue to increase – for example our utility costs continue to rise and additional rate increases have already been submitted for the near future. We have worked to limit utility cost increases through many different efficiency measures, but some rise in these costs is unavoidable.

We are assuming the general fund reductions to the state appropriations noted below, per the information/model received from the System. These represent a huge impact on the campus, and dramatically affect the core mission.

	Prop. FY10 Level	FY09 Leg. Approved	Difference	% change
UNLV	\$137,463,606	\$183,139,626	-\$45,676,020	-24.9%
LAW	\$7,830,203	\$9,638,374	-\$1,808,171	-18.8%
ICA	\$7,520,186	\$9,256,767	-\$1,736,581	-18.8%
SW Programs	\$1,240,762	\$1,527,282	-\$286,520	-18.8%
SDM	\$7,350,095	\$9,047,398	-\$1,697,303	-18.8%
BCS	\$1,853,269	\$2,281,231	-\$427,962	-18.8%
	\$163,258,121	\$214,890,678	-\$51,632,557	-24.0%

### **Program Cuts/Eliminations**

Reductions of this level would indeed require program cuts/eliminations. If, however, we were to specifically list all those programs right now we would effectively eliminate their viability, impacting faculty, staff and students. If reductions are made we will need to work with each program carefully to define the options for each of the students that would be impacted, and assure as much professional support to them and the faculty/staff as possible.

### **Positions/Salary**

This is where most of our budget is located, so impacts in this area cannot be avoided. While salary reductions were recommended, we do not believe they are feasible, as noted below.

\*It is our assumption that in order to implement salary reductions in FY10 the Board would have to declare financial exigency. We believe that such a declaration would essentially ruin the future for higher education in Nevada, and therefore is not feasible. Therefore, salary reductions in FY10 are not feasible.

\*If we could not give salary reductions for FY10 it is technically possible that we could give massive "notices" to all employees indicating we would make salary reductions and/or exercise furloughs for FY11. The salary furlough option is preferred, and it could be in the neighborhood of 1 day per month for all employees (approximately a 4.7% reduction). This mass notification, however, will have major ramifications for all faculty and staff and will likely lead to employees who have opportunities leaving the institution. Our faculty and staff are already seeing increased workloads while benefits will be reduced and there are no prospects for any salary increases for the next two years. At this time we do not support the mass notice options to implement salary reductions for FY11, as it is essential we recognize the need to have a competent core of faculty and staff available when the economy improves and to support a reasonable future for the state.

It is also important to verify the state's assumption on salary adjustments for classified staff, including the assumption on withholding step and longevity increases for classified staff in the next biennium. Our planning to date assumes that these increases would not be allocated. Our calculations are that the classified step and longevity increases for state funded positions would be \$.74M for FY10 and an incremental \$1.1M for FY11 (or \$2.6M over the biennium).

### **Limits/Impacts on Enrollments**

We would likely not institute a hard cap on enrollments, but with these levels of budget reductions there would be a de-facto cap as due to the financial limitations we would have to offer fewer course and sections (projections provided below by the Provost, which approaches a 25% FTE reduction).

We are already deep into the application and acceptance process for Fall 09, and initiating caps on enrollments would require formal Board action before it could be implemented. The limitations on funding will limit class sections that can be offered, and that will have an indirect limit on enrollments as well as impact retention and graduation rates, or at least time to graduation.

Even the de-facto limits on enrollments will have major negative consequences for UNLV, and the state, as we will be offering significantly less opportunities for Nevada residents to pursue higher education at the time when the number coming out of the public high schools in the state will rise more than any other state in the nation, as noted by the following information from the National Center for Education Statistics.

### **Actual and projected percentage changes in public high school graduates**

	<u>US Avg</u>	<u>NV %</u>	<u>NV Rank</u>
2004-2012	4.5%	37.7%	#1
2004-2018	7.9%	66.1%	#1

This data, combined with the demographic details we know about NV high schools, shows that the majority of this increase in students graduating from high school will come from “first generation” families, linked to lower economic abilities, meaning they will be seeking higher education opportunities but have limits on their financial ability to participate, and will not have family role models to assist with entry in, and success through, higher education. Therefore, Nevada is sitting on the largest national increase in a population that will be seeking higher education opportunities, at a time it is thinking about making some of the largest cuts in public higher education history.

This combination with the following statistics shows that Nevada is already starting at a very low level relative to higher education participation (all data come from the “Postsecondary Education Opportunity” web site).

*(2007)H.S. Graduates or higher	36 <sup>th</sup> rank
*(2007) Bachelor’s degree or higher	43 <sup>rd</sup> rank
*(2006) H.S Graduation Rate	50 <sup>th</sup> rank
*(2004) Chance for College by Age 19	50 <sup>th</sup> rank
*(2007) College participation rate for dependent family members 18-24 years old from low income families.	50 <sup>th</sup> rank

### **Facilities/Fixed Costs**

UNLV does not see major opportunities to shut down buildings and have savings, in part because our space per student is already so low, both as an internal to NSHE comparison and even worse externally. We have done significant work on reducing our utility costs already, which was recently independently verified through the 2009 Cashman Good Government Award recognition by the Nevada Taxpayers Association, which represents their highest honor and goes for the most efficient use of taxpayer money in the state. Even with these efforts, however, overall utility unit prices are rising faster than we can implement cost saving plans to fully offset them, thus we face fixed cost increases at the same time our budgets are being reduced.

### **Paradise Campus Lease Savings**

This operating budget saving is about \$1.72M per year or about \$3.45M over the biennium. UNLV moved ahead to complete this land swap in order to reduce operating costs in FY10 and

FY11, even though we could have paid the full lease amount to the County and retained our 7 acres of parking. It was our hope that we would be able to use these lease savings towards whatever final budget reduction we would have to take in the 2009-2011 biennium (in recognition of an action taken in the overall best interests to the state and because UNLV contributed 7 acres of land to eliminate the lease payment). To put this into perspective we could probably fill at least 18 or more faculty positions with this savings - or service to approximately 2000 student enrollments in courses and outreach, research, and support of graduate students beyond that.

### **Overall Projected Position Impacts**

The information below highlights the projected level of position cuts from the proposed budget level. While we also expect some operating (non-salary) impacts, those budgets are in general already very lean so there are limited options for substantial savings in these areas, especially considering fixed cost increases for areas such as utilities. Our projected state funded position impact in total is approximately 492 (which does not include part-time or funded graduate positions), or about 20%.

### **Summary Impacts for Academic Area Cuts**

The Academic area is a priority for the campus, but cuts of these levels would still have major impacts on the programs and services offered to students. Our projection for these levels of cuts is that many of the faculty leaving will be our best faculty, and it will take years to replace them and build reputation back. Students unable to get courses would leave, and our retention numbers would be damaged for at least 6 years, which would erode our national rankings.

Local employers would not get the students they needed in critical areas, like health care and hospitality. Research funds brought into the university will shrink dramatically because funded faculty will be first to go. Many degree programs would likely be eliminated. Programs losing a critical number of faculty could lose accreditation. Several smaller units will likely be lost or combined into other programs. Listed below is an overall summary of impacts in the academic area.

- Approximately 210 faculty lost
- Approximately 170 PTI's teaching 4 sections per year lost
- Approximately 2,200 3 hour class sections lost
- Approximately 4,721 FTE students lost
- 6380 head count students lost
- A projected 24% overall reduction in FTE for UNLV
- Severe cuts to library holdings
- Severe cuts to IT capacity/services
- Curtailed budget for distance education
- Loss of seed funding for research programs and activities

### **Research and Graduate Education**

Implications for loss of the 24 staff positions, even though this would dismantle much of the needed infrastructure for research and graduate education (but the alternative is to eliminate 180 – 23% - of our funded Graduate Assistants):

As for the Graduate College, essential services in areas of financial aid, international student admissions, outreach and coordination with academic departments, and student program processing will be slowed dramatically.

In the Research Division, pre-award grant proposal services to faculty will be curtailed and IRB approvals will be dramatically slowed.

The Tech Transfer Office will be eliminated.

Eliminates all data collection services for both graduate education and research.

### **Summary Impacts for Non-Academic Cuts**

Overall Assumption: Budget reductions internally to the institution would not be across the board, and the Academic area of the institution would be given priority (smaller budget reduction percentages). This means the non-academic areas of the institution would see higher budget reduction percentages. This translates into very significant impacts on existing employees and services to students and the campus.

Summary of Major Impacts: Additional reductions will be required in the enrollment services area (admissions, registrar, financial aid), due to necessity to meet the reduction targets, even though we are at the same time working to implement a new automated student system (iNtegrate). This will likely impact the overall success of the iNtegrate project.

Projected impacts of approximately 50 positions eliminated as well as reductions to the operating budgets within the Student Affairs division.

Processing of admissions applications will take two to three weeks longer, negatively impacting recruitment efforts. Analyses of transcripts for transfer applicants will take three to four weeks longer, negatively impacting recruitment efforts.

Student financial aid and scholarship determination will be delayed by several weeks negatively impacting recruitment and retention efforts. The number and types of new student recruitment activities and programs would be severely impacted.

Support services and programs that foster academic success for new students enrolling at UNLV will be severely limited or eliminated, negatively impacting retention and graduation rates. Support services and programs for currently enrolled students that foster and enhance academic success will be reduced or eliminated, negatively impacting retention and graduation rates. Support services and programs for students preparing to graduate from UNLV will be severely limited or eliminated.

Hours of operations (beyond the current 40 hour work week, for customer service) for many student support service offices and facilities will be reduced by two to four hours per day

The Finance and Business area has approximately 500 total state positions reporting throughout the division. At cut levels like this we project that we would need to eliminate approximately 100 positions.

To date we have focused on retaining support for on-going building Preventative Maintenance activities, as this is a “pay now or pay more later” issue. However, with reductions of this level we would not be able to support the building preventative maintenance activities. Facility repairs would be only focused on major breakdowns. Normal upkeep of furniture and equipment in student classrooms and labs would not be feasible. To the extent enrollment dropped significantly we would look to determine if there were any opportunities to take existing buildings totally off-line and close them down, in order to have some savings.

There would be far less business support staff existing for transaction processing, which will likely lead to much longer processing times and complaints (including for vendor payments, etc.), and likely audit comments.

Risk Management and Safety programs are, in general, mandatory to meet state and federal requirements. There would be staffing reductions in these areas, but all required areas would have a minimum staffing level maintained.

In the VP for Advancement area there are limited options to make reductions since the program supports all campus communications, fundraising and development, community relations, and alumni relations. This budget cut would eliminate 15 professional positions. These positions raise private support for UNLV. Currently, our professional team raises \$8 for every \$1 of investment. Over the last three years, our team has raised an average of \$41,667,000 per year. The elimination of 15 professional staff members would reduce private support by at least \$10,400,000 per year. Private support is a critical source of funding for student scholarships and academic programs. The proposed increases in student fees, coupled with a significant loss of scholarship support, would eliminate the possibility of a college education for thousands of deserving students. In addition, our communications, community relations and alumni relations programs would be drastically reduced.

### **Statewide Programs**

We would need to completely eliminate at least 75% of the funding in the appropriation, through total elimination of some of the programs. The current programs in this appropriation include the Center for Business and Economic Research, the support for the Supercomputer Center, the Nevada Small Business support program, KUNV radio, continuing education, the UNLV Museum, and the Southern Nevada Writing Project

### **Impacts at Law School**

Operation under a budget modeled in this way would require significant reformulation of the Law School’s program of legal education and undermine the success the law school has enjoyed in its first decade. Changes demanded by this budget would be difficult to reverse when times improve and would likely be permanent.

- The Law School would need to cut several positions in instruction and student services that are currently funded by annual gifts from individuals and corporations which even under the best circumstances cannot be sustained, and in these difficult times are no longer feasible. This was the primary aim of our tuition increase proposal. The positions in question currently consist of two faculty-in-residence positions, three student services

positions, and one classified staff position and amount to about \$500,000 in annual spending.

- In addition to eliminating positions supported by non-recurring funds, the Law School would be forced to eliminate additional positions from the faculty and staff. Specifically, we would be forced to eliminate at least 2 of 40 faculty positions, 2 of 8 library faculty positions, and 3 of 15 professional staff positions.
- The Law School's substantial tuition increase requires that we adjust existing scholarship and aid commitments to match the proportional increase. This budget would leave us short by almost exactly the \$600,000 we would need to support competitive scholarships which are necessary to ensure that the top Nevada applicants attend our law school. Indeed, competition for top students between law schools is fierce and the elimination of scholarship funding coupled with increased tuition would lead to the gutting of our entering classes with eventual devastation to our bar passage rate and immediate effect on rankings. These rankings effects would further disadvantage our student recruiting success.
- The Law School would be required to eliminate some of its programs. The inability of the Law School to *expand* its faculty would undermine our evening program, the operation of which requires that we have a larger faculty than comparable schools without an evening division. And, as position reductions are realized we might be forced to abandon at least one of our other existing programs as well, including our Lawyering Process Program, the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution, or the Thomas and Mack Legal Clinic. Elimination of some of these programs would invalidate significant gifts to the Law School and compromise our operations.
- This budget would lead to a 60% reduction in the Law School's operations budget.

