Minutes were approved at the September 3-4, 2026 Quarterly meeting.

BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

University of Nevada, Reno
Joe Crowley Student Union, Ballrooms B & C
87 West Stadium Way, Reno

Thursday, June 11, 2026
Friday, June 12, 2026

Members Present:
Mr. Byron Brooks, Chair
Ms. Stephanie Goodman, Vice Chair
Mr. Joseph C. Arrascada
Mr. Aaron Bautista
Mr. Patrick J. Boylan
Mrs. Susan Brager
Ms. Heather Brown
Mrs. Amy J. Carvalho
Mrs. Carol Del Carlo
Dr. Jeffrey S. Downs
Mr. Carlos D. Fernandez
Mr. Pete Goicoechea
Ms. Jennifer J. McGrath

Others Present:
Mr. Matt McNair, Chancellor
Ms. Renée Davis, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Mr. James J. Martines, Vice Chancellor and Chief General Counsel
Mr. Brody Leiser, Vice Chancellor of Budget and Finance/ Chief Financial Officer
Ms. Keri D. Nikolajewski, Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents
Mr. Chris Nielsen, Special Counsel to the Board of Regents
Dr. Stacy S. Klippenstein, President, CSN
Dr. Kumud Acharya, President, DRI
Dr. Amber Donnelli, President, GBC
Dr. Amber Lopez Lasater, Acting President, NSU
Dr. Jeffrey W. Alexander, President, TMCC
Dr. Chris Heavey, Interim President, UNLV
Mr. Brian Sandoval, President, UNR
Dr. J. Kyle Dalpe, President, WNC

Faculty senate chairs in attendance: Tracy Sherman, CSN; Dr. Vera Samburova, DRI; Oscar Sida, GBC; Dr. El Hachemi Bouali, NSU; Dr. Jinger Doe, TMCC; Dr. Maria Roberts, UNLV; Dr. Jennifer McClendon, UNR; and Jessica Rowe, WNC. Student body presidents in attendance: Brayden Boulter, CSN; Storm Raine, GBC; Stephanie Flores, NSU; Pulin Muangsiri, TMCC; Kelechi Odunze, UNLV-CSUN; Trey Curtis-Brown, UNLV-GPSA; Dillon Moss, UNR-ASUN; Ratchanya Dev Chinnappan, UNR-GSA; Karla Salas, WNC; and Devan Glensor, UNR-ASUNSOM. NSHE Classified Council Executive Board members in attendance: Lisa Carter, UNLV; and Gustavo Gomez, UNR.

Chair Byron Brooks called the meeting to order at 11:50 a.m. with all members present. Jade Colon sang the national anthem and Regent Downs led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Brooks noted that Agenda Item 25 was withdrawn at the request of University of Nevada, Reno President Brian Sandoval.

1. Information Only-Public Comment

Dr. Deborah Arteaga discussed a double standard at UNLV that concerned many faculty members. She noted that she had been a member of World Languages and Cultures for 34 years and explained that while every faculty member from lecturers to tenured associate professors had been vetted through a national search, this was often not the case for administrators. She asserted there was no reason the UNLV President, as the chief academic officer, should not be vetted like all other faculty. Dr. Arteaga highlighted that all other NSHE presidents had been selected via a national search. She concluded that given the double standard and UNLV's status as an R1 institution, Dr. Heavey should not only welcome a national search but insist on one.

Mr. Randy Robison, Director of Government Affairs for the City of Las Vegas and the Chair for the Institutional Advisory Council at CSN spoke in support of Agenda Item 13. He explained that they had spoken about the Northwest Campus and the potential for that site. He acknowledged that the campus had been under discussion for quite some time and thanked the Board for voting to elevate it on the recent CIP list. He remarked that there was a long road ahead and declared that, on behalf of the City of Las Vegas, he was in full support of the amendment to the agreement. Mr. Robison concluded that the City of Las Vegas had been, was, and would continue to be an enthusiastic partner for the potential Northwest Campus.

Mr. J.J. Goicoechea submitted written public comment in support of the UNR School of Veterinary Medicine proposal *(BOR Agenda Item #44 - ARSA Committee Report/ ARSA Item #8).* He emphasized that Nevada faces a significant veterinarian shortage, particularly in rural and underserved areas. Mr. Goicoechea stated that the proposed program would create research, innovation and job opportunities. He noted that the proposed program would be a transformative step toward achieving Nevada Department of Agriculture's goals.

Two written comments were received in support of the UNLV Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) in Clinical Psychology program proposal *(BOR Agenda Item #44 - ARSA Committee Report/ ARSA Item #5):*

- Mr. Kevin Osten-Garner explained that UNLV's proposed Psy.D. program was designed as a generalist, practitioner-oriented degree with a strong emphasis on youth and family services. He stated that the program provided specialized training in trauma-

1. Information Only-Public Comment – *(Continued)*

informed care, substance abuse treatment, culturally responsive practice, and other evidence-based clinical skills through coursework and hands-on experience. Mr. Osten-Garner noted that Nevada ranked 51st in overall mental health and was projected to face a shortage of about 420 full-time psychologists by 2030, reflecting major workforce gaps across the state. He emphasized that severe shortages in child and adolescent services, high HPSA scores, and rising substance use challenges had made the program's community-based practicum and internship partnerships especially important.

- Ms. Carolyn Streb stated that she was a Las Vegas-born student whose family had lived in the area since 1930, and she had witnessed generations of struggle with mental healthcare in the community. She explained that after returning to Las Vegas from California, she found there were very limited Psy.D. options nearby, with Utah being the closest choice for many students. Ms. Streb asserted that creating the program in Las Vegas would have benefited both the community and local mental health outcomes by helping train and retain more professionals. She added that the program would have allowed her and others passionate about serving their hometown to pursue doctoral education while staying rooted in the community.

2. Information Only-Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations – UNR President Brian Sandoval noted that before the presenters were heard, he wanted to take a moment to recognize what they represented. He explained that the individuals exemplified the caliber of teaching and community engagement that defined the University of Nevada, Reno. President Sandoval remarked that these qualities made the institution worthy of the partnerships and investments they continue to attract.

He introduced Mr. Abdulwarith Kassim as a Ph.D. candidate, originally from Nigeria. He mentioned that Mr. Kassim worked on the design of chemically recyclable polymers that could be built on demand. He added that this work was advancing the next generation of sustainable materials and had been published in a premier journal in polymer science. President Sandoval highlighted that beyond Mr. Kassim's research, he is a dedicated community builder and science advocate. He noted that Mr. Kassim was a founding member of several university chapters, including the National Organization for the Professional Advancement of Black Chemical Engineers and the African Student's Association. He pointed out that Mr. Kassim was a two-time Three-Minute Thesis champion at the university.

Mr. Kassim noted that the reality of plastics in landfills and ocean pollution was very much real. He clarified that his research was not intended to argue against the existence of those environmental issues. Mr. Kassim remarked that plastic materials were beautiful and announced that he would be talking about plastic recycling. He described polymers as long chains of repeating units of a molecule, comparing them to beads on a necklace. Mr. Kassim observed that every time materials were recycled, their properties got worse, and questioned if that was truly recycling or just a slower way to make waste. He mentioned common suggestions like using paper straws but stated that his research focused on a more sustainable way to recycle plastic. Mr. Kassim explained that one method was the chemical recycling of polymers using polymer chains designed with an exchangeable bond. He noted

2. Information Only-Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations – *(Continued)*

that the first part of the process involved breaking down the plastic and that the second part of the reaction used those broken-down pieces as building blocks to repeat the process. He emphasized that this cycle could go on indefinitely without a loss in the material's properties. Mr. Kassim shared his excitement that this was not just an idea but already worked in the lab. He concluded that the solution was not necessarily to eliminate plastics, but to rethink the solutions to plastic problems.

Regent Brown inquired about Mr. Kassim's commercialization plan. Mr. Kassim explained that the first phase of the project involved finding a system that worked. He noted that they were currently in the process of optimizing the material. Mr. Kassim added that from those stages, they would move toward scaling up the feasibility and safety for consumption. He pointed out that the project had been ongoing for about three or four years and was still in its foundational stages.

Vice Chair Goodman stated that she thought she could speak for everyone when saying this was the reason they were all there. She noted that she would be remiss if she didn't mention that back in her glory days, she had started the recycling program at UNLV. She loved the sustainability aspect and offered Mr. Kassim her congratulations and thanks for being in the state, and his contributions to the University of Nevada, Reno.

President Sandoval next introduced Dr. Lindsay Munro, a teaching professor in the Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, and Biotechnology. He explained that she had been deeply engaged in advancing pedagogy and implementing research-informed teaching practices that promoted meaningful student learning. President Sandoval added that her recent work focused on supporting faculty and students as they navigated the landscape of generative AI in higher education. President Sandoval noted that Dr. Munro's awards included the University's Distinguished Teacher Award and the Paul and Judy Bible Teaching Excellence Awards.

Dr. Munro reiterated that she had been an educator for 13 years and could honestly say that only recently, during the current AI moment, had she felt the responsibility of her role as heavily as she did now. She expressed her strong belief that it was the responsibility of educators and mentors to teach students AI literacy, including the responsible and ethical use of the technology. Dr. Munro remarked that as an educator who loved her students, she wanted them to leave the institution as prepared as possible for the world they were about to enter. She explained that part of that preparation involved equipping faculty with the skills to pass on AI literacy to students, leading to numerous collaborative initiatives involving the libraries, the teaching excellence office, and the provost's office.

Dr. Munro mentioned that a group through the AAC&U Institute had developed an AI framework focused on awareness, understanding what AI is and isn't, and knowing where information comes from to better articulate these concepts to students. She expressed that she was most enthusiastic about sharing two specific student-centered Pack AI initiatives: a generative AI certificate, and a course called "AI in the Wild." Dr. Munro stated that the generative AI certificate was currently being developed with Nevada Online as a three-course, nine-credit program covering AI fundamentals, ethics, and applications in various

2. Information Only-Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations – *(Continued)*

disciplines. She noted that this would equip students with the knowledge to make responsible decisions within their specific career paths and that the certificate would also be offered to non-degree seeking students.

She shared that her favorite project was a one-credit weekend course called "AI in the Wild" offered at the Lake Tahoe campus, which had been taught twice so far. Dr. Munro explained that in the course, she taught students AI fundamentals before taking them into the field for an outdoor experience, such as a hike, to collect observations and sketches. She noted that students then returned to the classroom to learn how to use generative AI as a collaborator to create creative artifacts. Dr. Munro shared that the most remarkable things she had noticed so far were the student reflections on how AI enhanced or hindered their experience with nature. She stated that the creativity and experience shown through the one-credit course had been truly remarkable.

Chair Brooks stated that the Board recognized the importance of AI and its development, particularly when talking about students and faculty, and thanked everyone for having the conversation with them.

Regent Del Carlo inquired when the class at Lake Tahoe would be held because she lived within a mile of the campus and would love to attend. Dr. Munro committed to getting her the exact October date.

3. Information Only-Regents' Welcome, Introductions and Reports – Regent Goicoechea stated that he had attended the Advisory Council meeting in Laramie at the end of May. He noted that there were at least nine states that did not have a vet school, including New Mexico, Montana, Idaho, and Nevada. Regent Goicoechea remarked that one thing apparent in the council meeting was the shortage of vets and the thousands of vet students applying who could not get placed. He recognized that it was a case of "build it and they will come" or that they needed a place to come to, and he urged everyone to do their part.

Regent Arrascada noted the UNR School of Veterinary Medicine proposal had been approved in the ARSA committee and is moving forward.

Regent Carvalho stated that she had attended many events during the quarter. She shared that she had been invited by Acting President Lopez Lasater to the Nevada State University Urban Land Institute Technical Assistance Panel, which she described as an awesome presentation. Regent Carvalho explained that as the NSHE representative for Springs Preserve, she attended quarterly meetings. She remarked that Springs Preserve was a treasure in Southern Nevada and was seeing constant increases in engagement and participation. Regent Carvalho stated that as the NSHE representative for the Nevada State Board of Education, she had been attending monthly meetings. She explained that they were tackling many big policy issues facing Nevada, including the future of education in a changing environment. She highlighted the focus on standardized testing to measure student learning and the importance of literacy levels by grade three. Regent Carvalho emphasized that she was very proud to represent the Board.

3. Information Only-Regents' Welcome, Introductions and Reports – *(Continued)*

Regent Del Carlo stated that it had been a busy quarter for her as well. She mentioned that in her role as ACCT National Chair, she had been invited to the AACC conference in Seattle. She explained that she had been invited to present a seminar focused on the trustee perspective of the "dos and don'ts" of being a brand-new president. She reported that she had attended five regional meetings across the country for updates on what was happening with ACCT. Regent Del Carlo announced that she was having a National Board of Directors meeting at Lake Tahoe Community College. She stated that they had also approved their '26-27 budget and that she had attended many graduations and events. Regent Del Carlo stated that she relished her role as a Regent representing students and the state.

4. Information Only-Chair of the Nevada Student Alliance Report – Mr. Kelechi Odunze stated that he was honored to have been appointed by his fellow student body presidents as Chair of the Nevada Student Alliance.

Mr. Odunze highlighted that affordability and higher education were main priorities for the next legislative session. He mentioned that they wanted to provide resources and transparency regarding increases in student fees, especially after the 12 percent increase passed in January. Mr. Odunze shared that a major focus for the year would be access for the entire System and building community across the state. Mr. Odunze expressed that student leaders were ready to partner with the Board, System staff, and institutions to advocate for students. He emphasized that unity would be important during the next legislative session and that showing up together was how they would get things done.

Mr. Odunze provided updates from various institutions, noting that CSUN was finalizing its budget and working on initiatives like an on-campus multicultural center and a tech loaner program. He mentioned that ASUN at UNR was focusing on affordability, food insecurity, and bringing back campus traditions. Mr. Odunze reported that CSN was rapidly filling its vacant senate seats and building a coalition for the next legislative session. He noted that GPSA at UNLV was finalizing constitutional changes and directing funding toward research travel and professional development. He added that Nevada State University was revamping its student space, the "Scorpion Den," while TMCC was opening a new community dining space. He highlighted that Great Basin College had seen a 100 percent increase in student organizations and was continuing key wellness initiatives. Mr. Odunze noted that Western Nevada College had hosted over 250 students for engagement events and participated in senior day for incoming students.

Mr. Odunze stated that all student governments had been busy and were there to serve as good representatives for the entire System, and continued to encourage the Regents' participation.

5. Information Only-NSHE Classified Council Report – Mr. Gustavo Gomez, NSHE Classified Council Secretary, expressed appreciation for the opportunity to join the meeting with the Board as the fiscal year closed. He noted that they attended regular meetings with the Chancellor and looked forward to continuing conversations with Chancellor McNair to support classified staff interests.

5. Information Only-NSHE Classified Council Report – *(Continued)*

Mr. Gomez explained that at the beginning of the fiscal year, the NCC goals were to continue working toward bridging equality and transparency across NSHE institutions. He added that they aimed to improve the presence of classified staff members at critical meetings throughout the state. Mr. Gomez mentioned that they were working toward finding a resolution regarding communication with PERS and the State of Nevada Human Resource Division. He expressed gratitude for the support and collaboration of all NSHE presidents and their willingness to listen and work on solutions with their respective classified councils.

Mr. Gomez noted that they were preparing to welcome newly elected board members as each institution completed their election processes. He stated that incoming officer positions would be established in fiscal year 2027. Mr. Gomez extended gratitude to all institutions and the Board for the opportunity to serve.