### **Impacts on School of Dental Medicine**

The impact of this level of reductions will devastate the dental school's infrastructure, jeopardize accreditation and compromise our ability to maintain acceptable academic standards. The short-term budget reduction will have a long-term effect on the dental school and the State of Nevada that may take decades of recovery. These long-term impacts include: 1) not being able to compete for the better Nevada and national dental applicants resulting in students leaving the state for their education; 2) the loss of current dental educators to other out-of-state institutions and the inability to compete and attract dental educators in a highly competitive market; 3) the loss of "diploma value" to current and future dental school alumni to ensure that their graduating institution maintains a reputation for quality education.

One example of the impact would be the effect on graduation requirements of eliminating 7,500 patient appointments due to reductions in faculty supervision and support staff. This would reduce the student's patient experiences by approximately 50 cases per year/per student or 20%. This ultimately impacts the competency of the student and their future patients. The only way to accommodate these reductions would be to lower the graduation requirements by 20%. This would result in dentists graduating with 20% less education than their peers and would put the safety of the public at risk. The unethical and immoral implications of graduating undereducated dentists make it impossible to implement these budget reductions.

The dental school operates on an integrated curriculum within a structured academic year. This curriculum differs from other programs in that dental students have a defined steplock schedule with no optional courses. All current courses are graduation requirements. Due to facility limitations, there are a set number of students in each class. Therefore, it is not possible to add students to increase the class size. Given these parameters it is impossible to eliminate, reduce, combine or limit programs or courses while maintaining accreditation standards.

- **Operating Expense:** A majority of the dental school's operating expenses are fixed and are mandatory for maintaining basic level of dental education needs including patient care, sterilization, facilities and compliance with state and federal regulations. Therefore, the budget reduction could not be applied evenly to operating expenses and salaries. It is estimated that an 8% reduction would be applied to operating expenses.
- **Salaries:** It is estimated that salaries would need to be reduced by approximately 20% or an estimated 20 FTE consisting of a combination of full-time and part-time faculty, professional and classified staff.
- **Reduction of Patient Care/Educational Experiences:** Reduction in faculty and dental assistants will directly affect patient care with fewer available appointments, longer appointments, longer waits to schedule appointments, and limited access to emergency clinic care.
  - Last year, over 37,000 patient visits were recorded at the Shadow Lane Clinic. Patient demographics include 5,500 patients under the age of 20 years old and 10,300 over the age of 50. The patient's average median household income is \$35,000.
- **Reduction and/or Elimination of Outreach Clinics and Services:** Outreach clinics and services would need to be eliminated and/or reduced and centralized to the Shadow Lane Campus. This would include access to dental care for the underserved. An example of these programs are:
  - **Close Facility:** *Enterprise Clinic* on Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
    - 17,000 patient visits last year under a "sliding-fee scale".
    - 41% of patients were under the age of 20 years old.
    - 27% of patients were over the age of 50 years old.
    - Many patients are classified as "disadvantaged" by state or national standards.
  - **Terminate the following programs:** *Special Needs Patient Care* which may jeopardize current and future federal grant funding; *Give Kids a Smile* clinic providing treatment to over 400 children per year; *Head Start* program provided dental screening to 207 uninsured children under the age of 5 years old in 2007; *Smiles for Success* providing no cost basic dental care to patients from the local women's shelter; *Tuesday Evening Pediatric Dentistry Program*; *Saturday Children's Clinic* organized and operated by student dentists provides comprehensive dental care to underprivileged children; *UNLV/1-Day Program*



*Homeless Treatment Clinic; Elementary School Educational Activities* has provided oral health and disease prevention to over 25,000 “at risk” elementary school students; *Senior Center/Assisted Living Centers Educational Activities* has provided oral health and disease prevention to over 1,200 local senior citizens; *Crackdown on Cancer* educates Nevada youth on the risk factors for oral cancer resulting from tobacco use. Has screened over 53,000 high school students since 2001. About 30% of statewide screenings occur in rural area. Over 1,300 suspicious oral lesions have been found in students since 2001; *UNLV Sgt. Clint Ferrin Memorial Clinic* treats members of the Nevada National Guard who are non-deployable as a result of significant dental disease.

- **Tuition and Fee Increase:** A tuition and fee increase is a consideration to offset the funding gap between the state funding and the program’s educational requirements. However, the current dental tuition and fee level is competitive compared to other state funded dental schools. An increase in tuition and fees would limit the Dental Schools ability to compete for the better Nevada and national dental applicants and the school would need to provide some of the tuition increase towards financial aid.

### **GPR Program: Reduction**

The proposed reduction would devastate the GPR Program that provides advanced dental education to residents and much needed advanced dental care to the citizens of Nevada. The reduction would reduce operating expenses to an unacceptable level and eliminate 4 FTE comprised of faculty and classified staff. It is impossible to implement these reductions without reducing the educational experience of the residents and putting the program’s accreditation at risk. A budget reduction of this magnitude makes it impossible to meet the obligation to the resident and to the safety of the public to graduate dental care providers qualified in advanced dental care.

### **Athletics**

A budget reduction of this size would have a major impact on the UNLV intercollegiate athletic programs. We would likely have to eliminate at least 2 sports programs, and reductions beyond that level would directly impact our ability to compete at the NCAA division I level, and even reductions to this level could impact our Mountain West Conference affiliation. These cuts would impact approximately 12 FTE, and would also have impacts on our Title IX and gender equity compliance.

### **Business Center South**

In order to reach the FY10 BCS Reduction Amount of \$427,962., we will have to cut a Total of approximately 8 FTE(approximately 1/3rd of the total). That means cutting positions from the following Departments: Purchasing, Human Resources, Accounts Payable, Accounting, Health & Safety, and Payroll. This will absolutely impact services and processes not only with UNLV, but also with NSC & CSN.

\*Payroll, Human Resources and Health & Safety affect us all. These departments deal with time sensitive material; fewer employees to work on them will affect the work they produce.

\*Almost every department deals with Purchasing; Accounts Payable and Accounting on a daily basis. Cutting their employees will affect purchases, contracts and payments to vendors.

### **Summary of Reductions Made in the Current Biennium**

UNLV has taken \$25.1 million in budget reductions over biennial 2007 – 2009. This includes a number of one time reductions totaling \$11.59 million, \$1.7 million in deferred professional merit, and \$11.81 million in operating budget reductions for UNLV, Intercollegiate Athletics, Law, Dental, Statewide Programs, and Business Center South. When considering the FY09 operating budget reductions to date (\$6.94M + \$1.425M from the Paradise Lease), approximately \$7M was not one-time, with \$3.9M of that total coming from the UNLV appropriation (excluding the Paradise lease). Priority was given to supporting our students, our academic programs, and maintaining our research mission.

Reductions included \$3.13 million credit for UNLV's share of the \$10 million cut for the iNtegrate implementation, \$2.85 million for the Paradise campus lease, \$.88 million for Research Challenge Grant savings, \$.95 million for one shot appropriations, \$1.66 million for a 6 month delay in professional merit for FY09, \$1.85 million credit for deferred maintenance and State Public Works Board projects, and \$2.6 million HECC funds reduction. The balance of the cuts were applied to the operating budgets and involved elimination of positions, fewer class sections, a larger number of students in classes, and reductions to operating allocations normally used for supplies, postage, phones, and other normal office expenses.

Within the non formula budgets, the School of Dental Medicine reduced budgets by deferring the renewal and replacement of technology based supplies, the result is to limit the students' educational experience in learning the team approach in the dental practice with utilization of a dental assistant.

The Boyd School of Law eliminated positions for a Director of Information Technology and a technology related Law Librarian. There was a reduction in the number of clients that can be served by the law clinic, reduction in library services provided to students and public patrons, cancellation of many law journal subscriptions, reductions in funding for part time instructors and class electives, and reductions in administrative support.

Intercollegiate Athletics' budget supports 17 athletic teams; reductions impacted recruiting, team and staff travel, equipment and team apparel, and sports medicine expenses. Cost reduction efforts include seeking the least expensive mode of travel (regardless of distance) and regionally scheduling and recruiting. These options involve home games only or travel for large game guarantees, and elimination of professional staff development.

**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO**  
**Response to Budget Reductions**

**Budget Reduction Actions Implemented to Date**

July 1, 2008. Since that time, we have been asked to plan for budget reductions of 14.12 percent and ranging as high as 30 percent. At the direction of the Joint Subcommittee, we have been instructed to develop a detailed plan for a potential budget equivalent to Fiscal 2006 levels augmented by potential tuition increases. This plan will reduce funding to the University of Nevada, Reno and its several appropriation units by \$45.7 million; a 21% reduction from the Fiscal 2009 legislative appropriation.

We have approached the budget reductions with the following principles in mind:

1. Engage faculty leadership, student leadership, deans, and vice presidents early and often with transparency in our decision making.
2. Protect the core missions of the university, teaching and research and ensure students can get access to the courses they need.
3. Do not make across the board reductions, but rather protect and invest where possible in core high-quality programs, even at the cost of reducing other programs.
4. Communicate often with the campus at large, with the faculty, staff and students through town halls, emails, written communication as well as the web.
5. Communicate by direct contact with community leaders and the media what we are and are not doing.

We were able to address the first two reductions with serious short term impact, but still protecting of the long term potential and goals of the University by this collaborative approach. Indeed, the faculty of the University volunteered to defer their merit raises and the student leaders volunteered to pay a surcharge, both of which were approved by the Board of Regents. However, beyond this point, we are now in the process of taking steps which have long term, serious, negative consequences for the university and the state.

*Preparing for Significant Budget Reductions for FY10-11*

While the NSHE has generated public discussion to minimize budget reductions for higher education in the next biennium, the University of Nevada, Reno has been preparing to operate with a significant state budget reduction in FY10-11 by taking steps to protect the core teaching, research and outreach functions of the university while trimming the use of state funds in a strategic fashion. Throughout the development and implementation of these plans, the Faculty Senate has been involved and student governments have been involved in appropriate discussions.

1. FY09 state budget reductions in administrative units to accommodate the 8% reduction which occurred in the present biennium will carry through the next biennium, including closure of the Applied Research and Excellence in Teaching programs, the replacement

of half the cost of the Mining Engineering program with industry funds, and reductions in Marketing and Communications and Campus Recreation units.

2. The university issued 37 notices of non-renewal prior to July 1, 2008 that will not take effect until July 1, 2009; most of these positions were in administrative and student support functions.
3. An employee buyout opportunity resulted in 30 faculty and staff positions being vacated by the beginning of FY10; these positions will be eliminated from the state budget.
4. Administrative units (Student Services, Administration and Finance, Development and Alumni Relations, and the President's Office) have been mandated to eliminate expenses equivalent to 20 percent of their professional salary base resulting in the elimination of an additional 43.78 state funded positions.
5. Separately budgeted units are identifying their methods of preparing for 14.12 percent reductions in the use of state funds, including the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, the University of Nevada School of Medicine, Intercollegiate Athletics, the State Health Lab and Business Center North.
6. All academic units have been assessed an amount equivalent to 5 percent of their operating funds for FY09, FY10 and FY11 to address the current year and next biennial budgetary shortfalls.
7. Each departmental faculty participated in a review of teaching resource management with the goals of delivering a larger portion of student credit hours with full-time, regular faculty, while maintaining quality instruction and fulfilling research and outreach missions. Initial targets for review were elimination or consolidation of persistently small-enrollment courses or sections of courses, increased class size to reduce the number of sections offered each year, closing of majors with small enrollments, closing degree programs with small numbers of degrees granted, increasing the number of classes taught per year per faculty member to a standard level and other solutions discovered during the discussions. Having a larger portion of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty is a measure of quality in some national rankings. Having a larger portion of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty will allow UNR to meet its upcoming budgetary shortfall and release some faculty vacancies for recruitment. Having a larger portion of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty will allow university enrollment to grow and still get closer to college budget autonomy when the budgetary downturn subsides.
8. Each Center, Institute and Academy was individually reviewed to determine whether it was core to the university and whether the use of state funds could be reduced or eliminated by way of non-state revenue sources replacing current state revenue sources, center program reduction or center program closure. Thirty-nine centers were reviewed

in consultation with a faculty committee. Few programs actually were closed, but large shares of state funds were removed as a result of finding alternative sources or program downsizing. The Math and Writing (Tutorial) Centers are being closed after spring term, 2009, but a student-faculty-administration committee is studying effective methods of supplemental instruction to help students succeed at reduced cost.

9. The University has established a “soft-freeze” for personnel hiring. All position vacancies in the central campus budget must gain approval of a central Expenditure Committee prior to filling (Executive Vice President and Provost, Vice President of Administration and Finance, Budget Director, Vice Provost). Few positions have been released for search during this academic year.

A list of departments, centers and programs that have or will experience budget reductions is shown below. This list is extensive, in keeping with the magnitude of the potential reductions, but it is not yet complete. We need to make additional reductions just to meet a 14.12% reduction target. To date, we have focused reductions mainly in administrative and support programs and have left academic programs and other core functions largely intact. Reductions beyond 14.12% will require at least retrenchment, and possibly elimination, of many academic programs.

- Applied Research Initiative\* Mining Engineering (transfer of expenses to funds provided by mining claim surcharges)
- Equestrian Program\*
- Marketing and Communications
- Excellence in Teaching\*
- Campus Recreation
- Child and Family Research Center
- Center for Ethics and Health Policy
- Marching Band
- Writing Center\*
- Math Center\*
- Human Resources - Training and Development\*
- Career Development\*
- Greek Life\*
- Student Success – Parents Program\*
- Escort Services
- Financial Aid
- Oral History
- Northern Nevada Writing Project
- Learning Resource Center
- Basque Studies
- Women’s Studies
- Center for Holocaust, Genocide and Peace Studies
- Latino Research Center

- Continuing Education/Extended Studies
- Research and Educational Planning Center
- Gerontology/Geriatrics Program
- Academy for the Environment
- Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming
- Cancer Research Program
- Engineering Research and Development Center\*
- Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology
- Nevada Small Business Development Center
- Nevada Seismological Laboratory
- Center for Learning and Literacy
- Raggio Research Center for STEM Education
- Center for the Application of Substance Abuse Technologies
- Custodial Services
- Human Resources
- Planning, Budget and Analysis
- Development and Alumni Affairs
- Grounds Maintenance
- Controller's Office
- Purchasing
- Campus Information Systems
- Environmental Health and Safety
- Library
- Teaching Learning Technologies
- Accounts Payable

\*Programs/services targeted for elimination

In order to reach the 14.12% targeted goal, the university will also eliminate an additional 36 state-funded academic and administrative faculty positions. These positions cut deeply into many key instructional departments including English, Mathematics, Journalism, Civil Engineering, History, Speech Communications, Foreign Languages and Public Health. It is at this point, after an approximately 12% reduction, when budget reductions will begin to noticeably diminish the instructional course offerings for students. Eliminating these 36 faculty lines will result in savings of approximately \$3.8 million and the loss of approximately 300 class sections.

### **Fiscal 2006 Funding Plan**

To reach the FY 2006 funding will require an additional \$14.5 million in budget reductions bringing the total expenditure cuts to \$45.7 million, or 20.7% of the Fiscal 2009 general fund appropriation. The plan to achieve a reduction 50% larger than what was initially anticipated will fall heavily on the core mission of the university and will result in substantial losses of class

sections, de facto enrollment caps, program eliminations, and a tangible change in the breadth and quality of the university.

1. Statewide Programs reductions of 50%: We will extract an additional \$2.0 million from the Statewide Programs appropriation. This means that vital services such as the Small Business Development Center, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, Seismology Laboratory, and the Cooperative Extension Service will experience additional reductions beyond what has already occurred. Also, it is likely we will eliminate all state funding for the Fleischmann Planetarium; an action which could ultimately result in the closure of the facility.
2. Intercollegiate Athletics: The NCAA establishes minimums in terms of the number of sports an institution must offer in order to remain in Division I. At the present time we are over NCAA limit and would consider a number of options including restructuring some coaches' contracts, reduction of scholarships in selected sports, along with the potential elimination of two intercollegiate sports. As part of this process we are aware of the need to remain compliant with the gender equity requirements of Title IX. These reductions could net approximately \$300,000 - \$700,000.
3. Faculty Positions/Program Elimination: It will be necessary to eliminate 100 additional faculty and 20 classified positions to reach the expenditure target established by the Joint Subcommittee. A reduction of this magnitude – approximately \$12 million - is equivalent to eliminating the Colleges of Education and Business. This cut will result in the elimination of some 400-500 class sections annually and could directly impact virtually every undergraduate student. Elimination of entire academic programs is unavoidable under this scenario. The NSHE Code requires that program closure be the result of an academic planning process which involves faculty or administrative proposals, thorough review by the Faculty Senate, open discussing and decision-making, substantial notification periods and closure. Total class closures resulting from budget reductions will be approximately 800 sections, roughly 25% of our annual courses. This level of reduction seriously damages the university, its students and the state.

## PLANNED REDUCTIONS

[illegible]



**DRI Response to 18.76% Budget Reduction  
March 24, 2009**

**Introduction**

In the simplest terms, DRI has very limited flexibility in what it can apply to its mandatory state reductions without profound impacts on the quality and productivity of our research endeavors and/or services provided to the State of Nevada. These additional state reductions will severely weaken the institution's hard-earned reputation as a world leader in high-quality, unbiased environmental science, as well as result in the elimination of one of the major services it provides to the State of Nevada for enhancing water resources. For these reasons, this level of reductions is unacceptable to DRI.

**Reductions to Meet 18.76% State Budget Reductions**

1	Eliminate Cloud Seeding Program	614,000
2	Reduce ARI Funding	390,820
3	Reduce State Library Funding	194,673
4	Eliminate Vice Presidential Position	117,542
5	Eliminate State Operating Budgets and Reconfigure Other Staff Positions	179,310
6	Eliminate Lease Space, Sierra Nevada College	121,980
7	Eliminate an Integrated Science Center	90,000
8	Reduce O&M Funding (Operating and Staffing)	194,019
Total		1,902,344

**Impact of Reductions on DRI**

**1. Eliminate Cloud Seeding Program - \$614,000**

DRI has been a pioneering climate-research organization in North America and consequently is very well known internationally for its research and service activities in the field of weather modification. DRI has operated the Cloud Seeding Program continuously for well over 20 years, receiving support until 2005 from the IFC; subsequently, state support became part of the institution's base budget. Seeding operations occur in five regions within northern and western Nevada, and efforts in 2007 augmented an estimated 46,000 acre-feet of water at an average cost of \$12.79 per acre-foot. It has been projected that within a single decade, the cloud-seeding program in these areas provided approximately 600,000 additional acre-feet of water for an estimated net savings to the State of more than \$240 million (based upon average costs of acquiring municipal or agricultural water). In southern Nevada, water supply from the Colorado River has been drastically affected by recent droughts that have produced low lake levels at Lake Powell and Lake Mead. This situation has led the seven Colorado River Basin states to create cooperative agreements related to augmenting water supply. One of these cooperative agreements is for increased wintertime cloud seeding in the states of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming to pursue water augmentation to benefit the entire Colorado River System. A 2006 U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) evaluation

indicates the potential for up to 800,000 additional acre-feet of water in an average year if the states were to continue existing weather-modification activities and implement new target areas and programs. Elimination of DRI's cloud-seeding services will have direct bearing on the potential water availability in Nevada, both north and south.

## **2. Reduce ARI Funding - \$390,820**

Over the fiscal years 2004-2007, DRI has used state-supported Applied Research Initiative (ARI) funding to leverage external research, acquisition of equipment, and economic development in the State of Nevada. In direct return on investment (ROI) alone, over that same five-year period, ~\$2.77 million of ARI support has been used to leverage ~\$20.81 million in research to DRI (a direct return on investment of ~7.5). Any loss of ARI funding will result in a 7.5-fold loss of direct support for research and economic development coming into the State of Nevada.

## **3. Reduce State Library Funding - \$194,673**

The DRI library, both in Reno and Las Vegas, has been a well-managed source of research efficiency for many years. It provides a service to our faculty members that allow them to focus on the research at hand rather than spend grossly inefficient time searching for documents, photocopying or scanning relevant information, and other time-consuming tasks. Moreover, each library bears the name of people who are recognized for their support for DRI (Patrick Squires in Reno and Aileen and Sulo Maki in Las Vegas). Therefore, elimination of library support also would be a diminution of their recognition by DRI.

## **4. Eliminate a Vice Presidential Position - \$117,542**

DRI's administration already has been cut, trimmed, and reallocated to increase our administrative efficiency and to remain aggressively competitive. Further cuts will have a profound and negative impact on critical business operations such as: (1) new research and interdisciplinary program development including international efforts; (2) effective management of the institution's one quarter of a million square feet of facilities; (3) our teaching activities with other NSHE campuses as well as the effective oversight of graduate student training and support at DRI; (4) internal oversight of faculty annual evaluations, promotions, and recognition; and (5) tracking and resolving resignations, grievances, terminations, continuation, retirement, and appointment to emeritus status. Eliminating a vice presidential position means that additional burdens will be shifted to existing personnel who are ready working under demanding loads.

## **5. Eliminate State Operating Budgets and Reconfigure Other Administrative Staff Positions - \$179,310**

DRI always has been lean in its administrative infrastructure as part of its business-oriented management approach and entrepreneurial undertakings. Over the past few years, the national trend has been less funding of research and development, declining federal investment in research, and rapid changes in the type of markets for scientific

research. As a consequence, DRI responded in 2007 with a comprehensive, institute-wide efficiencies/cost-reduction/reallocation process to remain competitive by (1) eliminating many elements of its operating budget that could have been applied to the FY08-11 mandatory state reductions; (2) reducing administrative staff support to FY 2004 levels; and (3) eliminating both key front-line and critical backup positions in research-support areas which has meant that additional burdens have been shifted to existing personnel, and DRI has little or no backup capacity. Eliminating additional state-funded operating budgets and reconfiguring other administrative staff positions will severely exacerbate this problem.

**6. Eliminate Lease Space, Sierra Nevada College - \$121,980**

The lease space at Sierra Nevada College has been effectively used to enhance all the DRI and UNR research efforts at Lake Tahoe. The facility provides lake-based collaborative opportunities among DRI, UNR, UC-Davis, and other colleges/ universities and key state and federal agencies. It provides a staging and meeting area and provides office space for all DRI and UNR research activities conducted at Lake Tahoe. The elimination of this funding will take away this valuable resource, thus diminishing collaborative efforts to save Lake Tahoe and its environs.

**7. Eliminate an Integrated Science Center - \$90,000**

The Integrated Science Centers at DRI provide a foundation for incubating innovative and interdisciplinary research that crosses the three major Research Divisions (Atmospheric Sciences, Earth and Ecosystems Sciences and Hydrologic Sciences). It also provides the resource for developing new research directions at DRI that include renewable energy, advanced visualization and environmental change and human health. Elimination of a center dramatically reduces the ability of DRI to provide such interdisciplinary research and to move into these new research areas at the exact time when national and state efforts are being focused on such areas as renewable energy, environmental change, and human health

**8. Reduce O&M Funding (Operating and Staffing) - \$194,019**

Since fiscal year 2006, DRI has increased its laboratory and office square footage by over 36% to meet the growing research (non-state funded) portfolio. Reducing O&M funding will mean that a current lean maintenance staffing level will be further reduced. This not only places a significant burden on an already overworked staff, but also means an overall reduction in maintenance levels for the Reno campus of DRI. The reduced funding level also means a reduction in supervisory personnel at the Las Vegas campus of DRI and a reduced ability to meet inflationary utility costs. The reduction in maintenance of our research laboratories will have a negative impact on the effectiveness and competitiveness of DRI's world-class researchers.

Nevada State College  
FY 2005-06 Funding Scenario  
March 24, 2009

As would any budget reduction, the higher education budget reduction scenario would inflict pain on the citizens of the state who are attempting to improve their status by earning a bachelor's degree at Nevada State College (NSC). This particular plan imposes a disproportionate share of the reductions on the students of NSC. 70% of the students at Nevada State are supporting themselves and attending NSC. The average income of these working students is only \$25,913. NSC students with family support come from families who earn just over \$50,000 per year. Clearly, Nevada State serves a working class population whose dream of a better life depends upon access to the College's 4-Year programs.

By dramatically reducing support to NSC, the state will limit the number of classes and support services available to these working students and thus significantly extend their time to completion and hence their entry into the professional workforce. Our sister institutions will be similarly impacted should the state enact the reductions in this scenario. Should this scenario become a reality, the State of Nevada will accelerate its downward trajectory on educational quality. The same statement can be made for other state services as well. Without additional revenues, government in Nevada will become dysfunctional, unable to meet the essential needs of its citizenry.

The federal government has made resources available to assist in the short term. NSC and the other institutions of higher education in the state can maintain the quality of their academic offerings and provide the citizens of Nevada with access to education programs which will allow these individuals to become contributing members of society and improve the quality of life in Nevada.

Based on an overall FY 2005-06 funding scenario for the Nevada System of Higher Education, the total operating budget in FY 2010 for NSC could drop from its current level of \$21,591,514 to \$15,002,044. Included in this total number is an assumption that enrollments would meet current projected levels. A decrease in funding at this level dictates that every component of the college would be negatively affected, with the ultimate impact being felt by each student.

A total of 37 positions would be abolished, which represents a 23% reduction in NSC's workforce. Academic programs would receive highest priority and no academic program would be abolished, but programs would be hindered in their ability to serve students and to provide the opportunity to graduate in a timely manner. Student support services would be reduced when approximately 40% of the student body is classified as first generation attendees and over 40% are from the underrepresented portion of society.

More specifically, in addition to general operating reductions, the following actions and results would occur:

#### ACADEMICS

The School of Education would be reduced by 1.0 FTE teaching faculty positions and 0.5 FTE classified positions, a reduction of 13% of the teaching staff and 17% of the support staff. These reductions would hinder the development of the Deaf Education program which has recently been initiated and extend the average completion time for Teacher Education students.

The School of Liberal Arts and Sciences would be reduced by 6.0 FTE teaching faculty positions (20%), 1.0 FTE classified positions, and 2.0 FTE administrative positions (42% of staff). As a result, fewer class sections would be provided in the areas of English, Mathematics, Physical Sciences and Psychology. Students would be more challenged to find required courses, which would delay graduation for most of them. These areas provide the core curriculum for all students, including those who are training to be nurses and teachers, impacting time to completion for those students as well. In particular, this reduction would impact NSC's ability to produce high school and elementary math and science teachers, so important to this state.

The School of Nursing would be reduced by 2.5 FTE teaching faculty positions and 2.0 FTE administrative positions (40%). The entering class would be reduced from 40 to 32 students, a 20% reduction in the number of students entering the workforce in an area that is in extraordinarily high demand.

NSC would delay the implementation of a School of Business and the hiring of a Dean. This program has grown rapidly and needs to be developed more extensively to meet the demand. The lack of a School of Business would reduce the attractiveness of the program and negatively impact enrollment in this area.