6. Information Only- Chair of the Council of Faculty Senate – Dr. Jinger Doe remarked that serving as a Faculty Senate Chair was both a privilege and a profound responsibility. She noted that over the past year, she and her colleagues had worked diligently to advocate for faculty at both individual institutions and the System level. She explained that although institutional missions sometimes differed, they remained united by a shared commitment to students and academic excellence. Dr. Doe thanked the Board for listening to faculty concerns regarding the implementation of reduced credit baccalaureate degrees.

Dr. Doe requested that the Chancellor's office form a working group with administrative faculty from each institution to address their unique positions. She observed that shared governance was not always easy and that thoughtful disagreement was inevitable. She expressed that her experience reaffirmed that decisions were stronger and more sustainable when diverse perspectives were welcomed. Dr. Doe voiced her hope that the spirit of collaboration and mutual respect would continue to strengthen shared governance across NSHE.

Regent Fernandez left the meeting.

Dr. Doe introduced the next generation of Faculty Senate Chairs, including Jessica Rowe, Sandra Cosgrove, Steve Cola, Ethan Hawkly, and others. She concluded by thanking the partners for their dedication and wishing her successors continued success in the important work ahead.

Chair Brooks thanked Dr. Doe for her work as the Chair and for the continued dialogue and conversation.

7. Information Only-Chancellor's Report – Chancellor McNair noted that for his first year, he had been focusing on building relationships with Regents, presidents, shared governance, and community and business leaders. He explained that the past year had been about laying a stronger foundation for NSHE by building the team and listening across the state. Chancellor McNair shared that he had visited every campus multiple times and participated in hundreds of meetings with students, faculty, staff, and government officials.

7. Information Only-Chancellor's Report – *(Continued)*

Regent Fernandez returned to the meeting.

Chancellor McNair took a moment to recognize and congratulate Renée Davis, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, on her long career. He mentioned that he had made key hires in the leadership team across human resources, communications, finance, and government relations. He noted that the System supported the Board through the implementation of the Open Educational Resources policy to advance student affordability.

Mr. McNair stated that for the year ahead, one of the highest priorities was to present a unified voice at the upcoming legislative session.

Chancellor McNair noted that another top priority was enhancing the strategic plan to draw a clearer line between Board direction to campus work. He explained that changes in the last couple of years, including mission differentiation and artificial intelligence, necessitated an update to that plan.

Chancellor McNair emphasized that building trust was one of the most important things the System could do to maximize its ability to serve students and align with workforce needs. He expressed his goal to ensure the NSHE strategic plan became a living management tool that guided decisions and strengthened accountability.

8. Approved-Consent Items (Agenda Item 9) – The Board approved the consent items except for item 9e, which was considered separately.

Pursuant to NRS 281A, Regent Carvalho disclosed that she was a graduate student at UNLV. She specifically noted on Item 9c that Dr. Marianno was her professor. She shared her belief that the independence of judgment of a reasonable person in her situation would not be materially affected by the information presented in Agenda Item 9c and that she would be voting on the matter.

Regent Del Carlo asked that Item 9e be heard separately.

8a. Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the March 5-6, 2026, quarterly and April 17, 2026, special meeting minutes *(Refs. BOR-9a1 and BOR-9a2 on file in the Board office).*

8b. Approved-Appointments, Task Force on Power-Based Violence at Institutions of Higher Education – The Board appointed the following individuals to the Task Force on Power-based Violence at Institutions of Higher Education, pursuant to NRS 396.141(1), *(Ref. BOR-9b on file in the Board office):*

- Shaun Mabanta, B.S., TMCC
- Sarah Peterson, B.S., UNR Med

8. Approved-Consent Items (Agenda Item 9) – *(Continued)*

8c. Approved-WestEd Board of Directors – The Board appointed the following individuals to the WestEd Board of Directors for three-year terms *(June 1, 2026, to May 31, 2029)*, *(Ref. BOR-9c on file in the Board office):*

- Denise Padilla, M.A., GBC
- Bradley Marianno, Ph.D., UNLV

8d. Approved-Gift-in-Kind Donation, UNR – The Board accepted a gift-in-kind donation to the UNR Student Food Pantry consisting of a refrigerator and freezer from the Food Bank of Northern Nevada *(Ref. BOR-9d on file in the Board Office).*

8f. Approved-Allocation of Grants-in-Aid, 2026-27 – The Board approved tuition waivers for students from other states and foreign countries based on 3% of each institution's fall headcount enrollment as provided for in NRS 396.540. Board of Regents policy provides an equal number of grants-in-aid for Nevada students and requires that the total number of grants-in-aid allocated to each NSHE institution be approved annually by the Board. The allocations recommended for approval are for academic year 2026-27 and represent the total number each institution could award. In all cases, funding is not sufficient to support the maximum allowable number of grants-in-aid. *(Ref. BOR-9f on file in the Board Office).*

Regent Downs moved approval of consents items 8a-8d and 8f. Regent Del Carlo seconded. Motion carried.

8e. Approved-Gift-in-Kind Donation, UNR – President Sandoval explained that the university sought approval to accept a generous gift of two robotic platforms from Tesla to support instruction within the College of Engineering. President Sandoval acknowledged that the university had no dedicated manufacturing lab with real-world industrial robots, but that this gift changed that.

President Sandoval pointed out that the robot arms, displayed in the room, were the kind used on actual factory floors and would enable a new manufacturing lab. He shared that the lab would serve both mechanical and industrial engineering programs, giving students direct hands-on experience with automation technology. President Sandoval announced that beginning next fall, Tesla engineers would be on-site in the Pennington Building to work directly alongside students. He explained that they would provide assistance and offer professional mentoring.

President Sandoval noted his understanding that this was the first gift of its kind by Tesla to a university anywhere in the U.S.

Regent Del Carlo moved approval of Item 9e. Vice Chair Goodman seconded. Motion carried.

9. Information Only-UNLV @ Civic Plaza (Agenda Item 14) – University of Nevada, Las Vegas Interim President Chris Heavey presented an update on the vision, proposed programming, and collaborative framework for the UNLV @ Civic Plaza project as it moves through the initial planning and stakeholder engagement phases. *(Ref. BOR-14 on file in the Board office).*

University of Nevada, Las Vegas Interim President Chris Heavey presented an update on the vision, proposed programming, and collaborative framework for the UNLV @ Civic Plaza project as it moves through the initial planning and stakeholder engagement phases. Dr. Heavey shared his expectation to return to the Board with an item for action in the September agenda of the quarterly meeting. He stated that they were aiming to bring the resources of UNLV into the heart of downtown in the Civic Plaza project.

Interim President Heavey described Civic Plaza as a facility built by the city of Las Vegas to bring in key partners, including the Chamber of Commerce, Workforce Connections, and the Secretary of State. He explained that the range of services offered would be accessible to people who did not always have the ability to make it to the Maryland Parkway campus. Interim President Heavey highlighted that at the heart of the programming would be the "Rebel One Stop," which would offer services for admissions, the registrar, financial aid, and financial literacy. He mentioned other potential offerings, such as continuing legal education from the School of Law and high-value micro-credentials.

Dr. Heavey shared his goal to support the business community by bringing services like the Black Fire Innovation Institute and cybersecurity services into the heart of downtown.

Ms. Dina Babsky, Director of Economic and Urban Development for the City of Las Vegas, stated that from the city's perspective, the project was not just about filling space in their beautiful, brand-new Civic Plaza. She explained that it was more about strengthening the connection between higher education, workforce development, and economic growth. Ms. Babsky emphasized that this was why the partnership with UNLV was so important. She recalled that when they first envisioned Civic Plaza, the goal was to create an intersection of government, higher education, workforce development, and community engagement.

Ms. Babsky highlighted that notable partners had already taken space in Civic Plaza, including Workforce Connections and the Vegas Chamber, who moved in last September. She remarked that having UNLV as an addition would be fantastic for the ecosystem they were trying to create.

Regent Arrascada asked what the lease fee was going to be. Interim President Heavey stated that they had a term sheet from the City of Las Vegas that had not been finalized yet. He shared that they expected the rent to be roughly $50,000 a month. Dr. Heavey further noted an amortization over ten years of the tenant improvement costs, which were estimated to be in the range of $5 million. He highlighted that the city would make a significant contribution to cover perhaps as much as 40 percent of those costs. Dr. Heavey committed to having the exact figures when they returned with an action item.

9. Information Only-UNLV @ Civic Plaza (Agenda Item 14) – *(Continued)*

Regent Brown remarked that through partnerships with CSN, Nevada State, and now UNLV, the city was constantly showing engagement in a perfect Venn diagram of business, economic development, and education. She highlighted the potential partnership sectors, including the new art museum and the legal sector between nearby courts and Boyd Law School. Interim President Heavey noted that the art museum was a great example of the types of partnerships they were looking for. He added that having students in the heart of the city would create a vibrant atmosphere that benefited everyone involved.

Regent Fernandez commended UNLV and the City of Las Vegas for putting the plan together. He stated that the project was going to be at the heart of the City of Las Vegas. He acknowledged that the location was in his district and expressed that he was incredibly excited to be able to bring the broader community to the institution. Regent Fernandez thanked those who presented as well as the City Council for the continuous investment they made in higher education and the citizens of the city.

Vice Chair Goodman stated that this was very exciting. She shared that she held a special place for downtown and expressed that it was wonderful to have a presence there. Vice Chair Goodman thanked Ms. Babsky for continuing that momentum. She noted that downtown wasn't always the way it was at that time. She remarked that it was very exciting that they were doing that work and creating those partnerships and thanked them.

Regent Carvalho stated that she was in full support of this. She asked if there was any revenue generation that would be derived from the space. Interim President Heavey stated that they expected some of the continuing education courses through lifelong learning to be revenue-generating. He noted that the cyber clinic and continuing education also had the potential to generate revenue. He explained that in the broad scheme of the financial picture, they were comfortable having the revenue to support the duration of the lease. Interim President Heavey shared that they expected the lease to be ten years with two five-year renewals. He expressed his hope that they would be there for at least ten years and remarked that it was a great investment to make university resources available to the community. He recognized Vice President Constance Brooks from Government Affairs for her work in bringing the project to life as a vibrant offering to UNLV and the community.

10. Approved-President Emeritus, Dr. Karin M. Hilgersom, TMCC (Agenda Item 12) – The Board of Regents granted emeritus status to Dr. Karin M. Hilgersom in recognition of her nine years of service to TMCC and her contributions to the institution and community *(Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 32)*, *(Ref. BOR-12 on file in the Board Office).*

Chancellor McNair noted that Dr. Hilgersom had undertaken significant efforts to modernize all TMCC campuses. He mentioned that her efforts included opening a fitness center and breaking ground on a new performing arts center. Chancellor McNair highlighted that Dr. Hilgersom helped TMCC earn national recognition as a Green Ribbon School for sustainability. He pointed out that it was the first Nevada school to achieve such a distinction.

10. <u>Approved-President Emeritus, Dr. Karin M. Hilgersom, TMCC (Agenda Item 12)</u> – *(Continued)*

Regent Brager asked how it was decided, inquiring if it was a specific number of years. Chancellor McNair stated that there is criteria, including at least five years of service, and that Dr. Hilgersom met them all. Regent Brager shared her view that five years does seem like a long time, representing a small part of someone's career. She noted that she would like to take that into consideration through a new business item.

Regent Downs asked for the list of benefits in receiving emeritus status, specifically what it provides and what the obligations are. Keri D. Nikolajewski, Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents, cited Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 32 of the *Board of Regents Handbook*. A former president granted emeritus status shall be granted office space on campus and attendant privileges. Emeritus status must be recommended by the Chancellor and approved by the Board.

Regent Downs asked TMCC President Alexander whether there is spare office space on campus to fulfill that requirement. President Alexander stated that they could perhaps find interim space. He noted that the campus master plan had recently identified a shortage for existing staff members. He believed there would be space available in the interim and on an ongoing basis.

Regent McGrath inquired if the financial ramifications for the System were limited to providing office space, or if there were additional financial considerations. Chancellor McNair believed that grant-in-aid was another benefit.

Dr. Hilgersom expressed that she was grateful for the opportunity to receive the honor of Emeritus. She thanked those who had crafted beautiful letters of support for the honor. She expressed that she looked forward to staying connected to the amazing college. She gave special thanks to Melissa Olson for putting the package together and working hard to craft a solid request for the honor. Dr. Hilgersom thanked the Regents, Chancellor, and staff, noting that their work was important.

Regent Arrascada moved approval to grant emeritus status to Dr. Karin M. Hilgersom. Regent Goicoechea seconded. Motion carried. Regents Carvalho and Del Carlo voted no.

11. <u>Approved-*Handbook* Revision, Institutional Mission Statement, TMCC</u> – The Board of Regents approved a revision to the *Board of Regents Handbook* *(Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 5.8)* updating the TMCC mission statement *(Ref. BOR-11on file in the Board Office).*

President Jeffrey W. Alexander stated that after a process involving employees, students, and community partners, TMCC had developed and approved a revised mission statement. He noted that TMCC was currently developing a new plan for 2027, and the leadership team found it timely to issue a new statement. President Alexander shared that in the spring of 2026, they had conducted surveys of employees, students, and community partners and also hosted open forums. He explained that participants were asked if the current mission

11. Approved-*Handbook* Revision, Institutional Mission Statement, TMCC – *(Continued)*

should be retained or revised, and if revised, what themes should define it. He noted that the feedback showed support for a new mission statement and the themes it should address.

Dr. Alexander stated that the final version was approved in April 2026 by the TMCC President's Council.

Regent Downs moved approval of a revision to the *Board of Regents Handbook* updating the TMCC mission statement. Regent McGrath seconded. Motion carried.

The meeting recessed at 1:16 p.m. and reconvened at 2:03 p.m. with all members present.

12. Information Only-Board Chair's Report (Agenda Item 8) – Chair Byron Brooks stated that he didn't believe there was a thing called too much acknowledgment when someone had served in the capacity that Renée Davis had served. He remarked that she had done fantastic things that contributed substantially to the state of Nevada and higher education. He announced that on behalf of the Board, he presented Ms. Davis with a framed certificate of appreciation. Chair Brooks explained that the certificate recognized her distinguished service and leadership.

He noted that the Board of Regents extended its deepest gratitude for her exceptional career in service to students and the people of Nevada. He highlighted her vision and unwavering commitment to expanding opportunity across every corner of the state. He listed her lasting contributions, including championing the Next Steps Nevada initiative and leading landmark reforms to create new statistics and science pathways. He mentioned her work in modernizing mathematics placement policies and expanding statewide support to enable direct enrollment in college coursework. Chair Brooks shared that she had been part of advancing financial aid leadership and access, including resources for foster youth through the Fostering Success initiative. He pointed out her role in the development and review of academic programs to ensure they remained responsive to the state's economic aspirations. He noted that she oversaw System-wide transfer and articulation policies to reduce barriers to degree completion for Nevada's diverse student population. He added that she had served as a voting member of the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs, bringing Nevada's voice to national conversations.

Chair Brooks remarked that the list of her accomplishments could have been several pages long. He shared that condensing many years of work into one certificate was extraordinarily challenging, which he called a testament to her outstanding service. He concluded by stating that her legacy was written in the lives of students and in a higher education system made stronger by her principled leadership. He wished her the best in her future endeavors and invited her to come up to receive the recognition.

13. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, UNR (Agenda Item 10) – University of Nevada, Reno President Brian Sandoval presented data and metrics on UNR's progress in achieving the strategic goals adopted by the Board of Regents. The metrics included

13. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, UNR (Agenda Item 10) – *(Continued)*

those identified by the Board to ensure comparability and alignment with the NSHE Strategic Plan *(Ref. BOR-10 on file in the Board Office).*

President Sandoval began by recognizing the university's students, faculty, and staff for their resilience, innovation, and commitment to moving the institution forward. He remarked that the university was delivering a measurable impact for students, communities, and the state of Nevada because of their work.