The Library would be reduced by 1.0 FTE faculty position (33%). The Library is a central part of a student's learning experience, and the support for this component of a student's academic experience would be reduced.

### STUDENT SERVICES

The areas which are critical to providing services to students to ensure their success would be reduced by 4.0 FTE administrative positions and 4.0 FTE classified positions. Programs such as the Student Academic Success Center and the First Year Experience would be abolished. These two support units are crucial to the retention and the persistence of the student population that NSC serves. Enrollments would drop without these services. Other support functions such as advising and counseling would reduce the impact they have on students' success. Support for students with special needs would be reduced, again affecting one of the primary student populations of NSC. Admissions and Records would see a drastic reduction in level of service, such as processing of applications at a much slower rate, and Financial Aid processing would be delayed, again affecting enrollment.

### SUPPORT SERVICES

A total of 12.0 FTE positions which provide a variety of support functions to the institution would be abolished.

Institutional Research, which provides critical data and data analysis to assist in the management of the institution would be reduced by 1.0 FTE position and the office abolished.

The Controller's Office would be reduced by 1.0 FTE administrative position and 1.0 FTE classified accounting position. These losses would reduce the oversight and processing effectiveness of financial transactions.

The Human Resources department would be reduced by 1.0 FTE classified position. In stressful times such as these, the Human Resources function plays an even greater role in the success of the institution. The processing of payroll, contracts and the development of appropriate policies is critical for a new institution, and these functions would be negatively impacted by this reduction.

The Office of Information Technology would be reduced by 1.0 FTE administration position and 1.0 FTE classified position. This area has provided superior service to students, faculty and staff and has kept NSC on the leading edge of technology support. The development of distance education would be severely limited which reduces the likelihood of enrolling students in rural areas.

The facilities area would be reduced by 2.0 FTE administrative positions and 2.0 FTE classified positions. NSC has recently occupied its first permanent academic facility and has initiated a deferred maintenance program. These efforts, as well as the overall development of the physical campus, would now be hampered.

The President would reduce his staff by 1.0 FTE administrative position and 1.0 FTE classified position. These reductions place an ever greater stress on the President and his staff related to the myriad of responsibilities faced each day, and private and other external fundraising efforts would be reduced.



## Office of the President

---

**TO:** Dan Klaich  
Executive Vice Chancellor

**FROM:** Mike Richards  
President

**SUBJECT:** Response to Legislative Counsel Bureau Questions – March 20, 2009 Hearing

**DATE:** March 24, 2009

---

As a follow-up to the Budget Hearing of March 20, 2009, the following information is provided in order to illustrate the impact on the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) if general fund support is provided at the FY 2006 level as adjusted to reflect enrollment increases and the formula funding.

### Background:

Over the past two fiscal years, CSN has realized enrollment growth of significant proportion. This enrollment increase has occurred at a time when state revenues have been reduced. As the state and national economy have been negatively impacted by the recent downturn, community college enrollments have directly been influenced. The following table illustrates the increase that CSN has realized over the past several years, for reference purposes the legislative approved budgeted full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment is also provided to illustrate this tremendous growth:

Fiscal Year	Legislative Approved FTE	Actual/Projected FTE	% Difference	FTE in excess of budget
FY 2007-08	18,414	19,607	7.9%	1,193
FY 2008-09	18,760	21,000	7.1%	2,240

\*Note1: FY 2008 growth over FY 2007 FTE of (18,176).

\*Note 2: FY 2009 is estimate final enrollment numbers will not be available until end of Spring 2009 semester.

Enrollments have been driven by increased demand for higher education in both traditional general education courses, which lead to transfer to 4-year programs and from the need for students to obtain new and/or enhanced job skills and a desire for retooling of skill sets for new or revised employment opportunities. Regardless, as the economy has realized this downturn, the community college enrollment has increased significantly. It is this instructional and workforce training and CSN's commitment to access to higher education that is our core mission.

While the State of Nevada revenue outlook has projected reduced revenues into the 2009-2011 biennium the impact on general fund support to CSN will have a dramatic affect. The calculations that have been presented based in response to the hearing of March 20<sup>th</sup> include funding from the FY 06 general fund level as adjusted for the FY 2008-09 preliminary enrollments, and updated registration fee projections based on updated enrollment levels accommodated within the formula. The results in an increase of projected FTE for CSN of 22,403 in FY 2009-10 and 23,856 in FY 2010-2011, supported at a level of 70.82% and 69.96% of the formula respectively.

CSN has long struggled with adequacy of resources to support our comprehensive, multi-campus, community college student body. Resources to meet the demand of our diverse student population has been extremely challenging as CSN provides academic programs, student services, and academic support infrastructure to our three main campuses and expanding on-line course and program offerings. The ability to meet student demand for courses, programs, and classes is further constrained by an inability to improve upon the full-time/part-time ratio and to attract an adequate compliment of part-time instructors to balance the demand.

Funding challenges are not new to CSN and have resulted in strained resources to meet student demand. All aspects of the budget have been directly impacted by the limitation of resources. Students feel the burden directly through the limits of course offerings, the College's inability to keep pace with equipment replacement, limitation of operating resources, constrained library operations, access to counselors and advisors, overcrowding of lab and study space, and limited academic support services including tutoring and writing center access.

As funding discussions have led to reviewing a funding scenario which is predicated on FY 2006 general fund, revised enrollment targets consistent with the funding formula, and registration fee calculations based on the updated enrollment levels, the funding support per student will be greatly impacted. Funding support per full-time equivalent will be reduced from the FY 09 legislative approved level of \$7,061.60 to approximately \$5,393.27 or (23.63%) in FY 2009-2010 and to \$5,229.75 or (25.94%) in FY 2010-2011. CSN will be unable to support the projected enrollment at these funding levels. As noted previously, CSN already is operating in an environment of significantly strained resources.

As CSN is unable to meet enrollment levels projected revenues from registration fees will not be realized, which will cause further reductions in institutional resources. Provided below are anticipated reductions that will be necessary as a result of inadequate funding:

- Eliminate outreach and access to specific communities: CSN will continue with plans to close specific neighborhood and rural locations including Boulder City site, A.D. Guy Center, Downtown Learning Center, and the Lincoln County site. This will impact approximately 51 FTE for credit instruction and numerous non-credit services and training opportunities. Specific impact on the locations include:
  - Boulder City: CSN will need to relocate the Aviation program currently located solely at this site students desiring higher education will need to drive to the Henderson campus or other valley campus locations.
  - A.D. Guy: Closure will result in community services to be either discontinued or relocated to more-distant campuses. Disadvantaged and underrepresented minorities who may not have transportation available to them and are unable to travel to other campuses will be unable to have needs met.
  - Downtown Learning Center: This collaboration with the Hispanic community provides downtown area residents with access to key education and training opportunities. Again, students requiring these services will need to be dispersed to CSN main campuses and/or other service locations within the Las Vegas Valley.
  - Lincoln County – This is the only higher education outreach within this community, a closure will directly impact access to the residents of this community as travel to another CSN campuses is not feasible.
- Reduction/elimination of operating hours for support operations: CSN will reduce hours of operation for support functions including but not limited to computer labs, select campus libraries, outreach locations (technology centers), retention services, cashier's office, program open labs, campus sites and/or locations. This will impact students that attend part-time and work full-time and rely on the campuses flexible hours of operation. Over 73% of all students at CSN attend part-time enrolling in less than 12 credit hours.
- Elimination of key vacant positions at the institution: As a result of budget reductions experienced over the past two years and the uncertainty of 2009-2011 funding, the College implemented a hiring moratorium. If funding levels are approved as outlined the College will need to freeze the following positions on an indefinite basis. Responsibilities will need to be redistributed to existing staff, or services eliminated:



Function	Professional	Classified	Total
Instruction	0	4	4
Public Service	.60	.40	1.00
Academic Support	4	5	9
Student Services	3.25	1	4.25
Institutional Support	3	4	7
Operations & Maintenance	1	17	18
Total:	11.85	31.4	43.25

CSN has already eliminated eight non-instructional administrative positions over the course of the past two years in order to respond to budget reductions and increased student demand.

- Reduction in operating support: Operating funding which provides departmental, student, and faculty support will be reduced across the board at the College.

The College of Southern Nevada is the access institution for the communities of southern Nevada. This is illustrated in the enrollments of the institution which have resulted in CSN as the largest higher education institution in Nevada with full-time equivalent enrollments of approximately 21,000 annualized in the current academic year and unduplicated headcount of over 41,250. The ability to respond and meet the demand in our community will be dramatically impacted. As the economic climate of Nevada changes to meet the current realities, higher education is uniquely positioned to help the state meet the workforce needs, but resources are essential in order to adequately tool the institutions.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me.

PAC

Cc: Patty Charlton, Senior Vice President, Finance & Facilities



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Dan Klaich  
Vice Chancellor

**From:** Carl Diekhans  
Interim President

**Date:** March 24, 2009

**Subject:** Budget Reductions of 18.76%

In order to comply with the 3.3 million dollar reduction from the FY09 legislative approved budget, GBC will need to eliminate 40 positions from the state budget along with additional operating dollars. Of the 40 positions, 10 will be teaching faculty and 30 will consist of classified and professional positions including administrative aids, admissions and records, custodial, library, security, financial aid, recruitment, and computer tech positions. Dean and vice presidential positions will also be eliminated. Since some of these positions include tenured or implied contracts, legal counsel will need to advise on the issue of financial exigency.

Since 2006, GBC has grown from 1365 FTE to a projected 1775 for the year ending in 2009. This is an increase of about 30%. GBC cannot sustain this increase in student enrollment into the future while suffering 15-20% or more reduction in funding. Specific impacts include the following:

1. Reduction of 10 full-time faculty positions

- Reduction of total full-time faculty by 15%
- Reduction of 100 class sections per year
- Reduction of about 2000 class seats
- Reduction of about 200 FTE (about 12% of the 2009 enrollment)

2. Reduction of 10% of adjunct (part-time) instruction

- Reduction of about 44-50 additional class sections per year
- Reduction of about 1100 additional class seats
- Reduction of about 100 additional FTE ( about 6% of the 2009 enrollment)

3. Reduction of all support services for students. This will result in reduction of capacity to serve students and the general public. This includes recruitment, student financial services, computer technology services, security, accounts receivable, and admissions and records. A reduction in buildings and grounds will delay maintenance which creates more expensive facility and equipment failures in the future. The appearance of the GBC grounds has been a strong reason for students to be attracted to the campus. If this degrades, it will take many years to bring the campus back to its current state of appearance.
  - Recruitment – 50% reduction
  - Student Financial Services – 20% reduction
  - Controller’s Office – 20% reduction
  - Security – 50% reduction
  - Admissions & Records – 20% reduction
  - Computer Technology – 20% reduction
  - Tutoring and lab aides - 15% reduction
  - Buildings & Grounds – 30% reduction
4. Elimination of two administrative positions (Vice President of Administrative Services (VPAS) and Dean of Extended Studies (DES)). The VPAS formerly oversaw all budget and finance operations, and all facilities, grounds, security and IT departments. These are all critical operational functions of the college. The DES formerly oversaw all distance education (52% of total GBC FTE) and four branch and 17 satellite campuses (20% of total GBC FTE) throughout the 62,000 square miles GBC service area. The quality of instructional delivery to the 118,000 residents of rural Nevada will degrade in the future without adequate coordination and oversight of resources.
5. The Library staff will be reduced by a third, and the new acquisitions budget will be eliminated. The number and variety of electronic data bases will be reduced.
6. All operating budgets will be reduced by over 50%. This lowers the ability to provide adequate, quality instructional delivery in all areas.
7. The professional development budget will be reduced by about 75%. Higher education is not static, and the faculty and staff will fall behind in new developments across the board, from office procedures to curriculum and instruction.

With the proposed budget cuts, things in general will begin falling apart faster than they can be taken care of, leading to general inefficiencies in all functions of the college.

#### Summary of Reductions

10 Faculty positions	725,000
30 Support Staff positions	1,733,682
Adjunct Faculty (part-time)	100,000
Operating	<u>785,000</u>
	3,343,682



DATE: March 27, 2009  
TO: Dan Klaich, Executive Vice Chancellor *Maria C. Sheehan*  
FROM: Maria Sheehan, President, Truckee Meadows Community College  
RE: Impact of the Funding at the 2005-06 Level

---

## **TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE IMPACT OF FUNDING AT THE 2005-06 LEVEL**

The college currently has 65 vacant positions spread through all functional areas. With additional funding (beyond the 2006 level) the college will focus on the restoration and addition of critical faculty and staff positions as identified below:

### **Needed for Faculty Positions**

TMCC has record numbers of entering students. Our highest priority is more faculty for the classroom. This includes replacing vacant full-time faculty positions and adding full-time faculty for core and developmental classes. Approximately 70% of the entering students are testing into one or more math and/or English developmental class. If funding is not made available TMCC will be forced to limit enrollment by the number of sections of classes that can be offered. Thousands of potential students will be turned away. This priority also allows the college to move forward in improving the ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty.

### **Services to Students**

The numbers of new student applicants testing into developmental courses is a huge challenge for the college. The college has a number of vacancies in the student support areas and a strong need exists for employees supporting services to our students. Currently we have vacancies in counseling, advising and outreach services. Being able to fill these positions is critical for supporting all students with special needs.

### **Director of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion**

There are currently 30 vacancies in the administrative functions including the HR Director and the Director of Equity, Diversity and inclusion. With this vacancy, the position responsibilities were distributed across other administrative positions. The Director of Equity and Diversity is a critical need in the administrative area. This vacancy puts at risk an essential focus for the college.

What are some additional impacts of funding at the 2006 Level?

It is impossible for TMCC to continue serving all applicants to the college with funding at the 2006 level.

It will be necessary to continue to focus reductions on all areas that are NOT integral to our core mission that is; university transfer, applied science and technology, business and industry partnering, developmental education, community service and student support service programs (attached). This focuses the reductions to the institutional support (finance and accounting, marketing, public information, information technology and institutional research), O&M (operation and maintenance of our facilities) functional areas and mandated services such as utilities and insurance. Although not included in the core mission, the college cannot operate without this ancillary support. TMCC is projecting this will required a reduction of an additional 10 positions throughout the ancillary support offices and all of these offices are already operating with limited staff.

The college will be required to reduce the part-time (adjunct) faculty budgets. At the current level of projected funding, the cut is projected to be approximately \$800,000. This will reduce the number of classes the college can offer and will result in turning away students. An \$800,000 reduction equates to a reduction of 300 to 350 three credit class sections (with an average class size of 18 students this is turning away approximately 7,000 students). This is particularly onerous as TMCC is the primary provider of nurses, police officers, EMT/paramedics and other allied health and first responders in our area.



# Western Nevada College

Carson City • Douglas • Fallon • Fernley • Hawthorne • Lovelock • Smith • Yerington

*The Right Choice*

## OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Dan Klaich, Executive Vice Chancellor

FROM: Carol A. Lucey, President

SUBJECT: Response to legislative questions

DATE: March 24, 2009

Attached is a response to question 1.a regarding the impact of a return to 2006 funding from the budget for 2009 approved during the '07 legislative session.

Of particular note are the following:

1. We have assumed a salary freeze for all professional employees, going forward. We have not assumed a classified salary step freeze, because our classified employees are part of the state personnel system, and we do not control their remuneration schedule. Therefore, step increases for classified employees are identified as a new cost in our response.
2. For a small institution like Western, it makes more sense to talk about functions lost (which are associated with position vacancies) rather than program cuts occurring as a result of budget cuts. We have listed current vacancies, created as a result of position freezes, retirements, and past "buyouts." The functions lost and detailed here have resulted in decreased library acquisitions, fewer class offerings and fewer sections, reduced services to students, and reduced or deferred facility upkeep and maintenance.
3. In some cases where a function cannot be lost without jeopardizing institutional integrity, full-time vacancies must be filled with part-time employees. Funding for such part-time backfill positions is identified in our response, and titled "unfunded cost increases."
4. Despite the substantial savings identified by function cuts referenced in (2) above, at the 2006 level, the college is about a million dollars "under water" to provide essential core services.

Visit us online at [www.wnc.edu](http://www.wnc.edu)

---

2201 West College Parkway • Carson City, Nevada • 89703-7399 • 775-445-4450 • FAX 775-445-3127

WNC - An Institution of the Nevada System of Higher Education

**Western Nevada College**

## Response to Question 1A

Legislative Approved FY09 Budget	\$	25,674,552
Adjustments:		
AEGIA & REGIA	\$	(483,309)
Worker's Comp	\$	(160,773)
Adjusted Legislatively Approved Budget Total	\$	25,030,470
Unbudgeted Cost Increases		
Loss of Student Surcharge Revenue	\$	210,884
Anticipated Classified Step/Longevity Salary Adjustments	\$	119,751
Lotus Notes	\$	53,000
PT Faculty Salaries Costs	\$	254,671
Northwest Accreditation Visit	\$	5,000
EnCompass	\$	13,200
Salary Schedule Changes	\$	39,000
Additional PT to Cover Vacancies	\$	120,120
<b>Adjusted FY10 Budget</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>25,846,096</b>
Projected Savings		
Public Safety	\$	51,542
Facilities - Custodial	\$	39,916
Facilities - Custodial	\$	38,246
Academic Faculty (Computer App)	\$	68,160
Academic Faculty (Biology)	\$	72,286
Academic Faculty (Legal Asst.)	\$	82,166
Academic Faculty (HIT)	\$	79,750
Academic Faculty (Construction)	\$	77,930
Academic Faculty (Computers)	\$	69,814
Academic Faculty (English)	\$	82,544
Academic Faculty (Engineering)	\$	85,918
Academic Faculty (Welding)	\$	116,104
Academic Faculty (Physics)	\$	124,500
Academic Faculty (Math)	\$	96,598
Academic Faculty (Business)	\$	110,894
Academic Faculty (Computer Aided Drafting)	\$	103,407
Academic Faculty (English)	\$	75,537
Academic Faculty (Surgical Tech)	\$	84,659
Academic Faculty (Automotive)	\$	105,167
Faculty/ASC/English	\$	68,307
Web Instruction Coordinator	\$	102,750
Administrative Assistant III	\$	54,669
Administrative Assistant IV	\$	50,231
Library - Audio Visual Assistant	\$	53,582
IT Network Engineer	\$	87,433
IT System Administrator	\$	94,854
Grant Writer	\$	78,883
Director Institutional Research	\$	138,205
Public Safety - .5	\$	21,261
Facilities Supervisor I	\$	67,923
Maintenance Repair Worker II	\$	44,165
Custodial Worker II	\$	53,135
Administrative Aide	\$	17,748
Custodial Worker II	\$	49,511
Sub-total of Savings	\$	2,547,793
Adjusted FY10 Budget Less Savings	\$	23,298,303
Projected FY10 Budget with 18.76% Reduction	\$	22,227,616
<b>Unfunded Difference</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>(1,070,687)</b>

## **University Press Budget Reduction Plan**

The University of Nevada Press is the only academic press in the state of Nevada. The projected 18.76% annual reduction will impact the press's ability to fulfill its mission "to publish high-quality, deserving works that advance scholarly research, contribute to the understanding and appreciation of regional history and culture, and reach a wide range of academic and general readers."

The press will need to reexamine the number and type of books it publishes, its marketing and personnel costs, and its ability to keep inventory in stock. Cutbacks in these areas could have the undesirable effect of decreasing book revenue, weakening the press.

A possible but undesirable remedy is to increase the prices of its books; the Press provides thousands of Nevada history textbooks to NHSE students at reasonable prices. Such price increases would provide an unfortunate financial burden on Nevada students.



## **System Computing Services Budget Reduction Plan**

The majority of System Computing Services' budget is committed to vendor obligations, network connections, and contractual agreements. The 18.76% budget cut will result in:

- Three vacant technical positions within SCS will not be filled.
- Eight additional frozen positions will remain unfilled.
- No funds for capital investment in equipment for 2010 and 2011 means improvement and replacement requests will have to be handled on a case by case basis. For example, increased demand for services like video conferencing may have to be deferred.
- With limited travel funds, the response time to unanticipated outages and equipment failure of the network will increase and will lower the level of preventative maintenance.

### System Administration

Functions of NSHE System Administration include Audit, Finance, Accounting, Risk Management and Insurance, Board of Regents staff support, Academic and Student Affairs, Legal Counsel, and Institutional Research. These functions provide oversight to the institutions and support to the Board of Regents in decision making and carrying out their fiscal, legal, and academic responsibilities. It is system administration that provides reliable and comparable data to state and federal governments for higher education in Nevada. In answering this request by LCB, it is system administration that coordinates institutional responses and builds System-wide budgets with integrity. With a cut at the level of 18.76 percent, our positions would be cut approximately 19% to match the budget cut, but no decision has been made at this time on exactly which functions and positions would be eliminated or cut. At the least, this will mean slower response time to requests for data, more reliance on institutional data which may not be comparable, less oversight related to Board and state policies, and fewer functions normally carried out by the Higher Education Agency in each state.

Also included in this budget is the Management Assistance Program. This cut would mean an 18.76 percent reduction in MAP's state funds amounting to \$119,745. MAP must demonstrate cost share of \$2 for every federal dollar from their U.S. Department of Commerce's NIST-MEP cooperative agreement. A loss of \$119,745 therefore correlates to an additional loss of federal funds of \$59,872 and a total reduction in funds of \$179,618 annually.

Such a reduction would require MAP to operate with two fewer positions than planned, and decrease operating budgets accordingly. Impacts go far beyond not filling current positions. Estimated loss of economic impact would approximate \$20 million per year (based on current impact levels reported by MAP's industrial clients.) MAP will serve 80 fewer clients per year.

## **Special Projects - Matching Fund Allocation (EPSCoR)**

### **Impact of an 18.76% Reduction**

A reduction of 18.76% of the allocation for Special Projects Matching Funds will result in a loss of over \$500,000 in State funds and at least an equal amount of loss in federal funds. This loss of over \$1 million in project funding will have the following adverse effects.

- Cash matching support critical to the success of DoD EPSCoR (DEPSCoR) proposals will cease to exist. This means a possible loss of six new research projects.
- Matching support for NASA Space Grant will not continue for the coming fiscal year, unless the burden for required matching funds is assumed by individual NSHE institutions that will be dealing with their own budget reductions. Space Grant funds currently pay for DRI's operational infrastructure for the program. Further reductions will impede the growth of the program and reduce – possibly eliminate - outreach scholarships and fellowships.
- The NSF EPSCoR program may have to eliminate the outreach educational component from the program. During the fall semester, students may lose fellowships and graduate assistantships that are pending approval.
- Any reduction of existing commitments to current NSHE programs will result in a variety of undesirable situations within the programs. Significant reductions will require agency approval of project changes in work scope and may result in return of federal funds. Especially with regard to the Cyberinfrastructure proposal pending with NSF, NSHE's proposed matching commitment to this \$2 million program may not be possible under the proposed reduction.

To operate at full capacity, the Special Projects Matching Fund Allocation currently should be funded at a level of \$3.7 million. At this level, support of six new DEPSCoR proposals, two new NASA EPSCoR programs, and continued growth of the Space Grant program would be assured. A reduction of 18.76% from the FY 2009 baseline allocation results in only 60% of NSHE's projected needs – effectively a 40% reduction in current program requirements.

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

***a.2. Report any recommended changes to the amounts funded via formula and note the formula percentages that would result.***

**Response:**

The amounts funded via formula are shown, and no recommended changes are presented. The formula percentages are 70.82 percent in FY 2009-10 and 69.96 percent in FY 2010-11.

Attached is a schedule showing the changes in the budgeted registration fees that differ from the Governor's recommended registration fees.

Attachment: Response 1 a 2

	Registration Fees as reflected in the Executive Budget (as amended)		Registration Fees using formula generated enrollments for FY 10 and FY 11		Registration Fees using projected FY 09 AAFTE as budgeted level for FY 10 and FY 11	
	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11
UNR	\$ 33,117,776	\$ 35,482,626	\$ 33,397,534	\$ 35,883,568	\$ 32,893,719	\$ 34,809,083
UNLV	\$ 52,728,431	\$ 56,092,695	\$ 51,220,470	\$ 53,960,761	\$ 51,530,647	\$ 54,616,212
NSC	\$ 2,621,706	\$ 2,988,495	\$ 2,460,753	\$ 2,805,419	\$ 2,268,274	\$ 2,383,473
CSN	\$ 28,904,583	\$ 32,230,236	\$ 29,156,270	\$ 32,605,381	\$ 27,379,958	\$ 28,753,495
GBC	\$ 2,613,047	\$ 2,941,496	\$ 2,599,933	\$ 2,921,744	\$ 2,429,833	\$ 2,551,946
TMCC	\$ 8,708,436	\$ 9,492,489	\$ 8,860,722	\$ 9,714,492	\$ 8,487,414	\$ 8,913,185
WNC	\$ 2,949,132	\$ 3,109,001	\$ 3,146,432	\$ 3,389,685	\$ 3,067,183	\$ 3,221,058
	\$ 131,643,111	\$ 142,337,039	\$ 130,842,116	\$ 141,281,050	\$ 128,057,027	\$ 135,248,452

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

***a.3. Identify any fee increases (per credit amount and percentage) over and above those included in the 2009-11 Governor's recommended budget that would be proposed for each campus and provide estimates of the revenues that would be generated from the increases.***

**Response:**

The attached calculations detail the amount of total revenue that would be generated at a 5% increase over the fee level approved by the Board of Regents for FY 10 and FY 11. Neither this fee, nor its distribution, have been reviewed or voted on by the Board. These calculations were prepared using projected enrollments generated by the formula applying the three year weighted average.