President Sandoval shared that the university continued to maintain its Carnegie R1 classification among the nation's top research universities. He expressed pride in the university's recognition as a Hispanic-Serving Institution, which reinforced their mission of access and opportunity.

Mr. Sandoval explained that enrollment growth remained strategic, reaching approximately 24,000 students in 2025, including more than 20,200 undergraduates. He highlighted that 53.7% of the student body identified as non-white, reflecting a commitment to receiving a federal Minority Serving Institution designation. He pointed out that 31.9% of undergraduate students were Pell-eligible in 2025, a notable increase from past years. He mentioned that one of the most significant areas of growth was dual credit, serving over 4,000 unique students across 38 high schools throughout the state.

President Sandoval reported that persistence rates for full-time students remained strong at over 85%, with student retention holding steady at around 80%. He stated that the most recent six-year graduation rate was approximately 60%, which was consistent with peer institutions. He shared that graduation rates for first-generation students now matched the overall institutional rate at approximately 60%.

Mr. Sandoval highlighted that research expenditures reached $195.5 million in 2025, marking the fifth consecutive record year. He added that the university's current capital investment portfolio totaled more than $356 million in active and planned projects. President Sandoval announced that university advancement had a record-breaking year, surpassing $104 million in philanthropic support.

Regent Brown mentioned she tried to help get more funding for the Knowledge Fund every session, but it never went anywhere. She asked about graduate stipends and remarked that she felt that might be something appealing for the legislature. President Sandoval shared that it had come to him to invest directly in graduate students to increase their stipends because of the competitive challenges they were facing. He emphasized the need to do better in attracting graduate students and noted the importance of retaining the faculty who worked with them. President Sandoval concluded that this would be a perfect investment from the Knowledge Fund to keep Nevada's best students in the state and improve their standing as research universities. Regent Brown agreed and stated that the Knowledge Fund provided a rare 10X return on investment. She urged graduate students to join them at the legislature the following year to advocate for the fund.

13. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, UNR (Agenda Item 10) – *(Continued)*

Regent Brown emphasized that she wanted to see the two different numbers in regard to dual enrollment. She questioned if the almost 6,500 students were individuals and if she should subtract that from the 20,200 total. President Sandoval confirmed and stated they had to present the information the way they were told to. He expressed that they were proud of their on-campus student population and the growth seen in dual credit. He pointed out that dual credit had gone from approximately 400 to 6,000, and then to approximately 7,700 that year. Regent Brown shared that she wanted to be able to take a snapshot and understand where actual enrollment on campus was.

Regent Brown questioned how many of those students had less than a 3.0 GPA. She pointed out that while exceptions were made, they didn't know how many or how many actually matriculated. She emphasized that she didn't know how they could sell it to the legislature without knowing all those pieces as well. She suggested that at some point, the legislature would ask if it had been successful and how many students matriculated or took remedial classes.

President Sandoval stated they would be happy to share that information. He explained that high schools performed an assessment of every student to determine college readiness. He asserted they were very careful about who was allowed to enroll in those classes. Regent Brown reiterated that technically they didn't qualify and questioned how many exceptions were being made and if those students were staying. President Sandoval stated they were assessing that. He explained that just like other institutions, they had a special admit process where they looked at each student individually. He noted that the GPA alone was not the only factor they looked at when determining admissibility. President Sandoval stated his recollection was that 59% were matriculating across every institution in the state, including CSN and UNLV.

Regent Arrascada noted that of the 6,500 students in dual enrollment, it had been said that 59% matriculated to Nevada campuses. President Sandoval clarified that 59% enrolled in a post-secondary institution after graduation and noted that 57% attended R1 research universities. Regent Arrascada concluded that it sounded like there was a great benefit for dual enrollment in Nevada, especially for the NSHE system, and expressed his appreciation.

Vice Chair Goodman stated that she would be remiss if they didn't acknowledge the $100 million plus in fundraising. She remarked that it was a big deal and found it very impressive that he had done that in Reno and Northern Nevada.

Regent Downs asked if the HSI (Hispanic-Serving Institution) status and criteria mentioned on page 4 were calculated with or without the dual enrollment numbers. President Sandoval replied that the calculation was without those numbers. He clarified that they did not try to inflate anything and explained that the HSI status and criteria were based on on-campus students. Regent Downs inquired if they were not allowed to include dual enrollment students in the HSI calculations. President Sandoval responded that 37% of their dual credit enrollment was Hispanic. He added that he didn't know for sure whether or not they were

13. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, UNR (Agenda Item 10) – *(Continued)*

allowed to include it, but remarked that it didn't really matter because they were already above the 25% threshold with on-campus students.

Regent Brager stated that when she heard about students with a 2.5 GPA or less, she believed that instead of pushing a student through the system only for them to struggle, they should be encouraged to attend community colleges for their first year. She noted that these campuses had amazing academic programs that would help make them better students as they moved through the system. President Sandoval replied that he couldn't agree more. He pointed out that according to the graph, 394 graduates from the collegiate academies had matriculated on to CSN, which he described as fantastic. She emphasized that it was important for the Board to reevaluate how they looked at that situation.

14. Approved-First Amendment to Cooperative Campus Development Agreement, CSN (Agenda Item 13) – The Board of Regents approved the First Amendment to Cooperative Campus Development Agreement with the City of Las Vegas related to the Northwest Campus and granted authority to the Chancellor to execute the First Amendment and any ancillary documents and non-material amendments necessary to implement the terms and conditions of the First Amendment. All such documents shall be reviewed and approved by the NSHE Chief General Counsel or NSHE Special Real Estate Counsel to confirm they are necessary to implement the terms and conditions of the First Amendment, as approved by the Board of Regents *(Ref. BOR-13 on file in the Board Office).*

President Klippenstein recalled that the Northwest Campus was BLM property back in roughly 2016 or 2018. President Klippenstein noted that they had received the patent and that it was then amended in 2020. He explained that with clarity around the completion in 12 years, the date would be 2032. He shared that they were bringing this amendment forward to mirror the 3.2 commitment with the City of Las Vegas. He stated that this would be updated with the correct dates so they would run in mirror with one another.

Chair Brooks left the meeting.

Regent Del Carlo stated that this was really needed and noted that she knew it had a big price tag. She remarked that the state was growing and the campus was needed. Regent Del Carlo shared her hope that they would be successful with the proposal. She acknowledged that it was going to be tough going in the session with the economy as it was, but reiterated that this was really needed. Regent Del Carlo stated that if they really cared about the state and its future, they had to do this. She concluded that they had to bite the bullet and do it, adding that she was very supportive.

Chair Brooks returned to the meeting.

President Klippenstein agreed. He expressed great thanks and mentioned that the collaboration with the City of Las Vegas had been outstanding. He shared that continued work was being done with the Cheyenne Campus and the North Las Vegas Campus.

14. Approved-First Amendment to Cooperative Campus Development Agreement, CSN (Agenda Item 13) – *(Continued)*

Regent Brager left the meeting.

Dr. Klippenstein stated that he had been impressed with the City of Las Vegas stepping up to continue their support. He mentioned having an agreement along with them and noted that an agreement would soon be done at the City Council. President Klippenstein concluded by saying it showed that the City Council continued to value higher education in Northwest Las Vegas.

Regent Del Carlo inquired about the $60 million for infrastructure cost. President Klippenstein stated that it was roughly between 15 and 16 million for the infrastructure. He explained that everything from the parking lots to the talks, lighting, sidewalks, and utilities carried a big price tag because it was virgin property. He shared that the project itself was 60,000 square feet. He concluded that it was about 58.1 million according to the last estimate from Public Works.

Vice Chair Goodman stated that she was super excited about this. She expressed a desire to evolve the project a little bit so that it could really be something the legislature was excited about. She noted that it was not just going to be another campus but something outstanding and a jewel for the state. She shared that she was very excited about the recent conversations with the City of Las Vegas.

President Klippenstein noted that they had a great opportunity. He remarked that they were having a good dialogue about what the future of the project should look like. President Klippenstein shared that the City of Las Vegas was very energized around the opportunity. He explained that this included training in the law enforcement academy in that area, which made up one half of the constructed project. He suggested connecting that and building out the campus location with other areas around public safety, public health, and community health. He stated that they would be so well prepared that they would be the best in the nation and the world. President Klippenstein concluded by stating that he thought this first building really laid the foundation for the concept to grow.

Regent Bautista moved approval of the First Amendment to Cooperative Campus Development Agreement with the City of Las Vegas related to the Northwest Campus and granting authority to the Chancellor to execute the First Amendment and any ancillary documents and non-material amendments necessary to implement the terms and conditions of the First Amendment. All such documents shall be reviewed and approved by the NSHE Chief General Counsel or NSHE Special Real Estate Counsel to confirm they are necessary to implement the terms and conditions of the First Amendment, as approved by the Board of Regents. Vice Chair Goodman seconded. Motion carried.

15. Approved-Campus Police and Public Safety Functions Assessment Report, NSHE – The Board of Regents accepted the Campus Police and Public Safety Functions Assessment report prepared by the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators and directed the Chancellor to bring an action plan addressing the recommendations to the next meeting of the Board of Regents Security Committee *(Refs. BOR-15a and BOR-15b on file in the Board office).*

Mr. Mike Parks, Executive Director of the University of Texas System, noted that IACLEA was a nonprofit law enforcement group of 4,000 members who were leaders in university policing and public safety. He explained that the purpose of the assessment was an independent System-wide assessment of NSHE at all campuses, as well as the Northern and Southern Commands.

Mr. Parks stated that they were asked about the feasibility of a statewide commissioner model but noted that they were not recommending it at that time. He shared the overall findings, stating that there had been meaningful progress toward consolidated campus policing. He pointed out that the core challenges were operational rather than structural, relating primarily to staffing, governance clarity, and implementation gaps.

He identified challenges in the Southern Command, including incomplete MOUs at some campuses and unclear accountability regarding funding and service expectations. Mr. Parks described the Northern Command as more mature and robust with better-understood MOUs and stronger campus relationships. He shared that there were continued concerns about accountability and consistency, as well as system-level risks regarding the absence of police services at some locations. Mr. Parks pointed out that technology capabilities varied significantly by institution and that co-locating services would present infrastructure and cost challenges.

Mr. Jim Nawoichyk reiterated that a statewide commissioner was not recommended at that time, but noted they had a plan to get there if the Board chose to. He asserted that adding a commissioner would not resolve staffing issues or implementation gaps and would only add another layer of bureaucracy. He recommended immediate priorities, including finalizing and executing the Southern Command MOUs and starting the standardization process. He suggested developing a system-wide, needs-based staffing model that analyzed crime statistics, call responses, and the specific environments of rural and urban campuses. He proposed transitioning to a more permanent officer assignment basis, which he referred to as community policing.

He stated the need to address service gaps for rural and satellite campuses by standardizing policies, technology, and communication practices. He recommended engaging a time-limited, external system-level coordinator with a background in higher education and public safety. Mr. Nawoichyk stated that the commissioner model should be reconsidered in the future once operational maturity was in place. He noted that policing did not require a new system design, but rather disciplined implementation and resource alignment to provide a safe learning and working environment.

Vice Chair Goodman left the meeting.

15. Approved-Campus Police and Public Safety Functions Assessment Report, NSHE – *(Continued)*

Regent Boylan inquired about operational maturity in the Southern Command. Mr. Parks explained through interviews they learned that some challenges existed because entities were recently collaborated, combined, and consolidated. Mr. Parks stated that while many of those challenges had been addressed, the assessment process felt the Northern and Southern Commands were not at the same level regarding transitional frustrations. Regent Boylan asked if it was an inconsistency in mission functions. Mr. Parks replied that it was, and stated that the team members did observe that. He noted that there were inconsistent deliverables depending on which campus was involved. He explained that there was an inconsistency in the service they felt they were getting for the dollars they paid.

Vice Chair Goodman returned to the meeting.

Regent Boylan described the command structure as a reverse pyramid. He suggested that NSHE should directly handle the funding for the police department. He questioned why the recommendation for a head honcho that both chiefs would answer to had been removed from the current report. Mr. Parks explained that the reason the recommendation was removed was based on the eight years since the last report and the current maturity of the organization. He noted that a commissioner model would not solve the specific issues they observed today.

Regent Boylan noted that there were a few things that needed to change and recommended that they accept the report. He further recommended that before bringing it back to the Board, they should talk to those on the Security Committee.

Regent Brown shared her takeaway from the report was that the System was lacking three things: budget, FTEs, and assets to do the job. She expressed confidence in the ability and vision of both commands and both chiefs.

Regent Brown moved to accept the report and direct the Chancellor to return with an action plan. Regent McGrath seconded.

Regent Del Carlo noted that she was going to vote for the item, but wanted to make sure they had timelines. Mr. Parks noted that he was not sure he could give a precise time at that moment. Regarding the review for the commissioner model, he shared that he believed they already had a plan for that, as they were due to come back in five years.

Regent Carvalho shared that she thought it was important for the recommendations to come back to them within six months.

Chief Arnold Vasquez, Southern Command, thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He stated that the ICLEA team had demonstrated an extreme amount of professionalism and had put together a very well-drafted and thorough report. He noted that the report pointed out many areas that the Southern Command and Northern Command leadership teams were already familiar with. Chief Vasquez remarked that a lot of the

15. Approved-Campus Police and Public Safety Functions Assessment Report, NSHE – *(Continued)*

issues were driven by funding and resource allocation. He shared that he had been in the profession for close to 27 years and noted that they constantly worked in a state of being understaffed and underfunded. He explained that they were often asked to do extraordinary things without some of the resources and tools at their disposal. He acknowledged that since joining NSHE, he had experienced a tremendous amount of support from the system, institutions, presidents, regents, and the community. Chief Vasquez stated that leaders were conditioned to do as much as possible with the least amount of resources, and noted that they would always operate that way. He recognized that there were gaps and areas that needed improvement, but pointed out that many improvements had already been made. He guaranteed that both he and Chief James were working at an all-time high in terms of a collaborative approach. He concluded by promising to give every ounce of their being to ensure campus safety and to mitigate and close those gaps as much as possible.

Chair Brooks inquired about what a realistic funding process looked like and expressed his preference that the Chiefs had to be a part of those conversations. Chief Vasquez agreed and shared that he and Chief James had a great working relationship. He explained that they had already strategized on and made a lot of progress in many of these areas. He reported that they were currently sitting at a seven percent vacancy rate. He shared that they had many strategies in place already and believed he and Chief James would be at the focal point of those brought back to the Chancellor and the Board.

Regent Boylan liked the idea of a timeline, and shared his belief that it should be sooner rather than later. He suggested three months.

Chief Vasquez stated that he was the type of person who liked to under-promise and over-deliver. He remarked that he thought it was one of the main pieces they needed to nail down to help address many of the issues. He shared that his goal was to have that final draft in the presidents' hands sometime at the end of summertime. He expressed hope that they could bring it back to the Board for approval before the end of the calendar year. Chief Vasquez noted that a three-month time frame was probably realistic to provide significant updates.

Regent Brown rescinded her motion. Regent McGrath rescinded her second.

Regent Brown moved to accept the IACLEA report and direct the Chancellor to come back to the next Security Committee with an action plan addressing the recommendations on slides 10, 11, and 12. Regent McGrath seconded. Motion carried.

The meeting recessed at 3:45 p.m. and reconvened at 4:07 p.m. with all members present except Regents Del Carlo and Fernandez.

16. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29 Tuition and Fees, UNR School of Medicine – The Board of Regents approved the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine *(Chapter 7, Sections 3 and 18) (Ref. BOR-16 on file in the Board Office).*

Regent McGrath left the meeting.