	FY 10 BOR	FY 11 BOR	Additional	Additional	FY 10 Budget	FY 11 Budget	Collection	FY 10	FY 11
	Appv'd Fee	Appv'd Fee	5% FY 10 *	5% FY 11 *	Credit Hours**	Credit Hours**	Rate	Add'l Rev	Add'l Rev
<b>UNR</b>									
Undergraduate	\$ 136.00	\$ 142.75	\$ 6.80	\$ 7.14	328,201	333,228	96.09%	\$ 2,144,504.06	\$ 2,285,416.77
Graduate	\$ 217.75	\$ 239.50	\$ 10.89	\$ 11.98	39,509	40,115	96.09%	\$ 413,339.39	\$ 461,592.08
<b>UNR Total</b>								<b>\$ 2,557,843.46</b>	<b>\$ 2,747,008.85</b>
<b>UNLV</b>									
Undergraduate	\$ 136.00	\$ 142.75	\$ 6.80	\$ 7.14	486,571	483,642	95.46%	\$ 3,158,466.00	\$ 3,295,274.21
Graduate	\$ 217.75	\$ 239.50	\$ 10.89	\$ 11.98	72,642	72,206	95.46%	\$ 754,987.54	\$ 825,405.26
<b>UNLV Total</b>								<b>\$ 3,913,453.54</b>	<b>\$ 4,120,679.47</b>
<b>NSC</b>									
Undergraduate	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	44,490	48,270	93.64%	\$ 204,656.89	\$ 233,345.14
<b>NSC Total</b>								<b>\$ 204,656.89</b>	<b>\$ 233,345.14</b>
<b>CSN</b>									
Upper Div	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	627	668	95.42%	\$ 2,939.07	\$ 3,290.61
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	671,459	715,021	95.42%	\$ 1,922,118.53	\$ 2,149,160.07
<b>CSN Total</b>								<b>\$ 1,925,057.60</b>	<b>\$ 2,152,450.68</b>
<b>GBC</b>									
Upper Div	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	6,719	7,189	95.62%	\$ 31,561.38	\$ 35,487.65
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	51,094	54,670	95.62%	\$ 146,568.25	\$ 164,667.68
<b>GBC Total</b>								<b>\$ 178,129.63</b>	<b>\$ 200,155.33</b>
<b>TMCC</b>									
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	212,660	222,013	91.67%	\$ 584,836.27	\$ 641,085.85
<b>TMCC Total</b>								<b>\$ 584,836.27</b>	<b>\$ 641,085.85</b>
<b>WNC</b>									
Upper Div	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	319	327	90.26%	\$ 1,414.45	\$ 1,523.71
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	76,281	78,252	90.26%	\$ 206,553.69	\$ 222,485.30
<b>WNC Total</b>								<b>\$ 207,968.14</b>	<b>\$ 224,009.02</b>
<b>NSHE Total</b>								<b>\$ 9,571,945.53</b>	<b>\$ 10,318,734.34</b>

\* Neither this fee, nor its distribution, have been reviewed or voted on by the Board of Regents

\*\* Budgeted Credit Hours may be unrealistic due to elimination of sections.

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

***a.4. The NSHE requested flexibility to move funds among the state supported operating budgets during the interim in order to better respond to institutions' needs. The Subcommittee suggested instead that as part of developing its alternative to The Executive Budget, the NSHE should identify which budgets should be increased or decreased to most effectively distribute available resources. Therefore, as part of responding to the Subcommittee's request, please provide a matrix of the system's state supported formula and non-formula operating budgets and document the funding levels and redistributions that the NSHE would recommend for each budget. Please note any changes from the Governor's recommended budget. If an increase, please note where the corresponding decrease(s) are occurring in other budgets or where new revenues are being added.***

**Response:**

The non-formula state-supported budgets now reflect a cut of 18.76 percent of General Fund, a change from the Governor's recommended reduction levels. This addresses NSHE's concern that all budgets should be impacted equally, not just the formula driven budgets which primarily serve students.



**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

- b. Core Mission: The NSHE has spoken about the inability of the system to meet its "core mission" at the funding levels recommended by the Governor. Can the system meet its core mission if the funding alternative described in question 1.a. is implemented? If not, please identify the level of state and other funding needed to meet the NSHE's core mission and present budget alternatives to accommodate this target. For the core mission alternative, please respond using the component framework outlined in question 1.a. above.***

**Response:**

Our introductory remarks to question 1 address the issue of "core mission." In response to this question, we will present an alternative that incorporates both state funding and federal stimulus dollars. It is described fully in the introductory remarks above. Within this second alternative, we respond to your questions using the component framework outlined in question 1.a. above.

Funding for the iNtegrate project is accommodated within this \$ 617 million plan. We recommend that federal stimulus dollars be used to fund \$10 million for iNtegrate that was reverted to the state in the last biennium and that this be taken out before the distribution of the total stimulus dollars to the other state-supported operating budget accounts.

The non-formula state-supported budgets are now cut at 9.74 percent, a change from the Governor's recommended budget. This addresses NSHE's concern that all budgets should be impacted equally, not just the formula driven budgets which primarily serve students.

At its special meeting in December, 2008 the Board of Regents proposed to the Governor a methodology to effectuate a budget cut for the NSHE. This methodology utilized the traditional funding formula as its basis; however given the uncertainty of appropriations and enrollments, only the 2008-09 projected enrollments would be utilized in determining the formula levels for each institution instead of the normal three-year weighted average. The model presented under this scenario is prepared using this methodology.

The following formula funding scenario assumes a General Fund appropriation level equivalent to the FY 2005-06 General Fund expenditure level of \$555.5 million plus stimulus funding of \$61.7 million per year for a total of \$617.2 million for each year of the 2009-2011 biennium. The General Fund and Stimulus funding equates to a 9.74% reduction in state funding support from the FY 2008-09 Legislative Approved General Fund Appropriation of \$683.8 million. The 9.74% reduction is applied to all NSHE appropriation areas in determining State support for the NSHE budgets within the \$617.2 million state support for FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11. Other revenues, i.e., student fees,

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

etc. are projected at \$208.8 million and \$219.2 million for each year of the biennium respectively for a total NSHE budget of \$826 million for FY 2009-10 and \$219.2 million for FY 2010-11.

The NSHE funding formula was used to determine the expenditure level of each appropriation area based on student enrollment projections using the annualized FY 2008-09 student full-time equivalent enrollments for each year of the next biennium. The non-formula budgets are budgeted at the 9.74% reduction to state support from the FY 2008-09 funding level plus other projected revenues. The formula budgets are funded utilizing the funding formula at 77.23% in FY 2009-10 and 77.05% in FY 2010-11.

NSHE Allocation of a 9.74 % General Fund Budget Reduction for the 2009-2011 Biennium

Budget Account	Budget Account Desc	FY09 GF Without COLA	FY 09 COLA	ANNUAL REDUCTION RATE				9.736514075%
				Total FY09 GF Plus COLA Funding	9.74 % Annual Reduction for FY2010	Annual GF Target FY2010	9.74 % Annual Reduction for FY2011	Annual GF Target FY2011
2977	NSHE - SPECIAL PROJECTS	2,751,729	13,805	2,765,534	269,267	2,496,267	269,267	2,496,267
2980	NHSE - UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA - RENO	136,590,971	7,561,965	144,152,936	14,035,471	130,117,465	14,035,471	130,117,465
2982	NHSE - SCHOOL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES	34,753,277	1,579,762	36,333,039	3,537,571	32,795,468	3,537,571	32,795,468
2983	NHSE - INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS - UNR	6,902,237	151,976	7,054,213	686,834	6,367,379	686,834	6,367,379
2985	NHSE - STATEWIDE PROGRAMS - UNR	8,509,466	382,575	8,892,041	865,775	8,026,266	865,775	8,026,266
2986	NSHE - SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION	5,622,271	244,744	5,867,015	571,243	5,295,772	571,243	5,295,772
2987	NSHE - UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA - LAS VEGAS	172,988,843	10,150,783	183,139,626	17,831,415	165,308,211	17,831,415	165,308,211
2988	NSHE - INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS - UNLV	9,103,052	153,715	9,256,767	901,286	8,355,481	901,286	8,355,481
2989	NSHE - AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION	9,249,670	436,758	9,686,428	943,120	8,743,308	943,120	8,743,308
2990	NSHE - COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE	9,410,306	565,964	9,976,270	971,341	9,004,929	971,341	9,004,929
2991	NHSE - SYSTEM COMPUTING CENTER	23,162,289	676,061	23,838,350	2,321,024	21,517,326	2,321,024	21,517,326
2992	NSHE - UNLV LAW SCHOOL	9,126,630	511,744	9,638,374	938,442	8,699,932	938,442	8,699,932
2993	NHSE - NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM	50,904	0	50,904	4,956	45,948	4,956	45,948
2994	NSHE - GREAT BASIN COLLEGE	16,997,300	826,047	17,823,347	1,735,373	16,087,974	1,735,373	16,087,974
2996	NHSE - UNIVERSITY PRESS	916,397	34,856	951,253	92,619	858,634	92,619	858,634
3001	NSHE - STATEWIDE PROGRAMS - UNLV	1,458,566	68,716	1,527,282	148,704	1,378,578	148,704	1,378,578
3002	NSHE - DENTAL SCHOOL - UNLV	8,431,499	615,899	9,047,398	880,901	8,166,497	880,901	8,166,497
3003	NSHE - BUSINESS CENTER NORTH	2,550,450	131,381	2,681,831	261,117	2,420,714	261,117	2,420,714
3004	NSHE - BUSINESS CENTER SOUTH	2,171,463	109,768	2,281,231	222,112	2,059,119	222,112	2,059,119
3005	NSHE - NEVADA STATE COLLEGE AT HENDERSON	17,670,035	475,881	18,145,916	1,766,780	16,379,136	1,766,780	16,379,136
3010	NSHE - DESERT RESEARCH INSTITUTE	9,795,172	345,191	10,140,363	987,318	9,153,045	987,318	9,153,045
3011	NSHE - COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA	97,672,554	5,221,576	102,894,130	10,018,301	92,875,829	10,018,301	92,875,829
3012	NSHE - WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	21,251,842	1,106,975	22,358,817	2,176,969	20,181,848	2,176,969	20,181,848
3018	NSHE - TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	41,002,040	2,184,075	43,186,115	4,204,822	38,981,293	4,204,822	38,981,293
3221	NSHE - HEALTH LABORATORY AND RESEARCH	2,046,391	83,006	2,129,397	207,329	1,922,068	207,329	1,922,068
	TOTALS	650,185,354	33,633,223	683,818,577	66,580,092	617,238,485	66,580,092	617,238,485

2009-2010									
	GF Target	Other Revenues Base	Other Revenues Maint	Total Budget	Funding at 77.23%	Adj to GF Target	GF Appropriation	Other Revenues Base/Maint	Total Budget
UNR	130,117,465	53,000,719		183,118,184	180,037,213	(3,080,971)	127,036,494	53,000,719	180,037,213
UNLV	165,308,211	88,323,920		253,632,131	246,687,965	(6,944,166)	158,364,045	88,323,920	246,687,965
CSN	92,875,829	33,559,221		126,435,050	135,148,773	8,713,723	101,589,552	33,559,221	135,148,773
GBC	16,087,974	2,586,859		18,674,833	20,762,063	2,087,230	18,175,204	2,586,859	20,762,063
TMCC	38,981,293	10,357,920		49,339,213	50,430,210	1,090,997	40,072,290	10,357,920	50,430,210
WNC	20,181,848	3,271,152		23,453,000	23,853,085	400,085	20,581,933	3,271,152	23,853,085
NSC	16,379,136	2,432,774		18,811,910	15,514,788	(3,297,122)	13,082,014	2,432,774	15,514,788
DRI	3,304,032			3,304,032	3,334,154	30,122	3,334,154	0	3,334,154
NFB				0	1,000,099	1,000,099	1,000,099	0	1,000,099
	483,235,788	193,532,565	0	676,768,353	676,768,350	(3)	483,235,785	193,532,565	676,768,350
SA	5,295,772	111,460		5,407,232	5,407,232	0	5,295,772	111,460	5,407,232
SP	2,496,267			2,496,267	2,496,267	0	2,496,267	0	2,496,267
SCS	21,517,326			21,517,326	21,517,326	0	21,517,326	0	21,517,326
UP	858,634			858,634	858,634	0	858,634	0	858,634
SOM	32,795,468	3,005,960		35,801,428	35,801,428	0	32,795,468	3,005,960	35,801,428
ICR-R	6,367,379			6,367,379	6,367,379	0	6,367,379	0	6,367,379
SW-R	8,026,266			8,026,266	8,026,266	0	8,026,266	0	8,026,266
CES	9,004,929	1,829,188		10,834,117	10,834,117	0	9,004,929	1,829,188	10,834,117
AES	8,743,308	1,389,398		10,132,706	10,132,706	0	8,743,308	1,389,398	10,132,706
SHL	1,922,068			1,922,068	1,922,068	0	1,922,068	0	1,922,068
ICA-LV	8,355,481			8,355,481	8,355,481	0	8,355,481	0	8,355,481
LS	8,699,932	3,998,231		12,698,163	12,698,163	0	8,699,932	3,998,231	12,698,163
SW-LV	1,378,578			1,378,578	1,378,578	0	1,378,578	0	1,378,578
DS	8,166,497	4,751,716		12,918,213	12,918,213	0	8,166,497	4,751,716	12,918,213
BCN	2,420,714			2,420,714	2,420,714	0	2,420,714	0	2,420,714
BCS	2,059,119			2,059,119	2,059,119	0	2,059,119	0	2,059,119
NDSL	45,948			45,948	45,948	0	45,948	0	45,948
DRI	5,849,013	148,486		5,997,499	5,997,499	0	5,849,013	148,486	5,997,499
	134,002,699	15,234,439	0	149,237,138	149,237,138	0	134,002,699	15,234,439	149,237,138
	617,238,487	208,767,004	0	826,005,491	826,005,488	(3)	617,238,484	208,767,004	826,005,488