Dr. Paul Hauptman noted a committee convened by the university reviewed a range of data, including peer comparisons with Western region public medical schools and benchmarks from the Association of American Medical Colleges. Dr. Hauptman added that they also looked at regional consumer and higher education cost indices and institutional needs. He shared that within the Western region peer group of 19 public medical schools, UNR Med currently ranked 14th in tuition and fees. Dr. Hauptman remarked that a lower number was better, reflecting their continued commitment to maintaining affordability. He noted that the committee reached consensus on a recommendation to increase tuition and fees by 3.8 percent for each year of the 2027-29 biennium.

Dr. Hauptman explained that the recommendation reflected a multifactorial assessment including cost pressures and alignment with peer institutions. He mentioned that the five-year rolling average of the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) was used, providing a consistent and predictable approach. He stated that using a multi-year average helped reduce year-to-year volatility. Dr. Hauptman emphasized that student representatives participated in the deliberations and that the recommendation reflected an inclusive process. He recognized that any increase in tuition had implications for students, including the impact on educational debt. Dr. Hauptman asserted that the adjustments were necessary to sustain the quality of the educational program, particularly in supporting instruction, advising, and licensure preparation. He noted that, if approved, all tuition and fee increases would be allocated to the state-supported operating budget of the School of Medicine. He pointed out that the student access fee was calculated as a percent of tuition and fees, resulting in an automatic increase when tuition and fees increased.

Regent Downs asked how those access fees were utilized in the structure. Dr. Hauptman stated that in academic year 2025-2026, $2.119 million was distributed in access fees. Regent Downs inquired how they determined who received those fees. Dr. Hauptman replied that all students paid in and 93% of the students received access fees. Regent Downs asked what the criteria were for those 93% who received the fees and why 7% did not receive them. Dr. Hauptman stated that the vast majority of the access fees were need-based. He added that access fees were charged across the board and then redistributed according to need.

Regent Downs asked if it was a correct interpretation that the 93% was being supported by the seven percent, since that assistance derived from the student access fee. Dr. Hauptmann described it as a pay-in by everyone and a payout to 93%. Regent Downs asked if it was correct that those receiving assistance were getting back the fees they paid plus more. Dr. Hauptman stated that it depended on the level of need, noting some students got part of the fees back while others got more back.

16. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29 Tuition and Fees, UNR School of Medicine – *(Continued)*

Regent Downs thanked Dr. Hauptman and stated that he felt student access fees were probably not appropriate at a professional school level. Dr. Hauptman noted that the median debt for the class of 2025 was almost $169,000, which he described as significant. He noted that anything they could do to mitigate was being pursued.

Regent Arrascada asked what the response was from the current medical students, especially the first-year students just starting the program. Dr. Hauptman stated that the increase was "baked in" and that the students knew what the tuition and fees would be for the year. He explained that they had first and second-year students on the committee that decided the increase because third and fourth-year students would not be impacted by it. Regent Arrascada inquired if it was a begrudging acceptance or if they understood that the cost of education was increasing. Dr. Hauptman stated that they presented detailed information on the budget and its challenges in a very transparent manner. He noted that the students accepted the argument that the 3.8 percent increase was needed.

Regent Arrascada asked if he could expand on the agreement and the working relationship between the University of Nevada School of Medicine and Renown Medical Center. Dr. Hauptman stated that Renown, because of the affiliation agreement, provided scholarship funding to their students. Regent Arrascada mentioned that if he remembered correctly, it was $350,000 of scholarships per year and a $1.5 million investment into the school. Dr. Hauptman confirmed those figures were correct.

Regent Del Carlo returned to the meeting remotely.

Regent McGrath returned to the meeting.

Regent Arrascada moved approval of the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine. Vice Chair Goodman seconded. Motion carried. Regents Bautista and Downs voted no. Regent Fernandez was absent.

17. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29 Tuition and Fees, UNLV Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine – The Board of Regents approved the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the UNLV Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, including an adjustment to the distribution of fees to support reserves for the Medical Education Building *(Chapter 7, Sections 4 and 19) (Ref. BOR-17 on file in the Board office).*

Interim President Heavey stated that they were asking to shift the distribution of the fees to put more money into capital improvement. He remarked that the goal was to create a reserve, specifically a capital reserve fund, for the maintenance of the medical education building. Interim President Heavey described this as a proactive approach to solving a problem that had been identified many times regarding not having funds set aside for expected maintenance needs. He shared that they were going to put more money in there,

17. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29 Tuition and Fees, UNLV Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine – *(Continued)*

which would ultimately be about $425,000 per year. He concluded that these funds would be available to maintain the beautiful medical education building they used, which was built by the Nevada Health Bioscience Corporation for the use of the School of Medicine.

Regent Downs asked how the access fees were utilized in this scenario. Interim President Heavey stated that the policy of the Board for student access fees for graduate students was that 50% of them were awarded based on merit and 50% were awarded based on need. He noted that they were awarded within those parameters. He explained that since they were not asking for a fee increase, they did not prepare a detailed breakdown of how the access fees were being used. Regent Downs asked if he knew what percentage they were getting fee money back. Interim President Heavey stated that he did not know what percentage of the students were awarded access fees.

Regent Arrascada asked how the current first-year or second-year medical students felt about the fee and tuition increase and if they were willing and accepting of it. Interim President Heavey replied that the students were fully supportive. He clarified that there was actually no increase in student registration fees. He noted that it was a level fee and explained they were just shifting a little more of the money into the capital improvement fund. Interim President Heavey stated the purpose was to create a reserve fund for deferred maintenance for the MEB and reiterated that there was no increase in fees.

Regent Brown moved approval of the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the UNLV Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine, including an adjustment to the distribution of fees to support reserves for the Medical Education Building Regent Bautista seconded. Motion carried. Regent Downs voted no. Regent Fernandez was absent.

18. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29 Tuition and Fees, UNLV School of Dental Medicine – The Board of Regents approved the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the UNLV School of Dental Medicine *(Chapter 7, Sections 6 and 21) (Ref. BOR-18 on file in the Board Office).*

Regent Carvalho moved approval of the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the UNLV School of Dental Medicine. Regent Boylan seconded. Motion carried. Regent Downs voted no. Regent Fernandez was absent.

19. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29, Tuition and Fees, UNLV William S. Boyd School of Law – The Board of Regents approved the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the UNLV William S. Boyd School of Law *(Chapter 7, Sections 5 and 20)* and a revision to the second seat deposit deadline *(Chapter 7, Sections 5.C and 11.A) (Ref. BOR-19 on file in the Board Office).*

19. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2027-29, Tuition and Fees, UNLV William S. Boyd School of Law – *(Continued)*

Regent Downs asked what the difference was between the student access line and the financial aid fee. Interim President Heavey explained that based on the policy of the Board, 50% of access fees were used based on student need. Dean Leah Chan Grinvald stated that the access and the financial aid line were used basically together to be able to award a hundred percent back to their students as Dr. Heavey had mentioned. Regent Downs asked what percentage of students received some form of aid. Dean Chan Grinvald replied that it was one hundred percent. Dean Chan Grinvald stated that all students received something based on merit, but the amounts varied based on their incoming qualifications. She noted that there were some students who need to take out loans.

Regent Arrascada inquired about enrollment and Dean Grinvald confirmed that currently it was approximately 486 students.

Chair Brooks asked how the student fee increase that was granted months ago played into what they were asking for that day. Interim President Heavey stated that this was totally independent, so the fee increases before were not factored into the professional schools. He explained that those were only for the undergraduate students because they were separate line-item budgets.

Regent Boylan asked why they called them differential fees and access fees, and inquired why they didn't just have all of those in the amount that the students saw up front. Interim President Heavey explained that there were additional fees charged to students to cover specific costs, like the technology fee, which covered items specific to those needs. He clarified that differential fees were only for specific graduate and undergraduate programs. Interim President Heavey noted that the dental, medicine, and law schools each charged their own specific cost determined through that process.

Regent Brown moved approval of the proposed 2027-29 biennium tuition and fee structure for the UNLV William S. Boyd School of Law and a revision to the second seat deposit deadline. Regent Boylan seconded. Motion carried. Regent Downs voted no. Regent Fernandez was absent.

20. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, Student Health Insurance Fees – The Board of Regents approved a revision to the *Procedures and Guidelines Manual* *(Chapter 7, Section 11)* regarding student health insurance rates for academic year 2026-2027 for UNR, UNLV, and NSU international students *(Ref. BOR-20 on file in the Board Office).*

Pursuant to NRS 281A, Regent Carvalho stated that she was a graduate student at UNLV and shared her belief that the independence of judgment of a reasonable person in her situation would not be materially affected by the information presented in agenda item number 20 and that she would be voting on the matter.

20. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, Student Health Insurance Fees – *(Continued)*

Chief Financial Officer Brody Leiser noted that the institutions worked with the System's insurance broker, Academic Health Plans, to develop the rates. He pointed out for the international students that there was a decrease in the rate for UNR, which was the result of positive claim history over the last year. He remarked that for international students at UNLV, the rate was going up slightly because of high-cost insurance claims.

Regent Boylan asked if a student who already had insurance was required to get insurance again from the university upon joining a program. Dr. Hug-English replied that the insurance was mandatory but came with a waiver. She explained that if a student came in with an existing insurance plan, they could be waived out of the university's requirement. She noted that the purpose was simply to provide insurance for those who were not able to purchase it. Dr. Hug-English emphasized how important it was for students to have access to that coverage. Regent Boylan stated that he agreed with her on that point.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser noted that it should be clear that for all international students, the rates were consistent for all students. He explained that although the rates were broken out by different schools, they remained consistent. He further stated that all programs had the same annual rate.

Chair Brooks asked about the distinction between the health service fee and mandatory insurance fees. He expressed that he was trying to understand the mandatory need and benefit for a student to have health insurance specifically through the institution based on their study program. Dr. Hug-English stated that if students went out to the private market, their insurance costs would probably be double the cost of the student plan. She reiterated that students were not obligated to purchase it if they had another plan. Dr. Hug-English shared that graduate students utilized the plan the most and emphasized that it provided options that might not be available to them otherwise. Chair Brooks asked if a student chose not to have health insurance for whatever reason, if it then became a liability issue within the institution. Dr. Hug-English asserted that having health insurance was critically important to the health of individuals. She clarified that they were not mandating the purchase of the school plan, but were saying it was important to have insurance. Chair Brooks remarked that it sounded like students were told they had to have the insurance plan unless they had a waiver. Dr. Hug-English confirmed that was correct.

Vice Chair Goodman thanked Dr. Hug-English for finding rates that would work for students. She noted that when students had to go outside and get independent insurance, it could be extremely expensive. Vice Chair Goodman remarked that it looked like some good negotiating had been done and expressed her appreciation for the work.

Regent Arrascada moved approval of the student health insurance rates for academic year 2026-2027 for UNR, UNLV, and NSU international students. Regent Del Carlo seconded. Motion carried. Regent Fernandez was absent.

21. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, Distribution of Student Registration Fee, Academic Years 2027-28 and 2028-29 – The Board of Regents approved the distribution of student registration fees for academic years 2027-28 and 2028-29 *(Chapter 7, Section 17) (Ref. BOR-21 on file in the Board office)*.

Pursuant to NRS Chapter 281A, Regent Downs stated that he was a parent of a student at UNR and because the independence of judgment of a reasonable person would not be materially affected by his situation, he would vote in the matter.

Pursuant to NRS Chapter 281A, Regent Carvalho stated that she was a graduate student at UNLV and that the independence of judgment of a reasonable person in her situation would not be materially affected by the information presented in Agenda Item 21 and she would be voting on the matter.

Vice Chair Goodman disclosed that she has a student at UNR.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser stated that this was not a request for the overall per credit fee amount itself. He noted that the Board had approved the per credit fee amounts at the January meeting. He explained that the agenda item was to approve how the per credit fee was distributed among the various buckets identified within Board policy. Chief Financial Officer Leiser shared that under the *Procedures and Guidelines Manual*, the various buckets of distribution included the state operating budget, student access, general improvement, capital improvement, and activities and programs.

He noted that specifically, the student access funds outlined in Title 4 Chapter 18 of the *Handbook* required that at least 10% of the per credit hour registration fee for community college lower division courses be allocated to student access. Mr. Leiser added that at least 15% of the per credit registration fee for all other courses was allocated to student access. He remarked that Title 4 Chapter 18 of the *Handbook* outlined the policy that 100% of fees deposited in the account go toward financial assistance. He further stated that at least 80% of those funds supported need-based financial aid, and no more than 20% supported access-oriented scholarships.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser noted that the use of the student access fee was reported in the annual financial aid report. He shared that regarding the fee account balances, which included student access, general improvement, and capital improvement, the Board would be hearing a presentation at the September or December meeting. Mr. Leiser mentioned that generally around 70% of the per credit registration fee was deposited in the state-supported budget. He noted that the percent allocation going to each of those buckets remained relatively consistent for the years the Board was considering for approval.

Mr. Leiser shared an additional clarification regarding the student association fees, which provided support for student governments. He pointed out that some distributions reflected a zero-dollar amount for the student association. He explained that this did not mean campuses were not supporting student government, but rather that under Title 4, Chapter 10 Section 15, an institution could establish a separate fee outside of the per credit hour registration fee. Chief Financial Officer Leiser stated that institutions showing zero dollars was because the fee had been approved outside of this specific fee.

21. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, Distribution of Student Registration Fee, Academic Years 2027-28 and 2028-29 – *(Continued)*

Regent Arrascada moved approval of the distribution of student registration fees for academic years 2027-28 and 2028-29. Regent Goicoechea seconded. Motion carried.

22. Information Only-Public Comment – None.

The meeting recessed at 4:59 p.m. and reconvened at 9:07 a.m. on Friday, June 12, 2026, with all members present except Regents Arrascada, Boylan, and Fernandez.

23. Information Only-Public Comment – Dr. Bill Robinson stated that the IP policy coming through the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee and the Research Council's claim of no possible objection were upsetting. He mentioned concerns regarding the amount of money going to faculty and the creation of a slush fund lacking details on administration, leadership, or auditing. Dr. Robinson pointed out that the entire university faculty lacked input, contrasting this with ten years prior when the entire faculty was involved in creating the existing policy. He observed that this was the fourth attempt to change the policy, marking the most significant change yet, and noted that the Faculty Senate was not involved, informed, or given a vote. He emphasized that the issue affected everyone, including the hospitality college at UNLV, and argued it was a campus-wide and system-wide issue requiring more discussion and openness. Finally, he expressed his frustration that the discussion did not involve the necessary people or address what mattered.

Staci Walters, NFA President, encouraged ratification of the TMCC Collective Bargaining Agreement as it was negotiated. She informed the Board that they had two other collective bargaining teams in negotiations with institutions that were currently moving to fact-finding. She noted that the largest of the issues being discussed was grievance arbitration. She emphasized that they looked to the Board to help figure out how to move past that issue.

Regent Arrascada entered the meeting.

Amy Cavanaugh introduced herself as a constituent of District 9, Professor of Biology at TMCC, and the Secretary and incoming President of the TMCC NFA. She stated that she was there to support the TMCC Collective Bargaining Agreement, Agenda Item 32. She noted that the TMCC faculty had voted overwhelmingly to support the agreement, with 79% of bargaining unit members in favor of ratification. Dr. Cavanaugh explained that the agreement included new provisions currently found in Title 4, which provided due process for faculty facing student complaints. She mentioned that the agreement increased department chair stipends for the first time in twenty years. She pointed out that it increased compensation for summer teaching and independent study. She clarified the responsibilities of accredited program leaders and noted they would receive compensation equal to department chairs. Dr. Cavanaugh highlighted that the agreement provided more flexibility for faculty regarding their attendance at completion ceremonies. She expressed

23. Information Only-Public Comment – *(Continued)*

that her proudest accomplishment was that the agreement addressed the concerns of administrative and non-instructional academic faculty equally with instructional faculty for the first time. Dr. Cavanaugh stated that together they had crafted an agreement that strengthened faculty rights and the institution as a whole.