2010-2011										
	GF	Other Revenues Base	Other Revenues Maint	Total Budget	Funding at 77.05%	Adj to GF Target	GF Appropriation	Other Revenues Base/Maint	Total Budget	
UNR	130,117,465	55,610,083		185,727,548	184,203,838	(1,523,710)	128,593,755	55,610,083	184,203,838	
UNLV	165,308,211	92,774,943		258,083,154	251,008,050	(7,075,104)	158,233,107	92,774,943	251,008,050	
CSN	92,875,829	35,424,860		128,300,689	135,596,718	7,296,029	100,171,858	35,424,860	135,596,718	
GBC	16,087,974	2,718,887		18,806,861	21,091,998	2,285,137	18,373,111	2,718,887	21,091,998	
TMCC	38,981,293	10,967,486		49,948,779	50,816,200	867,421	39,848,714	10,967,486	50,816,200	
WNC	20,181,848	3,425,763		23,607,611	23,936,719	329,108	20,510,956	3,425,763	23,936,719	
NSC	16,379,136	2,554,698		18,933,834	15,746,534	(3,187,300)	13,191,836	2,554,698	15,746,534	
DRI	3,304,032			3,304,032	3,314,608	10,576	3,314,608	0	3,314,608	
NFB				0	997,840	997,840	997,840	0	997,840	
	483,235,788	203,476,720	0	686,712,508	686,712,505	(3)	483,235,785	203,476,720	686,712,505	
SA	5,295,772	111,460		5,407,232	5,407,232	0	5,295,772	111,460	5,407,232	
SP	2,496,267			2,496,267	2,496,267	0	2,496,267	0	2,496,267	
SCS	21,517,326			21,517,326	21,517,326	0	21,517,326	0	21,517,326	
UP	858,634			858,634	858,634	0	858,634	0	858,634	
SOM	32,795,468	3,175,716		35,971,184	35,971,184	0	32,795,468	3,175,716	35,971,184	
ICR-R	6,367,379			6,367,379	6,367,379	0	6,367,379	0	6,367,379	
SW-R	8,026,266			8,026,266	8,026,266	0	8,026,266	0	8,026,266	
CES	9,004,929	1,847,346		10,852,275	10,852,275	0	9,004,929	1,847,346	10,852,275	
AES	8,743,308	1,389,398		10,132,706	10,132,706	0	8,743,308	1,389,398	10,132,706	
SHL	1,922,068			1,922,068	1,922,068	0	1,922,068	0	1,922,068	
ICA-LV	8,355,481			8,355,481	8,355,481	0	8,355,481	0	8,355,481	
LS	8,699,932	4,308,192		13,008,124	13,008,124	0	8,699,932	4,308,192	13,008,124	
SW-LV	1,378,578			1,378,578	1,378,578	0	1,378,578	0	1,378,578	
DS	8,166,497	4,751,716		12,918,213	12,918,213	0	8,166,497	4,751,716	12,918,213	
BCN	2,420,714			2,420,714	2,420,714	0	2,420,714	0	2,420,714	
BCS	2,059,119			2,059,119	2,059,119	0	2,059,119	0	2,059,119	
NDSL	45,948			45,948	45,948	0	45,948	0	45,948	
DRI	5,849,013	148,486		5,997,499	5,997,499	0	5,849,013	148,486	5,997,499	
	134,002,699	15,732,314	0	149,735,013	149,735,013	0	134,002,699	15,732,314	149,735,013	
	617,238,487	219,209,034	0	836,447,521	836,447,518	(3)	617,238,484	219,209,034	836,447,518	

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

The amounts funded via formula are shown as driven by the 2008-09 enrollments. The formula funding level is 77.23 percent in FY 2009-10 and 77.05 percent in FY 2010-11.

The following calculations detail the amount of total revenue that would be generated at a 5% increase over the fee level approved by the Board of Regents for FY 10 and FY 11. Neither this fee, nor its distribution, have been reviewed or voted on by the Board. This calculation was prepared using projected FY 09 enrollments as the enrollment level for FY 10 and FY 11.

Attachment: Response 1 b 2

	Registration Fees as reflected in the Executive Budget (as amended)		Registration Fees using formula generated enrollments for FY 10 and FY 11		Registration Fees using projected FY 09 AAFTE as budgeted level for FY 10 and FY 11	
	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11
UNR	\$ 33,117,776	\$ 35,482,626	\$ 33,397,534	\$ 35,883,568	\$ 32,893,719	\$ 34,809,083
UNLV	\$ 52,728,431	\$ 56,092,695	\$ 51,220,470	\$ 53,960,761	\$ 51,530,647	\$ 54,616,212
NSC	\$ 2,621,706	\$ 2,988,495	\$ 2,460,753	\$ 2,805,419	\$ 2,268,274	\$ 2,383,473
CSN	\$ 28,904,583	\$ 32,230,236	\$ 29,156,270	\$ 32,605,381	\$ 27,379,958	\$ 28,753,495
GBC	\$ 2,613,047	\$ 2,941,496	\$ 2,599,933	\$ 2,921,744	\$ 2,429,833	\$ 2,551,946
TMCC	\$ 8,708,436	\$ 9,492,489	\$ 8,860,722	\$ 9,714,492	\$ 8,487,414	\$ 8,913,185
WNC	\$ 2,949,132	\$ 3,109,001	\$ 3,146,432	\$ 3,389,685	\$ 3,067,183	\$ 3,221,058
	\$ 131,643,111	\$ 142,337,039	\$ 130,842,116	\$ 141,281,050	\$ 128,057,027	\$ 135,248,452

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

The following calculations detail the amount of total revenue that would be generated at a 5% increase over the fee level approved by the Board of Regents for FY 10 and FY 11. Neither this fee, nor its distribution, have been reviewed or voted on by the Board. These calculations were prepared using projected FY 09 enrollments as the enrollment level for FY 10 and FY 11.



	FY 10 BOR App'd Fee	FY 11 BOR App'd Fee	Additional 5% FY 10 *	Additional 5% FY 11 *	FY 10 Budget Credit Hours**	FY 11 Budget Credit Hours**	Collection Rate	FY 10 Add'l Rev	FY 11 Add'l Rev
<b>UNR</b>									
Undergraduate	\$ 136.00	\$ 142.75	\$ 6.80	\$ 7.14	323,250	323,250	96.09%	\$ 2,112,154.29	\$ 2,216,985.48
Graduate	\$ 217.75	\$ 239.50	\$ 10.89	\$ 11.98	38,913	38,913	96.09%	\$ 407,104.16	\$ 447,767.84
<b>UNR Total</b>								<b>\$ 2,519,258.45</b>	<b>\$ 2,664,753.31</b>
<b>UNLV</b>									
Undergraduate	\$ 136.00	\$ 142.75	\$ 6.80	\$ 7.14	489,517	489,517	95.46%	\$ 3,177,591.26	\$ 3,335,302.59
Graduate	\$ 217.75	\$ 239.50	\$ 10.89	\$ 11.98	73,082	73,082	95.46%	\$ 759,560.55	\$ 835,429.40
<b>UNLV Total</b>								<b>\$ 3,937,151.81</b>	<b>\$ 4,170,731.99</b>
<b>NSC</b>									
Undergraduate	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	41,010	41,010	93.64%	\$ 188,648.67	\$ 198,249.11
<b>NSC Total</b>								<b>\$ 188,648.67</b>	<b>\$ 198,249.11</b>
<b>CSN</b>									
Upper Div	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	589	589	95.42%	\$ 2,760.94	\$ 2,901.45
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	630,551	630,551	95.42%	\$ 1,805,015.29	\$ 1,895,266.06
<b>CSN Total</b>								<b>\$ 1,807,776.23</b>	<b>\$ 1,898,167.51</b>
<b>GBC</b>									
Upper Div	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	6,279	6,279	95.62%	\$ 29,494.55	\$ 30,995.55
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	47,751	47,751	95.62%	\$ 136,978.52	\$ 143,827.44
<b>GBC Total</b>								<b>\$ 166,473.07</b>	<b>\$ 174,822.99</b>
<b>TMCC</b>									
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	203,700	203,700	91.67%	\$ 560,195.37	\$ 588,205.14
<b>TMCC Total</b>								<b>\$ 560,195.37</b>	<b>\$ 588,205.14</b>
<b>WNC</b>									
Upper Div	\$ 98.25	\$ 103.25	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.16	311	311	90.26%	\$ 1,378.98	\$ 1,449.16
Lower Div	\$ 60.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.15	74,360	74,360	90.26%	\$ 201,352.01	\$ 211,419.61
<b>WNC Total</b>								<b>\$ 202,730.99</b>	<b>\$ 212,868.77</b>
<b>NSHE Total</b>								<b>\$ 9,382,234.59</b>	<b>\$ 9,907,798.81</b>

\* Neither this fee, nor its distribution, have been reviewed or voted on by the Board of Regents

\*\* Assumes FY 09 projected enrollment levels for FY 10 and FY 11

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

2. **Low Income Student Participation:** *In its presentation, the NSHE indicated that Nevada's college participation rate for low-income students dropped to 12.2 percent in 2007. In response, the Subcommittee asked the NSHE to provide the following:*
- a. *The steps and actions the NSHE is taking to address the decline in the participation rate.*

**Response:**

NSHE has taken numerous steps to address outreach to students from low-income families. Some of these are general -- as one would expect with Nevada's overall low-college going rate where we are encouraging all high school graduates to go to college. These include a *Go to College* brochure which has been distributed statewide to middle school students and their parents now for 5 years. Each institution reaches out to high school students in various ways such as College nights and events to bring students to the campus. Recently, NSHE launched a project to reach out to adults who have dropped out of our institutions with enough credits to be close to receiving a degree in partnership with Lumina and WICHE. Many of these adults are also low income.

But the key ingredients are adequate financial aid and student support services. NSHE universities promote the Gear Up, Upward Bound, and TRIO programs for students from low income families. The University of Nevada, Reno, launched the Pack Advantage program for all Pell grant recipients that will cover tuition, fees and books for up to four years for these low income students. UNLV has Academic Opportunity Awards for students of under-represented populations through community partnership and individual student awards. The colleges are all active on high school campuses, encouraging first generation college students to take dual enrollment courses and to apply for financial aid early.

Board policy as described in 2.c. requires a set aside from each student fee increase for financial aid for students. The amount has varied through the years but overall has risen as fees have risen in an attempt to keep fees affordable for the lowest income students. Anticipated Fall 2010 student access fees set aside are 10 percent of university undergraduate student fees, 11.5 percent of university graduate student fees, 12 percent of Nevada State College undergraduate student fees, and 5 percent of community college lower division fees. Of that financial aid set aside by institutions, at least 80 percent has to be need-based at the undergraduate level and thus is targeted to meet the needs of students from low income families.

Need-based financial aid in 2007-08 (the most recent year with complete data) comprised 35 percent of total aid given to students. Primarily this is in the form of grants and loans. Pell Grants are the primary source of federal need-based grants. The average annual Pell grant for NSHE students in 2007-08 was \$2,388, with 13,699 students receiving Pell

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

grants. With the recent increase in the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007, the maximum dollar amount of Pell grants rose to \$4,731. It is anticipated that this may enable NSHE to assist more Pell-grant eligible students.

It must be noted, however, that it is almost impossible to continue to proactively address the decline in the participation rate of students from low income families in a time when fewer classes can be offered and critical services for first generation students are being cut due to budget constraints. Additionally, it is critical to provide sufficient financial aid to cover their full financial need. While programs covering just part of the cost of education, such as registration fees, remain critical, they at a minimum serve as a "band-aid" and do not serve to fully remove all financial barriers for the student.

The reality remains that with relatively little need-based assistance, the declining value of the Millennium Scholarship, and now the perception that budget cuts have shut the door on many prospective students, attracting and retaining qualified low-income students will continue to be one of NSHE's primary challenges. We are committed to address this problem through every means possible as we go forward.

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

- b. The demographic and institutional data which shows where students are entering/participating in the system.**

**Response:**

The following table indicates Pell Grants distributed in 2007-08 by institution:

<b>Number of Pell Grants by Institution (2007-08)</b>		
	<u>Total*</u>	<u>Percent</u>
UNLV	4,034	29%
UNR	1,692	12%
NSC	314	2%
CSN	4,690	34%
GBC	431	3%
TMCC	1,709	12%
WNC	829	6%
<b>NSHE Total</b>	<b>13,699</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*Source: NSHE 2007-08 Financial Aid Report*

Demographic data of Pell Grant recipients is not readily available in the System Office. Below is demographic data by institution for need-based grants that is a close approximation of the information requested.