Amy Pason stated that she represented over 200 members of the Nevada Faculty Alliance at UNR. She expressed that the Nevada Faculty Alliance was in full support of the collective bargaining agreement that they hoped the Board would approve that day. She noted that TMCC's success in completing a new agreement demonstrated what was possible when an administration was willing to negotiate with faculty in shared goals. Dr. Pason mentioned that the goal was to create a workplace for faculty that enabled their best work in serving students. She pointed out that TMCC's success also demonstrated that collective bargaining did not require a massive legal team and did not undermine collegiate ties. She suggested that readers might be surprised to find mundane details in the agreement, such as specifying that a chair was an advocate for their faculty. Dr. Pason observed that the benefit of having these mundane items was that faculty and administration walked away with the same understanding of the provisions. She argued that faculty were not left guessing how an administrator would interpret or apply those provisions. Dr. Pason asserted that conflict arose from different expectations and understandings of policy, which was what a CBA prevented. She congratulated the newest members, including NSHE administrative assistants and classified staff. She stated that the decision to join a union was a step toward having a voice in the workplace.

Karla Salas stated that she was speaking in support of Agenda Items 29 and 31. She noted that during the last legislative session, Nevada's institutions faced significant funding challenges and many campuses felt the impact. She mentioned that as students, they saw firsthand how funding shaped their educational experience, from the resources and programs available to the support and services that helped students persist, succeed, and achieve their goals. Ms. Salas encouraged the continued support for the small institution factor as the Board considered budget priorities. She emphasized that these investments were critical to ensuring that institutions like Western Nevada College could continue providing accessible, high-quality education and support for the students they served. She thanked the many individuals who contributed to the development of Western Nevada College's 2026 through 2033 strategic plan. Ms. Salas stated that their willingness to listen to the students ensured that student perspectives were included in shaping the future of WNC. She explained that these two agendas were closely connected, as the strategic plan provided a vision for where Western Nevada College was headed, while adequate funding provided the resources necessary to achieve that vision for student success. She respectfully encouraged the board to approve the Western Nevada College strategic plan and continue advocating for the resources necessary to support students and institutions across Nevada. She concluded by thanking the board for their time, leadership, and commitment to Nevada students.

Kelechi Odunze, CSUN President, stated that he wanted to provide feedback that had been shared that morning with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Chancellor regarding Agenda Item 35. He stated that they would like the amendment to provide clear clarification about a timeline

23. Information Only-Public Comment – *(Continued)*

regarding review. He noted that they wanted clarification on what steps student leaders could take to ensure the will of the student body was being upheld if the review process by the Vice President of Student Affairs or Student Services took too long. Mr. Odunze observed that the topic of access fees had come up during the previous day's meeting. He asserted that CSUN and many of his peers in the NSA strongly supported maintaining those funds. He emphasized that it was important for those funds to remain in place to support their growing and diverse bodies. Mr. Odunze emphasized that without those funds, many currently enrolled students would not be able to access higher education at all. He noted that they prided themselves on their non-traditional and diverse student body, which was largely Nevadan, and that they wanted to keep it that way. He suggested that instead of assessing access fees because of tuition increases, the System should assess unnecessary or superfluous operational expenses.

Isabelle Hatch, Director of Government Affairs for the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, expressed strong support for Agenda Items 33 and 37. She mentioned that since September, she had the honor to serve on the NSHE Task Force on Power-Based Violence as the student representative for UNLV and UNR. Ms. Hatch noted that witnessing and participating in the work dedicated to developing the survey affirmed the association's belief that current data better supported NSHE's response to power-based violence. She asserted that ensuring a safe and supportive environment was undeniably crucial to both student well-being and academic success. Ms. Hatch pointed out that based on the most recent needs assessment, 15% of students viewed sexual assault prevention as their top safety concern on campus. She added that an additional 11% viewed Title IX policies as their greatest concern. She asserted that a student's ability to persist depended on concrete action informed by thorough data. She explained that the survey approved by item 33 would allow for tracking emergent trends and evaluating institutional responses. Ms. Hatch stated that the reform in Agenda Item 37 signified an important step in aligning NSHE policy with state law and recognizing the full scope of behaviors that constituted harm. She urged the Board to approve Agenda Items 33 and 37.

Dillon Moss, President of the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, noted that since 1898, the association had represented the undergraduate student body at the university. He explained that he was there to express their strong support for student access fees. Mr. Moss asserted that access fees stood at the summit of a very slippery slope if an access fee counted as paying for another student's education. He questioned why fees for the student health center, counseling services, or student government weren't viewed the same way, noting that his tuition was unable to pay for his entire experience at the university. Mr. Moss asserted that each and every student would eventually dip into the bucket. He stated that if their leading concern was accessibility and affordability, cutting student access fees single-handedly dismantled the progress made by the body. He expressed that they were committed to increasing and sustaining access to the education offered at the university. Mr. Moss pointed out that financial stability was the leading concern blocking students from higher education. He warned that any changes in scholarship funding resulted in increased housing and food insecurity, lower class loads, and potentially the end of a student's education career altogether. He emphasized that protecting the scholarships and grants that helped students succeed in their education was

23. Information Only-Public Comment – *(Continued)*

crucial. Mr. Moss urged the Regents to uphold access fees and reaffirm their commitment to higher education before thanking them for their time.

Ratchanya Dev Chinnappan, President of the Graduate Student Association at the University of Nevada, began by thanking President Sandoval for recognizing the vital role research and innovation played in Nevada. He respectfully urged the board to continue prioritizing investments that strengthened research, innovation, and graduate education as they considered the budget. Mr. Chinnappan noted that graduate students were an essential part of Nevada's research enterprise. He explained that they conducted research, supported faculty projects, published scholarly work, mentored students, and contributed directly to the work that helped maintain the university's R1 status. Mr. Chinnappan pointed out that many students continued to face rising healthcare costs and growing student fees, which had significantly increased the cost of pursuing graduate education. He mentioned that many students relied primarily on modest stipends as their sole source of income. He informed the board that the GSA Council had formally adopted a resolution during Spring 2026 supporting the Knowledge Fund investment. Mr. Chinnappan stated that they stood ready to work alongside the Community Engagement Office and Vice President Michael Torres in advocating for those priorities going forward. He respectfully encouraged the Board to make research and graduate support a priority within the budget requests.

Trey Curtis-Brown, President of the Graduate Student Association at UNLV, thanked Chair Brooks, Vice Chair Goodman, and the General Counsel for their support and felt they had productive conversations. He thanked Interim President Heavey for his continued support of graduate and professional students at UNLV and valued his input and collaboration. Mr. Curtis-Brown expressed support for continued investment in Nevada's Knowledge Fund and other opportunities that created opportunities for students across the institutions as they considered the 2027-29 biennium request. He encouraged support for strengthened student success, including investments that expanded graduate education, enhanced student support services, and helped with financial stressors. Mr. Curtis-Brown noted that graduate and professional students were often the people conducting research, supporting faculty projects, mentoring students, and helping drive innovation. He encouraged the Board to remember that graduate students made much of that work possible as conversations continued about investing in research. He mentioned that many graduate students relied on their internships and stipends as their primary source of income while facing rising costs of living and increased expenses. Mr. Curtis-Brown asserted that investing in research was also investing in the students who helped support those situations. He stated that he looked forward to working with them in the future.

Dr. Jennifer McClendon, Chair of the UNR Faculty Senate, noted that the Senate had reviewed the proposed intellectual property changes discussed in the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee. Dr. McClendon asserted that after review, the UNR Senate stood in strong support of the revised royalty distribution formula. She expressed the belief that the proposal reflected a thoughtful balance and was consistent with practices at many peer institutions. She stated that UNR faculty appreciated the creation of a proof of concept fund to support early-stage research and innovation. Dr. McClendon highlighted their appreciation for the hold harmless provision aimed at protecting existing agreements and

23. Information Only-Public Comment – *(Continued)*

current faculty. She noted that they were grateful for the transparency surrounding the proposal. She mentioned that they appreciated the many opportunities faculty had to engage in the discussion as it moved forward through the process.

24. Information Only-Affiliation Agreement with Renown Health, UNR School of Medicine – University of Nevada, Reno President Brian Sandoval described the partnership between the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine and Renown Health as instrumental in strengthening clinical training, expanding access to care, and advancing their shared mission to serve the health needs of the state of Nevada. President Sandoval mentioned that the year marked the fifth anniversary of the affiliation and emphasized that it continued to play a critical role in supporting medical education and building the state's physician workforce. He introduced the School of Medicine Dean, Paul Hauptman, M.D., and Renown Health Chief Executive Officer Brian Erling, M.D., M.B.A., who provided an update regarding the affiliation agreement between the UNR School of Medicine and Renown Health *(Ref. BOR-24 on file in the Board office).*

Dr. Hauptman thanked the Board for the opportunity to present an update on the affiliation, noting they were celebrating five years since the agreement was signed in June 2021. He stated that his appearance alongside Dr. Erling spoke to the strong ties and unified vision of their historic 50-year agreement. He noted that Renown was the only not-for-profit healthcare system in Washoe County, serving a massive area of a hundred thousand square miles. He pointed out that they operated the only Level II trauma center for both adults and pediatrics between Sacramento and Salt Lake City. Dr. Hauptman explained that their new mission and vision blatantly included the academic affiliation and a focus on research. He stated that Renown Regional was the busiest hospital in Nevada and currently had 713 providers, including 50 who were wholly UNR physicians. He noted that they had recruited over 60 pediatric sub-specialists, reducing the number of children leaving the community for care from 30% to less than 3%. Dr. Hauptman shared that UNR Med, formed in 1969, averaged a class size of 70 and included programs for physician assistants, speech pathology, and audiology. He noted that their strategic plan shared a fourth pillar with Renown: building an integrated academic health system. He described the organizational structure where the medical school remained at UNR while the hospital and faculty practice plan were under Renown. Dr. Hauptman highlighted that the affiliation was comprehensive, covering clinical, educational, and research domains. He listed several joint leadership positions, including President Sandoval serving as a full voting member of the Renown Board of Directors.

Dr. Erling updated the Board on the final design phases for a new $260 million, 7-story cancer building on the north side of Renown Regional. He noted that while the affiliation was working well, it created challenges because research rolled up to the Dean while clinical research sat on the Renown side. He asserted that they needed partnerships at the state and university levels to grow their basic science research to achieve National Cancer Institute designation. Dr. Hauptman mentioned the "five by 2030" goal for growing graduate medical education and their collaborative work on LCME re-accreditation. Dr. Hauptman concluded by reflecting on the benefits of joint recruitment from institutions like MD Anderson and Stanford, noting they still had 45 years of the agreement to go.

24. Information Only-Affiliation Agreement with Renown Health, UNR School of Medicine – *(Continued)*

Regent Brager asked whether the Big Beautiful Bill was having significant financial effects on Renown similar to other situations. Dr. Erling replied that the bill indeed had significant Medicaid impacts, initially causing a loss of enrollment due to the loss of exchange subsidies and new work requirements. He noted that they were starting to see an increase in charity care and reminded the Board that Medicaid covered approximately 45% of their costs. He explained that the Nevada provider fee supplemental program would begin stepping down in 2028, with an eventual impact to Renown of about $50 million annually. Dr. Erling mentioned that the full impact would not hit until 2032 and noted they had a plan called "Accelerating Care Transformation" to stay ahead of it by growing service lines and improving efficiency. Regent Brager then inquired about how the financial relationship between Renown and UNR was viewed. Dr. Hauptman stated that Renown Health provided the university with academic support payments. He clarified that they maintained a funds flow that was at times bidirectional, which he described as typical for a medical school affiliated with a health system. Regent Brager asked if UNR was responsible for all compensation and salaries for professors working back and forth between the institutions. Dr. Hauptman explained that while some clinical faculty were grandfathered into UNR paychecks, the majority of physicians were Renown-employed going forward. He noted that these physicians still held faculty titles and were provided with protected time to teach and conduct research. Regent Brager noted that it was nice to see the relationship continue.

Vice Chair Goodman asked whether UNR and Renown worked separately to obtain graduate medical education (GME) spaces, or if everything they did was collaborative. She further inquired if there was more opportunity for Renown as a nonprofit health system or if the collaborative effort allowed both entities to obtain more, noting that GME spaces were a huge problem in the state. Dr. Erling stated that they did all their graduate medical education in collaboration and saw great benefit in joint proposals between the medical school and Renown. He noted that their current challenge was being above their cap by at least 20 FTEs for residents or fellows that Renown was funding. Dr. Erling mentioned that they had built a commitment to GME programs into their 10-year plan and would find the necessary funding through their ACT initiatives. He expressed the belief that state or federal grant applications were received differently when an organization was truly committed to a program rather than just asking for money to start something new. He clarified that while UNR Med remained the sponsoring institution in the eyes of the ACGME, they worked side-by-side. Dr. Erling highlighted that many of their residents and fellows also continued to rotate at the VA hospital.

Regent Carvalho stated that she had been on the Board when the affiliation agreement was approved and had reviewed the discussions held at that time. She highlighted that there had been an agreement for $350,000 a year in scholarships for medical students and asked if that was still the case or if there was interest in moving that higher. Dr. Erling stated that the scholarship amount was still the case and noted that they were also providing full-ride scholarships to the nursing school through their foundation. He added that the funds flow was complex but not a point of contention, as they usually came together collaboratively to see what the school needed. Regent Carvalho noted that providing that level of support for five years was extremely generous. She pointed out that there had been discussions

24. Information Only-Affiliation Agreement with Renown Health, UNR School of Medicine – *(Continued)*

about increasing class size, which she did not think had happened yet, and asked for an update on that goal. Dr. Hauptman stated that the bottleneck was graduate education and noted that retention was much higher for those who completed residency and fellowship programs. He explained that their goal was to grow those programs first and then follow on with growth in class size. Regent Carvalho expressed her support for those initiatives and mentioned a report from the Lincy Institute at UNLV regarding medical education in Nevada. She noted that the report cited an average doctor retention rate of 42.4% for those completing in-state residency, which she found surprisingly lower than the U.S. average of 67%. Dr. Hauptman stated that he would have to review the report's data source, as his understanding of the historical average was the 40/60/80 rule. He explained that 40% of medical students, 60% of residents and fellows, and 80% of those who did both in-state ultimately practiced in Nevada. Regent Carvalho noted that she did not see Tonopah on the service map and asked if that area was covered through UNLV. Dr. Erling stated that the map showed critical access hospitals, which Tonopah did not have, but he noted that the Rural Transformation Fund had approved dollars to reopen a clinic there. Regent Carvalho asked if pediatric oncology was part of the programming for the new cancer tower being constructed. He stated that they were in a capital campaign for the cancer tower and a freestanding children's hospital, which would house their pediatric oncology. Dr. Erling noted that they already provided that service to the community but would be growing those services in the new building starting in 2028.