<b>Student Grants by Institution and Ethnicity (2007-08)</b>								
	<u>UNLV</u>	<u>UNR</u>	<u>NSC</u>	<u>CSN</u>	<u>GBC</u>	<u>TMCC</u>	<u>WNC</u>	<u>NSHE Total</u>
Native American	4%	2%	1%	2%	6%	6%	7%	4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	17%	7%	8%	9%	1%	6%	2%	9%
Black	15%	4%	14%	27%	4%	7%	4%	13%
Hispanic	15%	9%	12%	18%	10%	13%	9%	13%
White	39%	61%	49%	36%	74%	61%	68%	50%
Unknown	11%	17%	15%	9%	6%	6%	10%	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Source: NSHE 2007-08 Financial Aid Report*

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

- c. If fees need to be increased, provide a copy of the policies which the Board of Regents have in place to ensure need-based financial aid is protected and increased.**

**Response:**

The following Board policy is currently in place and ensures the allocation of certain dollars to need-based financial aid (Title 4, Chapter 18, Section 18):

*In order to improve the access of all students and to encourage participation in higher education, an amount up to 50% of all registration fee increases, net the amounts distributed to other fee categories, will be dedicated to student financial assistance. For the purposes of this section, "Student Access funds" means budgeted dollars intended for student financial aid, including allocations for such funds from state appropriations and funds generated from registration fees. The guidelines for the use of Student Access funds are as follows:*

- 1. One-hundred percent (100%) of Student Access funds will be used for financial assistance for students. Except for the Regents' Service Program, funds will not be used for administrative or any other purposes, unless specifically authorized by Board policy. The portion derived from undergraduate student enrollments will be dedicated to undergraduate financial assistance. The portion derived from graduate student enrollments will be dedicated to graduate financial assistance; however this shall not include funding of base salaries for graduate assistantships.*
- 2. At least eighty percent (80%) of state-funded Student Access funds for each institution each academic year will go to need-based programs, according to federal government methodology, for both undergraduate and graduate students.*
- 3. The remainder of the state-funded Student Access funds (not to exceed 20%) for each institution each academic year will go to other "access-oriented" financial assistance, including but not limited to scholarships non-need based grants and work study programs, for both undergraduate and graduate students.*
- 4. For fee-generated Student Access funds, at least eighty percent (80%) of undergraduate funds and at least 50% of graduate funds for each institution each academic year will go to need-based programs, according to federal government methodology.*

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

5. *The remainder of the fee-generated Student Access funds (not to exceed 20% for undergraduate and 50% for graduate students) for each institution each academic year will go to other "access-oriented" financial assistance, including but not limited to scholarships and other non-need based grant programs.*
6. *The institution will present a report each year to the Board of Regents showing how the Student Access funds were utilized. The findings of the report will be used to evaluate these guidelines.*
7. *Nothing in this Section precludes an institution from allocating additional funds for general scholarship purposes. Any such additional allocations are not subject to the student access distribution established in this Section.*
8. *Awards granted to students using Student Access funds shall be named the "Regents Higher Education Opportunity Award."*

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

***d. The definition of "low income" being utilized by the NSHE.***

**Response:**

While there are many methodologies used to measure low income status for students, NSHE identifies low-income as those students who are eligible for the federal Pell Grant, which is designed to help the neediest undergraduate students. Information is collected from students via the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Using formulas mandated by Congress in the Higher Education Amendments of 1965, as amended, financial need is determined via the FAFSA process and an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) is established for each student. The lower the EFC, the greater the demonstration of a student's financial need, and the amount of the grant increases as the EFC decreases. The Pell Grant serves as the foundation of financial aid, to which aid from Federal and non-Federal sources is added.

**Nevada System of Higher Education  
Responses to March 20, 2009, Budget Hearing  
Prepared for "Work Session"**

---

- e. *The information provided indicates Nevada ranked 49<sup>th</sup> in low-income student participation. Please identify the source of the data and, in table format, provide the comparative 50-state and national data so that Nevada's 49<sup>th</sup>-place rank can be more clearly understood.*

**Response:**

Information concerning low-income student participation is from the February 2009 edition of *Postsecondary Education Opportunities*. From that publication the table titled, "College Participation Rates for Students from Low Income Families by States," is attached.



**College Participation Rates for Students from Low Income Families by State**  
FY1993 to FY2007

State	Fiscal Year:														
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Alabama	13.6%	15.4%	13.6%	11.5%	13.1%	18.4%	19.3%	18.8%	18.4%	20.3%	21.6%	22.8%	22.4%	20.8%	20.4%
Alaska	4.5%	5.5%	6.5%	5.4%	5.5%	9.6%	10.1%	8.1%	8.2%	7.5%	7.7%	9.4%	8.6%	7.9%	5.5%
Arizona	16.3%	14.3%	23.3%	18.5%	20.0%	23.2%	20.3%	17.4%	16.0%	15.8%	16.7%	17.9%	18.1%	16.1%	14.8%
Arkansas	16.0%	13.6%	14.0%	14.6%	14.8%	21.3%	24.6%	20.2%	19.4%	18.5%	23.5%	24.2%	23.8%	22.0%	21.4%
California	16.5%	24.1%	25.3%	28.4%	30.0%	27.2%	26.1%	24.4%	22.5%	22.7%	22.6%	22.9%	22.1%	21.2%	20.7%
Colorado	16.4%	21.8%	18.9%	14.0%	15.8%	22.7%	24.8%	21.2%	18.5%	17.2%	21.9%	24.7%	25.4%	23.5%	22.7%
Connecticut	17.2%	25.1%	24.3%	31.8%	30.1%	30.0%	30.0%	24.9%	24.0%	24.5%	25.3%	26.2%	26.0%	26.5%	26.4%
Delaware	14.1%	12.4%	11.1%	10.4%	21.9%	24.7%	36.6%	24.0%	20.2%	19.7%	19.9%	20.4%	20.0%	17.7%	18.9%
Dist of Columbia	12.2%	12.3%	13.0%	20.6%	19.4%	14.6%	18.7%	15.4%	16.1%	17.3%	17.8%	19.6%	19.0%	19.5%	19.3%
Florida	20.7%	20.0%	23.0%	27.7%	26.4%	26.4%	24.4%	22.7%	21.9%	22.8%	24.3%	24.7%	23.6%	22.7%	24.4%
Georgia	13.1%	15.3%	14.6%	18.3%	19.0%	20.7%	17.6%	19.2%	16.2%	19.1%	20.1%	20.4%	20.0%	20.1%	21.0%
Hawaii	9.0%	15.0%	14.2%	16.1%	22.9%	21.2%	25.5%	28.6%	29.4%	30.9%	29.5%	22.2%	19.9%	17.4%	16.5%
Idaho	16.4%	16.6%	17.5%	15.3%	19.6%	27.0%	26.8%	24.7%	23.3%	23.6%	24.4%	25.0%	25.0%	21.2%	20.5%
Illinois	23.4%	22.2%	20.5%	24.3%	23.2%	26.3%	28.0%	24.6%	23.6%	28.7%	26.5%	27.6%	25.7%	22.9%	22.9%
Indiana	18.9%	21.1%	21.6%	19.6%	22.9%	32.3%	36.4%	25.5%	23.4%	25.0%	27.6%	29.6%	28.8%	27.4%	26.7%
Iowa	26.9%	28.6%	22.8%	31.7%	28.2%	43.5%	45.3%	39.0%	37.0%	39.3%	42.1%	43.7%	41.3%	35.5%	35.5%
Kansas	24.5%	29.0%	22.2%	27.4%	33.6%	30.7%	31.9%	28.0%	26.3%	26.7%	26.8%	28.3%	28.2%	25.0%	24.8%
Kentucky	20.0%	17.8%	17.2%	18.7%	19.8%	20.3%	20.5%	18.8%	17.4%	18.7%	20.0%	21.1%	21.1%	19.8%	19.8%
Louisiana	18.7%	19.2%	22.1%	18.1%	16.0%	19.8%	19.0%	18.2%	17.1%	17.9%	18.5%	19.0%	19.1%	17.6%	17.2%
Maine	26.4%	27.7%	31.9%	38.8%	35.5%	37.0%	41.4%	41.6%	31.0%	30.9%	33.0%	33.2%	34.0%	31.3%	31.4%
Maryland	23.9%	25.4%	26.3%	26.4%	28.7%	33.8%	34.4%	32.8%	28.7%	28.5%	27.7%	27.6%	27.2%	25.9%	26.3%
Massachusetts	32.0%	33.0%	32.7%	34.0%	40.0%	47.0%	43.7%	37.6%	33.0%	32.3%	32.6%	33.5%	33.5%	30.5%	31.7%
Michigan	21.6%	21.2%	22.4%	22.2%	26.0%	28.1%	30.1%	26.3%	24.3%	25.5%	28.5%	29.3%	30.5%	28.6%	30.2%
Minnesota	48.4%	63.3%	42.4%	41.4%	45.8%	38.0%	38.3%	29.9%	28.4%	30.6%	30.5%	33.1%	32.8%	29.4%	29.4%
Mississippi	17.4%	18.1%	17.7%	16.5%	18.5%	20.4%	20.4%	18.9%	19.6%	21.1%	22.4%	23.5%	23.5%	22.4%	22.5%
Missouri	23.6%	25.1%	25.2%	23.6%	24.4%	25.6%	25.4%	23.8%	22.7%	23.0%	25.0%	25.5%	25.8%	23.9%	24.0%
Montana	23.8%	25.4%	23.3%	23.4%	23.9%	37.3%	42.0%	36.2%	34.0%	32.2%	30.3%	34.0%	31.8%	29.1%	27.1%
Nebraska	29.5%	30.9%	26.5%	29.2%	33.9%	37.6%	37.2%	33.9%	32.1%	32.8%	37.2%	37.8%	41.2%	33.0%	31.4%
Nevada	15.4%	12.6%	9.2%	17.5%	14.6%	23.2%	25.2%	17.8%	15.9%	15.4%	15.5%	15.9%	14.9%	14.2%	12.2%
New Hampshire	33.3%	41.3%	47.6%	79.8%	63.7%	54.9%	55.9%	45.5%	37.1%	35.2%	35.7%	36.6%	38.8%	34.3%	36.0%
New Jersey	24.5%	30.1%	37.7%	37.6%	43.5%	37.9%	48.4%	49.7%	41.3%	38.2%	43.7%	41.8%	36.1%	33.6%	34.3%
New Mexico	12.3%	15.4%	15.6%	13.1%	14.7%	18.5%	20.2%	18.5%	16.1%	21.2%	17.1%	19.5%	21.3%	17.6%	16.0%
New York	29.6%	32.4%	33.4%	42.0%	40.6%	43.0%	44.6%	41.7%	42.2%	37.9%	37.8%	38.3%	37.5%	34.2%	34.2%
North Carolina	15.2%	16.2%	16.4%	16.3%	17.7%	19.8%	21.3%	20.3%	19.7%	21.9%	24.6%	26.6%	26.6%	24.6%	24.5%
North Dakota	33.0%	28.1%	26.2%	31.3%	37.1%	46.1%	47.4%	41.2%	39.0%	38.9%	39.8%	40.4%	32.4%	30.3%	28.8%
Ohio	22.0%	21.4%	21.5%	20.7%	21.3%	26.6%	28.5%	25.2%	23.8%	25.3%	26.8%	29.3%	30.1%	30.1%	30.0%
Oklahoma	19.5%	23.3%	19.1%	21.3%	19.3%	22.3%	22.1%	20.5%	19.3%	19.4%	19.9%	20.6%	20.2%	19.0%	17.4%
Oregon	14.3%	19.6%	20.6%	20.1%	17.7%	25.7%	28.2%	23.7%	22.4%	25.4%	26.3%	26.4%	26.4%	21.3%	20.3%
Pennsylvania	24.0%	23.7%	35.0%	37.5%	37.3%	48.0%	48.4%	44.4%	38.3%	32.7%	34.1%	34.6%	32.6%	34.9%	36.2%
Rhode Island	18.3%	23.8%	34.2%	35.0%	42.3%	41.1%	40.2%	32.4%	30.3%	29.5%	29.9%	27.0%	27.0%	25.4%	25.8%
South Carolina	15.3%	18.5%	20.2%	17.8%	20.3%	20.5%	21.5%	20.3%	19.1%	19.9%	21.4%	22.6%	22.8%	21.1%	21.7%
South Dakota	21.5%	24.4%	19.9%	20.3%	22.4%	31.0%	32.8%	26.9%	27.1%	23.1%	25.7%	29.1%	27.6%	23.3%	22.8%
Tennessee	16.5%	17.4%	15.8%	14.9%	16.9%	18.0%	18.7%	18.0%	17.9%	19.1%	20.1%	18.9%	20.6%	21.0%	21.6%
Texas	16.5%	15.6%	15.4%	14.7%	15.2%	19.1%	19.1%	17.5%	16.3%	17.1%	19.0%	20.9%	20.8%	20.0%	19.7%
Utah	13.8%	17.0%	16.1%	12.9%	15.3%	24.5%	21.0%	18.1%	16.8%	16.5%	17.8%	19.2%	19.7%	17.9%	16.8%
Vermont	17.9%	25.3%	36.2%	31.4%	38.8%	48.4%	52.5%	44.6%	38.2%	36.2%	35.8%	32.9%	35.4%	31.5%	31.4%
Virginia	15.9%	18.9%	19.3%	20.5%	21.4%	29.5%	28.2%	21.9%	24.7%	24.5%	24.3%	25.3%	25.4%	21.8%	22.4%
Washington	16.9%	17.7%	17.1%	16.7%	23.0%	24.5%	25.2%	22.0%	21.4%	21.6%	22.7%	23.0%	22.3%	20.5%	19.6%
West Virginia	16.6%	17.9%	16.5%	16.5%	18.1%	21.6%	23.1%	21.5%	20.6%	21.4%	22.4%	21.4%	21.8%	18.6%	19.2%
Wisconsin	36.8%	23.7%	29.7%	31.2%	32.1%	33.1%	35.5%	27.9%	25.8%	27.6%	28.6%	30.4%	30.8%	27.4%	28.7%
Wyoming	17.9%	19.6%	17.1%	13.9%	21.6%	29.0%	26.6%	23.7%	20.2%	19.8%	19.1%	18.8%	19.3%	16.2%	14.6%
Total	20.1%	21.8%	22.4%	23.3%	24.5%	27.4%	27.7%	25.1%	23.5%	24.1%	25.1%	25.8%	25.4%	23.9%	23.8%

Source: Postsecondary Education Opportunity, February 2009