Regent Del Carlo stated that she had also been on the Board in 2021 and expressed her happiness regarding the affiliation. She mentioned that she had been worried about the 50-year length because none of them would be there in 50 years, but noted she was glad to have the five-year report and know the affiliation was going well. Regent Del Carlo asked for an explanation of how residencies worked because residency was the crux of keeping doctors in Nevada. She noted that she had heard from a constituent that there was a lock on residencies from the School of Medicine to Renown and that residencies could not exist at any other hospital. Dr. Hauptman stated that any hospital in the state could frankly stand up a residency program, including all hospitals in Northern Nevada. He explained that doing so required a major commitment, formal curriculum, and the identification of program directors and coordinators. He noted that it was a complex process lasting at least two to three years but asserted that nothing prevented any local hospital from standing up their own program. Regent Del Carlo asked for clarification that it would not be a violation of the affiliation with Renown if that were to happen. Dr. Hauptman stated that there would be no violation whatsoever. He explained that medical students in their fourth year could apply anywhere for any residency program and noted that the university supported them in that process. Regent Del Carlo asked what residencies were planned after the addition of OBGYN in 2027. Dr. Hauptman stated that they had a number of other residencies and fellowships in the planning stage. He mentioned that a critical care fellowship had received initial accreditation and they were looking to launch it the following summer. Dr. Hauptman noted that general surgery was on tap for 2028 or 2029 and that they really wanted to start it in 2028. He added that a hematology fellowship, a potential rural track in family medicine with Banner Health in Fallon, and a forensic pathology fellowship in the

24. Information Only-Affiliation Agreement with Renown Health, UNR School of Medicine – *(Continued)*

county were also being considered. Regent Del Carlo stated that the future looked bright and wished them luck on their upcoming campaigns.

Chair Brooks left the meeting.

Regent Goicoechea stated that he was a rural guy and noted that it looked like significant funding was coming to rural hospitals. He recalled that at one point UNR had doctors doing their residency at Northeastern Regional Hospital in Elko, but noted that affiliation was no longer there. Regent Goicoechea expressed concern regarding the areas served on the fringe and stated his belief that patients should come toward Reno rather than going to Utah or Boise. He asked if there was still an affiliation with Northeastern and if there was an ability to pull other northern rural hospitals in, especially in light of upcoming funding. Dr. Hauptman explained that, unfortunately, Northeast Regional Hospital pulled funding and they were unable to sustain the program. He noted that they had to recall two of the four residents back to Reno, while the two most senior residents were able to finish the program there. He asserted that sustainability was always an issue when standing up a new residency and stated they were committed to ensuring funding was available for future programs. Dr. Hauptman emphasized that it required a financial commitment from a hospital to ensure a plan would last for decades rather than just two years. Regent Goicoechea asked if the talk of $180 million coming from the federal side to rural Nevada would help those hospitals coordinate with the system. Dr. Erling stated that they had approached rural hospitals and told them they were not interested in a money grab, but were interested in partnering in meaningful programs. He noted that every hospital was different and explained that their current focus was around electronic medical records support, radiology telehealth, and workforce training.

Chair Brooks returned to the meeting.

Regent Arrascada stated that he championed the affiliation primarily due to the relationship with the Orvis School of Nursing. He expressed his hope that the partnership would maintain and strengthen. He noted that while new graduate medical education programs were listed on page 15, the Orvis School of Nursing was missing, and he stated her expectation that it would be addressed soon. Regent Arrascada asked for confirmation that the new cancer tower would include a pediatric cancer unit. Dr. Erling stated that the children's hospital was currently a "hospital within a hospital" and that the pediatric cancer unit would remain in the Sierra Tower until a dedicated children's hospital was built. He clarified that the new building was for adult care, though they had a plan to grow pediatric oncology coverage as well. Regent Arrascada inquired about the affiliation of specific providers, such as Dr. Max Coppes and neuro-oncologists Dr. Rau and Dr. Schush, at the new cancer tower. Dr. Erling stated that all current providers employed by Renown Medical Group would continue to be their providers as the physical infrastructure expanded. He noted that they currently have 12 oncology providers and set a goal to reach 24 in the next three years. Regent Arrascada asked if rare pediatric cancers, such as atypical teratoid rhabdoid tumors (ATRT), would still be referred out to UCSF or Stanford. Dr. Erling stated that he was not equipped to answer that specific question but explained their

24. Information Only-Affiliation Agreement with Renown Health, UNR School of Medicine – *(Continued)*

general strategy was to keep care local if they had enough volume to provide it exceptionally. He asserted that with the building of the adult cancer center and the addition of bone marrow transplants, there was no reason for adults to leave Reno for tumor care. He anticipated that some very unusual cases would still need to travel, but stated they were trying to minimize that number. Regent Arrascada congratulated them on their work.

Regent Downs left the meeting.

Regent Brown requested clarification about future GMEs. She asked if all programs would be housed at Renown because she understood there wasn't another partnership with a different hospital for their GMEs. Dr. Hauptman confirmed they would, except for the rural track family medicine program where the first year would be at Renown and the next two years would be in Fallon. Regent Brown inquired about staff grandfathered into the financial split. Dr. Hauptman stated that just under 50 physicians who were on the faculty practice plan when it was under UNR opted to stay with the university. He explained that this was allowed through the affiliation agreement, but noted that funds flow existed to support their positions from Renown. He clarified that those physicians held a Renown faculty title just like the Renown-employed physicians, making it more of a technical issue than anything on the ground. Regent Brown asked for clarification on whether some were 100% paid by UNR because they were grandfathered in while others were 100% paid by Renown even though they were teaching. Dr. Hauptman confirmed and explained that behind the scenes there was funds flow to allow that arrangement to continue. He noted that on a go-forward basis, all new hires with very rare exceptions were Renown-employed physicians with a university title. Dr. Hauptman mentioned they had carve-outs for key positions like clerkship director and residency program director where the split could occur. He asserted that a strength of the affiliation was that they had seamless discussions about these positions because Renown Health recognized their importance.

Regent Downs returned to the meeting.

Regent Brown stated that she understood someone getting their paycheck from UNR, but expressed that she cared about the financial health of the medical school. She used an example of someone earning a salary of $1,000 who spent 60% of their time teaching and 40% in the hospital, and she asked if Renown would cover 40% of that salary. Dr. Hauptman stated that was on a case-by-case basis and noted it wouldn't strictly be a 60/40 split, though it could be close to that. Regent Brown expressed that at some point she would like to learn more because she was trying to understand the two different models between the two medical schools. Dr. Hauptman stated that a major difference was that the UNLV faculty practice plan remained with the university, whereas the UNR faculty practice plan was under Renown. He noted that there were different models for the relationships between those the entities and explained that it looked different in the south than in the north. Regent Brown suggested there might be a clearer delineation when everything was under one umbrella where the money was bucketed. She expressed her desire to sit down and learn more at a later point.

25. Withdrawn-Nevada Rural Patient Safety Organization, LLC, UNR School of Medicine – This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

26. Information Only-University Gateway Transportation Improvement Project, UNR – Representatives from the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County presented an update on the University Gateway Transportation Improvement Project, a Regional Transportation Commission-led pedestrian and bicycle crossing of Interstate 80 connecting downtown Reno to the UNR campus *(Ref. BOR-26 on file in the Board Office).*

President Brian Sandoval stated that this project would connect downtown Reno to the university campus. He mentioned that the work reflected ongoing collaboration between the university and regional partners as they advanced planning, outreach, and future design. He noted that the Executive Director of the RTC, Mr. Bill Thomas, was in attendance.

Vice Chair Goodman and Regent Arrascada left the meeting.

Ms. Kim Diegle, Project Manager for the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, stated that the project had three main elements: the realignment of 9th Street and Evans Avenue, the extension of Ninth Street from Wells Avenue, and the Evans Park Gateway area. She explained that the RTC was involved because they were the region's metropolitan planning agency and managed construction projects on regional roads. She noted that the project emerged from regional planning efforts, specifically the Truckee Meadows Vision Zero safety initiative. Ms. Diegle mentioned that in 2020, the RTC completed the University Area Transportation Study to better understand the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and drivers. She pointed out that the corridor around Virginia Street and University Way was part of the high-injury network, seeing 25% of the highest crash rates in the region. Ms. Diegle mentioned that there had been a pedestrian fatality near the I-80 interchange and noted a pedestrian was hit on the corner of Virginia and 8th Street the very day of their public meeting. She observed that the extension of Ninth Street to Wells would help pull traffic and congestion out of the Virginia Street interchange. Ms. Diegle stated that the realignment of Ninth Street and Evans Avenue would help slow traffic and reduce conflict points for pedestrian crossings. She described the Gateway Project vision as an effort to restore and enhance the connection between downtown Reno and the university campus through a safe, inviting, and accessible pathway. Ms. Diegle identified the project priorities as safety, healing the divide created by I-80, pride of place, the road network, and acting as an economic driver. She stated that the preferred option was the Evans Avenue Gateway, which would increase the width of the Evans Avenue bridge to provide park-life experiences for pedestrians. Ms. Diegle noted that Evans Avenue would be reconfigured to eliminate parking lanes and shift vehicle traffic to the east. She mentioned that a dedicated pedestrian crossing and a two-directional "biggest little bike network" path would occupy the west edge. She stated that they were currently in early planning and conceptual design and were working to gain public feedback. Ms. Diegle mentioned that environmental review and preliminary engineering would occur over the next several years. She noted that construction funding had not been fully secured yet, but they were aiming for construction in 2029-2030. She explained that the estimated cost range was approximately \$60 million to \$90 million. Ms. Diegle identified funding sources to date as local RTC fuel tax revenues and approximately \$2 million in federal earmark appropriations.

26. Information Only-University Gateway Transportation Improvement Project, UNR – *(Continued)*

Vice Chair Goodman and Regent Arrascada returned to the meeting.

Regent Carvalho left the meeting.

Regent Del Carlo asked whether 9th Street would stay two lanes or be expanded to four lanes. Ms. Diegle replied that it would most likely stay two lanes based on early traffic studies. Regent Del Carlo noted that there was no way to get into the parking garage on the east side of the building. She inquired if there was any idea of adding ingress into the building on that east side. Ms. Diegle stated that the current plan was to maintain the access that was on the east side of the parking garage to the realigned section. Ms. Diegle further noted that there was an access on the north side of the garage along existing 9th Street. She further confirmed that they planned to maintain that access so there would be two. Regent Del Carlo remarked that maintaining the access would be very smart. Regent Del Carlo asked if the SAE house was gone. Ms. Diegle explained that while the conceptual plan did not show it, they were still looking at it. She added President Sandoval and his office had held early discussions with the SAE house about the matter.

Regent Carvalho returned to the meeting.

Regent Arrascada asked for a refresh of his memory regarding whether Evans Park was owned by the City of Reno or Washoe County. Ms. Diegle replied that the park was owned by the City of Reno. Regent Arrascada inquired if the city was going to provide the park free of charge for the entire project or what the relationship would be. Ms. Diegle stated that the city was very interested in ensuring the park was implemented as part of the improvements. She noted that there were deed restrictions to keep it as a park-like facility for public use. She explained that they would not be allowed to build new buildings on it, but the city was interested in partnering to provide connectivity to the campus. Regent Arrascada mentioned that one of the items was the large horseshoe-throwing community in the area and noted there were about 15 pits there. He stated that he had received over 20 emails from the horseshoe-throwing community asking what was going to happen. Ms. Diegle replied that it was something they still needed to work towards and expressed a desire to listen to the community. She suggested there might be opportunities to move the horseshoe pits to other places, noting that when she personally used them last, they were not in great shape. Regent Arrascada asked when the potential start date for construction would approximately be. Ms. Diegle stated that construction could potentially start in 2029. She noted they had a lot of work to do regarding environmental studies, design, bridge structural design, and utility work. Regent Arrascada asked if the RTC would be raising the finances or leading the charge to raise the finances for the project. Ms. Diegle stated they had a limited amount of funding for the current design and environmental aspects and would work with the city to look for additional state and federal grant opportunities.

Regent Arrascada inquired if any funding would be allocated from the university or if it would be the sole responsibility of the RTC. Bill Thomas, Executive Director of the RTC, stated that they did not know exactly how the project would be funded but confirmed the RTC would lead the charge in finding the funding. He noted that right now, the anticipated

26. Information Only-University Gateway Transportation Improvement Project, UNR – *(Continued)*

impact to the university would be the dedication of property where roads moved onto campus. He explained that the university's stake would be as a partner between the RTC and the City of Reno. He concluded by stating that they anticipated funding opportunities primarily at the federal level that targeted those types of improvements.

Regent Downs asked if they were going to go around the east side of "The Here" apartment complex and if that was a public road and not their property. Ms. Diegle confirmed that was correct and noted that it was Old Record Street, which was currently not connected through. She explained that at one time it was connected, but the connection was severed at 9th Street when "The Here" was built. She stated that they proposed to reopen and enhance that connection to allow traffic going to and from the east side of campus to be on the outskirts of that building. Ms. Diegle noted that this would provide safer access for pedestrians trying to get to and from the apartments and across the Evans Gateway towards the center of campus. Regent Downs asked if the fact that the access was severed meant that purchases had to happen to reopen it. Ms. Diegle stated that no purchases were necessary because it was city right of way. She added that they had to work closely with the Union Pacific Railroad, which was adjacent to that area, and noted there might be some small property acquisitions with them. Regent Downs noted that he thought it was very creative.

27. Information Only-UNR at Lake Tahoe – University of Nevada, Reno Executive Vice President and Provost Jeffrey Thompson presented an update on UNR at Lake Tahoe *(Ref. BOR-27 on file in the Board Office).*

Provost Thompson recalled that in 2022, President Sandoval was contacted by Sierra Nevada University (SNU) to offer their campus to the university as a philanthropic gift. He mentioned that while SNU was stable at the time, it was not sustainable and was looking for a path forward. He explained that SNU had approached UNR first but made it clear they would extend the same offer to UC Davis if UNR was not interested. He stated that they felt that was not in the best interest of the university or the community and subsequently embarked on a long-term transition process.

Regent Brown left the meeting.

Provost Thompson asserted that they made a strong commitment to SNU students to ensure they had a clear path to complete their degrees through a structured teach-out. He expressed pleasure in saying that as of 2026, they had successfully completed that process, with every student given the opportunity to finish their degrees on the Lake Tahoe or Reno campus. Provost Thompson noted that they worked to integrate SNU programs into their curriculum and phased out some programs. He mentioned that over the past several months, they had engaged in a strategic planning process involving faculty, staff, students, and community stakeholders. Provost Thompson stated that they would finalize the process that summer and would be happy to provide a full presentation on the strategic plan once finished.

Regent Brown returned to the meeting.

27. Information Only-UNR at Lake Tahoe – *(Continued)*

Regent Bautista left the meeting.

Provost Thompson informed the Board that they had completed the search for the Vice Provost for UNR at Lake Tahoe and anticipated sharing an announcement very soon. He highlighted that the Semester at Tahoe program had seen consistent enrollment and was now available to students across the country through the National Student Exchange program. Provost Thompson noted that their one-credit weekend courses had been extremely well received, filling within minutes of registration opening. He mentioned that they inherited programs in creative writing and interdisciplinary arts, noting that a new cohort would increase by 50% for the upcoming fall term.

Provost Thompson shared the success story of Abigail White, an inspiring writer who brought her young adult novel to publication and won the Sydney Taylor Book Award. He stated that the Lake Tahoe campus had 88 dorms that had been upgraded and noted they would identify housing needs over the next five years. He mentioned that the campus recently hosted National Geographic Explorers for a climate conference and noted clear community interest in a dedicated performance arts space. Provost Thompson informed the Board that the Innovation Hub was establishing a new laboratory with more than 2 million dollars in scientific equipment scheduled for installation the following month. He stated that they had two state-of-the-art research vessels scheduled to launch that fall to help monitor and safeguard the ecosystem. Provost Thompson mentioned that the Tahoe Basin was a "news desert," which led their local PBS affiliate, KUNR, to open a presence at the Lake Tahoe campus to address the gap. He stated that in January 2027, the Lake Tahoe campus would welcome the first 16 students from the School of Nursing as part of a 16-month rural health program.

Regent Bautista returned to the meeting.

Provost Thompson announced that they had recognized Chef Mark Sandoval at the Lake Tahoe campus to enhance dining and hospitality. He noted that they partnered with Classical Tahoe to construct a 400-seat outdoor auditorium that welcomed more than 4,000 attendees each year. He expressed pride in the Nevada ski team, which they kept from the Lake Tahoe campus and enhanced into a D1 program.

Regent Del Carlo recalled that when they received the campus from Sierra Nevada University, a benefactor named Mr. Wayne Prim was giving them $3 million a year to keep the doors open. She pointed out that there was nothing in the update regarding sustainability and money, noting they did not have a lot of students yet. She shared that she was thrilled about the 16 nursing students and mentioned talking to parents at a recent event who were excited about their daughter attending the school. Regent Del Carlo asked how the university was doing financially in relation to their budget, while noting her appreciation for the inventive teach-outs and new groups being brought in. Provost Thompson stated that it was a complicated question because if they only looked at student credit hours, they were still behind where they expected to be in two or three years. He noted, however, that in terms of conferences, campus use, and research opportunities, they were actually ahead of where he expected to be. He expressed confidence that they would catch up and offered

27. Information Only-UNR at Lake Tahoe – *(Continued)*

to get a more specific answer regarding the exact dollars. Regent Del Carlo stated that would be helpful and mentioned she would love a copy of the strategic plan for the campus. Provost Thompson replied that they expected to have the strategic plan finished that summer.

Regent Del Carlo further noted that the gift of the campus came with approved plans for two more buildings and emphasized that the community really needed a performing arts center. She encouraged everyone to attend the summer concerts, noting they were wonderful and featured top musicians. She asserted that the campus had to stay there and expressed excitement about the "Pack of the Navy" research vessels and the importance of keeping Lake Tahoe blue and clear. Provost Thompson stated that they were working hard with Lake Tahoe Community College to ensure a pathway for nursing students and confirmed they had heard the community's strong desire for a performing arts center.

Regent Arrascada noted that the Orvis School of Nursing would be starting at Lake Tahoe in January 2027 and asked if they would be starting with a 17-student cohort or a 16-student cohort. Provost Thompson stated that they would start with a cohort of 16 and bring in 16 students at each cycle when they admitted students into the program. He added that they expected a steady state of 48 students. Regent Arrascada asked if 48 was going to be the top number. Provost Thompson confirmed that it was. Regent Arrascada inquired if that included the 90 or 95 students they had in Reno. Provost Thompson stated that it would significantly increase the number of nursing students they had at the university.

Regent Carvalho stated that she was going back through the original discussions from when the university accepted the generous gift from Sierra Nevada University. She described the campus as definitely being a jewel for UNR and for NSHE. She recalled that at the time, they had also talked about collaborations or opening up the campus to other NSHE institution students specifically. She asked whether any work had been done on that since the acquisition. Provost Thompson stated that they had and would continue to enhance that as they had more space. He emphasized that they wanted to make sure they were not interfering with the teach-out program. He noted that through the program the previous summer, they had invited students from several campuses to be engaged in research and to talk with other students about their work. Provost Thompson mentioned that they had been doing those things in community colleges and four-year universities and would continue to engage as they moved forward. He listed programs like "We the People" and other artistic programs as ways they were engaging other campuses. Regent Carvalho replied that it was great and added that she looked forward to meeting the new Vice Provost.

Regent Arrascada stated that he was reviewing the slides and noted there were 88 dorms with 20 of them upgraded. He asked how many students currently resided in those dorms and how many were on campus. Provost Thompson noted that the housing was very full on the weekends, while there were maybe 15 or 20 people during the week. He mentioned that there were also conferences going on or graduate students doing research, so there were a lot of people using the housing at the moment. Provost Thompson clarified that they were not all semester-long students on that campus. Regent Arrascada asked if there was any response from nursing students regarding how many would be staying up there during

27. Information Only-UNR at Lake Tahoe – *(Continued)*

that cohort. Provost Thompson stated that it would be a residential program and noted they would be staying on the campus in the housing. Regent Arrascada inquired about the strategic plan for the campus itself and asked when they would be focusing on or working on it, specifically whether it would be those on the campus or those in the Clark administration. Provost Thompson stated that they had engaged over 700 people in the strategic plan process, including people on the campus, students who had taken courses there, the community, and stakeholders. He noted that it had been a very robust listening session to come up with wonderful ideas on how to move that campus forward. Regent Arrascada remarked that 700 participants made for a true strategic plan and thanked him for a job very well done.

Regent Brown expressed curiosity about what it cost to operate the campus. Provost Thompson stated that he did not have that number on him and asked for clarification on whether she meant all employees and buildings. Regent Brown replied that there were monthly bills that came due and asked what those bills were. She questioned whether the campus was hemorrhaging money, was stagnant, or was making a little bit of money since not all programs were running yet. She expressed interest in knowing what the delta looked like in the meantime before the strategic plan was released at the end of the summer. Provost Thompson stated that he was happy to provide the information but explained that the campus was not operated as a separate entity from the university's overall budget. He noted that research funding, self-supporting programs, and tuition were not pulled in or spent separately, but he confirmed they could pull together the specific information requested. Regent Brown stated that she would like that information. She additionally expressed excitement about the nursing program starting in January 2027. She noted that healthcare was limited in that area and emphasized that the program would be a huge resource as students matriculated into the local community.

28. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, CSN – College of Southern Nevada President Stacy S. Klippenstein presented data and metrics on CSN's progress in achieving the strategic goals adopted by the Board of Regents. The metrics presented include those identified by the Board to ensure comparability and alignment with the NSHE Strategic Plan. The presentation will include, but not be limited to, fall enrollment and distribution data; dual credit enrollment; persistence rates; graduation rates; outcome measures; and awarded degrees, certificates, and in-demand occupation credentials *(Ref. BOR-28 on file in the Board Office).*

President Klippenstein thanked the faculty, staff, students, and community partners for their work related to the metrics he shared. He noted that CSN continued to grow enrollment with nearly 48,000 students served, including 40,000 for-credit students, of which roughly 93% were Nevadans. He mentioned that 2 out of 5 students were self-reported first-generation students and 1 in 3 was eligible for Pell Grants. President Klippenstein pointed out that CSN had a roughly $3.4 billion economic impact in Southern Nevada. He stated that their source of funding was roughly 90% from the state of Nevada, with 10% coming from self-supporting sources and grants.

Regent Fernandez joined the meeting remotely.

28. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, CSN – *(Continued)*

President Klippenstein reported a 5% increase in Fall 2025 enrollment over Fall 2024, highlighting a 31% increase in apprenticeship programs and a 12% increase in health science enrollment. President Klippenstein noted that CSN was a Minority Serving Institution and a Hispanic Serving Institution, with Hispanics being the largest group at 44%. He mentioned that dual enrollment had grown significantly, with 14% of the student population now associated with those programs. He shared that 76% of dual credit students enrolled in higher education in Nevada after high school graduation, with almost 12,000 matriculating to CSN. President Klippenstein reported that CSN completed a Northwest mid-cycle accreditation evaluation in October 2025 and had activated working groups to address three recommendations. He noted a large increase in fall-to-fall persistence for full-time students from 60% to 68%. He observed that graduation rates saw gains from 19% to 22% in 2025-2026, though he expressed concern that the performance gap for African-American students had grown. President Klippenstein announced that 2024 saw the highest one-year total completions ever awarded at CSN with 5,657 awards, a 12% increase.

President Klippenstein stated that CSN had eliminated the performance gap for Pell students, who now technically outperformed non-Pell students in 8-year completion rates. He mentioned that their Prison Ed program had over a 90% success rate when disregarding the COVID years. President Klippenstein stated that for every $1 the state invested in CSN, there was a $2.10 return for taxpayers.

Regent Brager left the meeting.

Regent Del Carlo stated that she had seen CSN improve during her time on the Board, noting that the graduation rate had gone from 7% up to 22%. She congratulated President Klippenstein on celebrating his first year in his role. She expressed her appreciation for his hard work and production.

Regent Del Carlo mentioned that the greatest thing she could see him do in the next year before she left the Board was to focus on the biggest gap, which was the Black and African-American students. She recalled that around 2019, Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson had come to a Board meeting and begged them not to forget Black male students because their numbers were even worse. Regent Del Carlo noted that the student center on the North Las Vegas campus was named for him because the Board had taken his words to heart. She pointed out that when a focus was put on a cohort, such as the Hispanic cohort at WNC a few years back, that cohort not only met challenges but exceeded them.

Regent Del Carlo asked what Dr. Klippenstein's plans were so that the Board would know what to expect in terms of incremental improvements over the next couple of years. President Klippenstein replied that closing the completion gaps within student groups was one of his top priorities. He stated that they would be convening a group over the upcoming summer to specifically take a look at the issue and plan out their approach. President Klippenstein mentioned that they had roughly nine unit plans within different departments focusing specifically on growing the percentage from 11% to 12% or 15% to help close the gap more quickly. He noted that they had been working with Achieving the Dream and had recently received a report from their visiting coach. President Klippenstein explained

28. Information Only-Institutional Performance Metrics, CSN – *(Continued)*

that they would apply that report to conversations with teams and unit plans to focus on specific areas like mentoring, building a better environment for belonging, or improving the onboarding process. He asserted that knowing the predictive modeling allowed them to support African-American students differently right when they came in the doors to help them succeed up front. President Klippenstein stated that they were looking at the issue now and had been doing so over the years.

Regent Brager returned to the meeting.

29. Approved-2026-2033 Strategic Plan and *Handbook* Statement, WNC (Agenda Item 31) – The Board of Regents approved the WNC 2026-2033 Strategic Plan and a corresponding revision to the Board of Regents *Handbook* *(Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 5.7)* updating the WNC mission statement *(Refs. BOR-31a and BOR-31b on file in the Board Office).*

Pursuant to NRS 281A, Regent Downs disclosed he is an employee of WNC and will abstain from the vote on this item.

President Dalpe noted that when he started as president, there was already a strategic plan in motion through 2025 in coordination with their accreditation cycle. He explained that the 2018-2025 plan spanned three presidents, making this the first new plan in recent times. He mentioned that they conducted a climate survey with the campus and a student survey, involving faculty, staff, students, leadership, and community stakeholders. President Dalpe observed that they served a mix of urban and rural communities and were trying to strengthen prosperity through education. He informed the Board that they would not print a traditional plan but would instead create a dynamic website to share and update information regularly. President Dalpe noted that the agenda item required two votes: one for the acceptance of the strategic plan and another for the new mission statement. He shared the new mission statement, describing Western Nevada College as a gateway to learning and opportunity, accessible to all, and adaptable to change. He listed the high-level goals of the plan as access, learner success, workforce, organizational health, and community.

President Dalpe highlighted that the institution hit the highest number of graduates ever in 2026, awarding the most degrees and certificates in its history. He emphasized that organizational health was a personal priority, specifically focusing on employee well-being as a primary resource. He mentioned that he had started offering yoga classes on campus to promote a healthy environment. The community goal reflected a commitment to building relationships across their service area, including Carson City, Fallon, and Minden. He noted that the plan offered flexibility and included a number of KPIs that they were still working through. President Dalpe thanked the campus-wide group that worked on the process and committed to carrying out the plan in a positive way.

Regent Arrascada moved approval of the WNC 2026-2033 Strategic Plan and a corresponding revision to the *Board of Regents Handbook* *(Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 5.7)* updating the WNC mission

29. Approved-2026-2033 Strategic Plan and *Handbook* Statement, WNC (Agenda Item 31) – *(Continued)*

statement. Regent Del Carlo seconded. Motion carried. Regent Downs abstained. Regent Boylan was absent.

30. Approved-The Boring Company Station at UNLV – The Board of Regents authorized the following actions to advance the Vegas Loop station project at UNLV: approval to negotiate a suite of agreements relating to development and construction, anticipated to include a Temporary Construction Easement and Development Agreement; approval to negotiate a suite of agreements relating to The Boring Company's access to and operation/management of the station, anticipated to include an Access License and Operations and Management Agreement; and authorization for a Campus Master Plan Amendment to incorporate the proposed station location and supporting infrastructure *(Ref. BOR-30 on file in the Board office)*. The aforementioned agreements shall be presented to the Board of Regents for consideration and possible action at the June 22, 2026, special meeting.

Pursuant to NRS 281A, Regent Carvalho disclosed she is a graduate student at UNLV, and that she would not be materially affected by the information presented and that she would be voting on the matter.

Interim President Chris Heavey recalled that the Board had previously approved an easement for the Boring Company to move their Vegas Loop tunnel under the western edge of the Thomas & Mack Center parking lot. He noted that during that discussion, the Board indicated a strong desire for UNLV to have a station so the benefits of the Vegas Loop could be realized by the campus community. Interim President Heavey mentioned that they were in the active process of developing those agreements in collaboration with NSHE legal counsel, though they remained in draft form. He pointed out that the county was looking for Board approval so the Boring Company could begin the actual excavation of the tunnel. He expressed excitement for the station to come online and noted the Boring Company was ready to move forward quickly once they received the county commission's permit. He mentioned that Tyler Fairbanks with the Boring Company was online to help answer questions.

Regent Brager moved approval of authorizing UNLV to negotiate the agreements and bring them back to the full Board for consideration and approval. Vice Chair Goodman seconded.

Regent Brown stated that she appreciated the matter coming back to the full board instead of the Business, Finance and Facilities Committee.

Regent Brager stated that she thought it was important to move forward with the process as quickly as possible. Interim President Heavey stated that the request was to notify the Board and provide the agreements to the Board. He expressed the hope that the matter would only come back to the Board if issues of concern were raised. Interim President

30. Approved-The Boring Company Station at UNLV – *(Continued)*

Heavey confirmed UNLV would provide notice to the Board of all the final agreements for seven business days. He noted that if the Board did not raise any issues, then the Chancellor would be authorized to execute those agreements without additional action by the Board.

Special Counsel Chris Nielsen stated that the process was consistent with the one typically used for contracts where a seven day notice is provided to the Business, Finance and Facilities Committee.

Chair Brooks stated that if the Board had concerns with any of the agreements presented, they could be placed on the next meeting agenda for discussion.

Interim President Heavey asked Mr. Fairbanks of the Boring Company to share his thoughts. Mr. Fairbanks thanked the Board and Interim President Heavey for working with The Boring Company. Mr. Fairbanks expressed excitement about bringing the Vegas Loop to UNLV and progressing the agreements to a point where they could begin construction and start servicing UNLV. Mr. Fairbanks stated that they were excited about their partnership and wanted to get the station open. He noted that when the easement was voted on a couple of months prior, there was a lot of excitement and eagerness to get the station in front of the Board. He explained that they had worked hard to do that and described it as a huge effort from the UNLV team to get to that point. Mr. Fairbanks stated that once they got through the vote and received their permit, they would start construction.

Regent Carvalho stated that she appreciated that the item was coming back or being given to the full Board for their further look at it. She noted that her concern with the notice approach was that the Board conducts its business in public, and those documents would not be in the public if they went that route. She emphasized that all documents should be in front of the Board at a public meeting.

Vice Chair Goodman asked if the documents could be made public and suggested potentially putting them on the consent agenda for the next meeting so they could be available. She stated that she did not know why the documents would be precluded from being public. Special Counsel Nielsen replied that he did not think the consent calendar would be appropriate because the request was for authorization to execute, whereas consent would be an approval process. Vice Chair Goodman clarified that she was only suggesting it as a way to provide the documents to the public.

Special Counsel Nielsen stated that since the contract involved a public institution, he imagined the documents would generally become public. He noted that while he could not opine on whether there was anything confidential without seeing them, they were generally public types of projects or documents. Vice Chair Goodman mentioned the documents could be put on the agenda as an information item. Interim President Chris Heavey stated that he certainly agrees the documents would be considered public. He noted that UNLV has an easy process for people to request all documents. He asserted that they did not withhold any contracts at the university from anybody who requested them.

30. Approved-The Boring Company Station at UNLV – *(Continued)*

Regent Arrascada asked for clarification on whether the Board would review all those documents prior to the Chancellor signing. Dr. Heavey confirmed that they would. Regent Arrascada noted benefits to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, including the station ownership at no cost, no ongoing financial obligation, discount fares, and branding and naming rights. He asked if those could all be monetized. Interim President Heavey stated that he thought some of those could be monetized. He explained the main hope they had for monetizing the opportunity was through paid parking in conjunction with The Boring Company. He noted that they thought that was the most likely substantial source of revenue.

Regent Goicoechea stated that he had some pause with the agreements being approved before they are complete. He felt it needed to come before the Board at some point, whether before or after, rather than just receiving an email notice.

Vice Chair Goodman stated that she believed The Boring Company was okay with coming back to the June 22, 2026, special meeting and noted they had recommended that at first so it could be heard and be final for all of them. She mentioned that was the initial plan and then it was put on that agenda.

Regent Brager agreed. She noted that the nice thing about this was it was going to be more about making money instead of the reverse. She believed The Boring Company would be happy to bring the agreements to the June 22 meeting so the Board could vote on them. Chair Brooks asked Regent Brager if she would then want to rescind her motion. Regent Brager agreed and said she would make a new motion.

Regent Bautista asked, because UNLV is a public institution, if the station would be subject to prevailing wages. Interim President Heavey confirmed that all their projects were subject to prevailing wages.

Mr. Fairbanks stated that they wanted to work with the Board and present everything with full transparency. He asserted that Option 1, which would provide notice to the Board, was preferred over waiting until June 22. He expressed a desire to move forward to work in earnest with UNLV and get to a point where they had an agreement ready to be signed. Mr. Fairbanks stated they wanted to present that to the Board and noted that if there were any issues from that review, they could bring those items back to the Board. He maintained that their strong preference was to proceed with Regent Brager's initial motion. Mr. Fairbanks stated that if the Board felt anything needed to get back in front of a public vote, they were happy to bring it back, but they really preferred to proceed with the initial motion.

UNLV Chief Financial Officer Chris Viton stated UNLV is working in earnest to have the agreements ready as quickly as possible. There is still some work to do, but he believes they would be ready for a June 22 meeting.

Regent Brager rescinded her motion. Vice Chair Goodman rescinded her second.

30. Approved-The Boring Company Station at UNLV – *(Continued)*

Regent Brager moved to authorize the following actions to advance the Vegas Loop station project at UNLV: approval to negotiate a suite of agreements relating to development and construction, anticipated to include a Temporary Construction Easement and Development Agreement; approval to negotiate a suite of agreements relating to The Boring Company's access to and operation/management of the station, anticipated to include an Access License and Operations and Management Agreement; and authorization for a Campus Master Plan Amendment to incorporate the proposed station location and supporting infrastructure. The aforementioned agreements shall be presented to the Board of Regents for consideration and possible action at the June 22, 2026, special meeting. Vice Chair Goodman seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

The meeting recessed at 12:34 p.m. and reconvened at 1:21 p.m. with all members present except Regents Boylan and Fernandez.

31. No Action Taken-2027-29 NSHE Biennial Budget Request Process and Priorities (Agenda Item 29) – The Board of Regents discussed the process of developing the 2027-29 Biennial Budget Request for the 2027 Legislative Session, including the establishment of budget priorities and possible enhancements to the state-funded operating budget *(Ref. BOR-29 on file in the Board Office).*

Pursuant to NRS 281A, Regent Downs disclosed he is an employee of WNC and because the independence of judgment of a reasonable person would not be materially affected by his situation, he would vote on the matter.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser stated that maintaining the ongoing costs of what they referred to as their base and maintenance funding was very important for their campuses and the System overall. Mr. Leiser noted that caseload growth for their instructional institutions was a huge priority. He shared initial estimates that the caseload adjustment would be over $50 million a year, totaling over a hundred million dollars of new funding for the upcoming biennium just through caseload.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser mentioned the request to fully fund the small institution factor at a hundred percent of the impact based on GBC's and Western Nevada's weighted student credit hours. He provided an update to the figure for Great Basin College, noting that President Donnelli's desire to shift about $500,000 identified for safety and security to repurpose for the TEACH early childhood education scholarship program.

31. <u>No Action Taken-2027-29 NSHE Biennial Budget Request Process and Priorities (Agenda Item 29)</u> – *(Continued)*

Mr. Leiser mentioned that for the Silver State Opportunity Grant, they would try to broaden the request in August to be Systemwide for all eligible institutions. He noted that UNR had a specific request for the Knowledge Account focusing on research and grant assistance. Mr. Leiser also mentioned that on the WINN funding, they wanted to make sure they were reflecting support for WNC, Truckee Meadows, GBC, and CSN.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser mentioned that a new funding formula distribution methodology recommended by the Governor was considered but not adopted during the 2025 legislative session. He stated that the proposed model would preserve existing funding levels and create a structured approach for distributing new state appropriations and student-derived revenues. He noted that the funding distributions would be designated to move institutions towards a peer or aspirational funding benchmark over time.

Mr. Leiser shared that they had a call the previous week with campus representatives and Applied Analysis to pose questions and express concerns regarding the proposed funding formula. He stated that one of the next steps was to develop a matrix to identify what the current funding mechanism and model looked like compared to the new model.

Regent Del Carlo noted that she had asked that they increase the number of advisors to 351, which was one of their core pillars. She also noted that they needed to add information from NSU and WNC. She mentioned that they talked about graduation rates and stated that this was a key component of graduation rates. Mr. Leiser committed to adding a slide to expand on the advisor to student ratio for the August meeting. He noted that WNC had submitted a specific request that they would incorporate into the slide. He mentioned that some other institutions planned to use their caseload dollars to invest in additional advisors and that was why they didn't have a specific request. Mr. Leiser stated that they needed all that content to tell the entire picture.

Chair Brooks inquired about the new funding formula contribution methodology. He assumed it was something being worked on that would come before them later. Mr. Leiser asserted that they did not have any intent to bring back that distribution model for consideration by the Board at this time.

32. <u>Approved-Collective Bargaining Agreement, TMCC and TMCC-NFA</u> – The Board of Regents ratified the 2026-2031 Collective Bargaining Agreement between TMCC and TMCC-NFA *(Ref. BOR-32 on file in the Board Office)*.

President Alexander noted that after eight months of robust negotiations, TMCC and the TMCC NFA had reached a new collective bargaining agreement that was ratified by the membership on May 1, 2026. He explained that if ratified by the Board, the agreement would run from July 31, 2026, through June 30, 2031.

Dr. Alexander stated that the new agreement contained a number of benefits for both academic and administrative faculty. He mentioned that these benefits included greater flexibility for personal days, work-related leaves, and student completion ceremonies. He

32. Approved-Collective Bargaining Agreement, TMCC and TMCC-NFA – *(Continued)*

noted that there was further clarity around faculty workload expectations. President Alexander pointed out that there was clear language regarding the protection of scholarly works in alignment with the handbook. He stated that the agreement included extra duty pay for summer teaching, faculty advisor work, independent courses, and faculty serving as department chairs or in related program leadership roles.

Jim New, outgoing President of the Nevada Faculty Alliance, noted that the Board of Regents had approved TMCC's chapter as the first higher education collective bargaining unit in Nevada. He stated that the document represented the eighth contract negotiated between TMCC and NFA and mentioned that he had sat at the table for five of those eight negotiations. He asserted that the strong contract clarified roles and processes, especially when negotiated in good faith, which naturally reduced friction between management and labor.

Mr. New noted that the agreement marked significant progress on several previously disputed issues, such as clearly defining the role of department chairs while protecting their status as faculty. He mentioned that it addressed faculty compensation and workload and standardized language governing non-teaching faculty like administrative staff, counselors, and librarians. Mr. New shared that 80% of the TMCC faculty who voted had voted in favor of the agreement and expressed hope that the Board would do the same. He stated that they encountered obstacles caused primarily by severely outdated collective bargaining policies in Title 4, Chapter 4 of the *Handbook*, which was written in 1974.

Regent Fernandez returned to the meeting.

Mr. New observed that aside from a few modest adjustments the previous fall, Title 4, Chapter 4 had not seen substantial updates in 36 years while NRS 288 had been revised repeatedly. He sincerely encouraged the board to form a new ad hoc shared governance committee to modernize Title 4, Chapter 4 and bring well-deserved parity to the faculty.

Regent Downs congratulated them both on completing a negotiation in only eight months. He also asked if they discussed arbitration in the negotiations, noting it was not part of the agreement.

Mr. New stated that binding arbitration was one of the mandatory topics in Title 4, Chapter 4, and noted that was one of the areas where ambiguity crept in. He asserted that binding arbitration universally across the country was the mechanism employed in place of strikes. He pointed out that they were forbidden from striking and stated that therefore a union's only tool of leverage was usually binding arbitration. Mr. New explained that binding arbitration would bring a third-party view into any dispute between management and labor. He stated that he thoroughly supported binding arbitration and believed it was an important tool that served both sides of the table. He expressed hope that the Regents would take the matter under serious consideration in their future deliberations.

Regent Downs asked if there was a reason why that was not included in the contract. President Alexander stated that he was not a member of either bargaining team, nor did he

32. Approved-Collective Bargaining Agreement, TMCC and TMCC-NFA – *(Continued)*

communicate with the team very frequently. He maintained that both teams acted on their own recognizance in reaching the deal. He asserted that there was no arbitrator to tell the governor or the legislature what to do, nor did he see it practical that an arbitrator could tell the Board of Regents what to do. He noted that in the event of an impasse about dollars or programs and an arbitrator ordered the Board to decide, the Board would be surrendering its power. He stated that they did fantastic work and came to a great agreement and that they looked forward to building upon it in the future.

Regent Arrascada noted that section 11.5.1 mentioned that an APL might be removed from the assignment by the President on the recommendation of the Dean. He asked if the NFA was comfortable with the President making that autonomous decision to remove the individual.

Mr. New stated that the Academic Accreditation Program Leader, or APL, was a relatively new position defined in the contract. He explained that it was a position appointed by the administration rather than elected by the faculty like a department chair. He asserted that because the APL was an administrative appointment to begin with, they believed they had adequate protections in the collective bargaining agreement to ensure the administration would not act capriciously. He stated that they were satisfied with that at the time.

Regent Arrascada asked if he identified the discrepancy between the robust involvement in the removal of a dean or faculty member versus one individual making an autonomous decision. Mr. New stated that Title 4, Chapter 4 also placed power in the President for all personnel. He noted that they did have concerns, such as the fact that if a grievance was filed against the President, the final arbitrary of that grievance would be the President under current policy. He encouraged the board to take up Title 4, Chapter 4 to resolve disagreements and ambiguities within the policy.

Regent Downs mentioned that he thought the governor was bound to arbitration with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. He expressed the thought that the agreement might be the cause for that, which he thought could be a justification for binding arbitration as well.

Regent Downs moved to ratify the 2026-2031 Collective Bargaining Agreement between TMCC and TMCC-NFA. Regent Arrascada seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

33. Approved-Power-Based Violence Climate Survey Instrument – The Board of Regents approved the power-based violence climate survey instrument developed by researchers from the UNLV Center for Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (CREA), including a requirement that each NSHE institution work with CREA to administer the power-based violence climate survey during Fall 2026 *(Ref. BOR-33 on file in the Board office)*.

Dr. Elizabeth Gunn explained that the task force collaborated with UNLV's Center for Research, Evaluation and Assessment (CREA) to conduct a national review of climate

33. Approved-Power-Based Violence Climate Survey Instrument – *(Continued)*

survey instruments. She stated that they leveraged best practices for greater validity, usability, and actionability. She asserted that the revised survey was stronger, more actionable, and more responsive to task force feedback and legislative direction. Dr. Gunn mentioned that on June 12th, 2025, the redesign effort was made possible through the Board's action authorizing a second System-wide survey. She noted that the task force had worked closely with CREA through multiple rounds of refinement while simultaneously conducting a needs analysis.

Dr. Gunn explained that the survey was intended to provide student responses to prevention and support efforts and evaluate institutional capacity. She highlighted ten components that made the 2026 survey better than the 2023 instrument. She stated that the survey aligned more closely with Nevada's statutory definition of power-based violence, measuring the full spectrum including sexual misconduct, stalking, harassment, and voyeurism. She noted a major methodology improvement was the shift away from perpetration questions to focus more on victimization perceptions, reporting behaviors, and campus climate.

Dr. Gunn pointed out that the survey expanded beyond prevalence to help evaluate institutional effectiveness. She mentioned that resource awareness and service utilization were measured more frequently and directly. She stated that the survey included stronger measures of student intervention and prevention culture. Dr. Gunn noted that the survey better captured student success and impacts on retention, connecting to priorities around persistence and completion. She shared that the survey included more detailed contextual information about incidents for targeted interventions and resource allocation. She mentioned that CREA incorporated task force feedback regarding inclusivity and demographic analysis to support analysis across student populations. Dr. Gunn stated that the survey was designed to produce stronger participation and more System-wide results, with plans for a 15 to 20% completion rate. She noted that the survey would be administered prior to the Thanksgiving break.

Regent McGrath thanked Dr. Gunn and applauded her work in that area. She mentioned that she loved the emphasis on the perception of the climate, reporting procedures, and the information being gathered.

Regent Del Carlo expressed her appreciation for using CREA. She noted that at times the System has hired high-paid consultants when there was so much think power internally. She shared her hope that more institutions would take advantage of their own internal resources.

Dr. Gunn emphasized that working with CREA helped produce a much more effective set of instruments for the institutions.

Regent McGrath moved approval of the power-based violence climate survey instrument and to require each institution to work with CREA to administer it in the fall of 2026. Regent Brown seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

34. Approved-*Handbook* Revision, Legal Status of the University – The Board of Regents approved a revision to Title 3 of the *Handbook* updating the contained Nevada Constitution provisions and Nevada Supreme Court interpretations to reflect current law; adding *Nevada Revised Statutes* pertinent to the System, as amended to correct the following case citation: "Nev. Policy Research Inst. v. Miller, 558 P.3d 319, 327-28 (2024)."; and revising language for enhanced readability *(Ref. BOR-34 on file in the Board office)*.

Chief General Counsel Martines introduced Amanda Vaskov, a current law student completing the supervised practice component of the bar exam under the supervision of their office.

Ms. Vaskov discussed the item in three parts: what Title 3 is, why it was being updated, and the contents of the revision. She identified accuracy as the first reason for revising *Title 3*, noting it contained interpretations of law, cases, and statutes pertaining to the Nevada System of Higher Education. Ms. Vaskov pointed out that it had not been updated since 2009 and the law had changed significantly since then. She identified readability as the second reason, explaining that the previous version of Title 3 was difficult to read and has been edited for modern English. She identified responsiveness as the third reason, noting the Board's expressed interest in undergoing *Handbook* revisions.

Ms. Vaskov explained that Title 3 overviewed the legal status of the university. She clarified that Title 3 did not have the force and effect of law and was essentially an information-only item for reference. She stated that Section 1 of the revisions contained provisions of the Nevada Constitution pertaining to the System. Ms. Vaskov noted that Section 2 contained a selection of Nevada case law pertinent to employment or System operations. She highlighted that Section 3 contained information about Nevada statutes, specifically NRS 396, regarding elections and system operations.

Regent Brown thanked Ms. Vaskov for all the work she had done.

Ms. Vaskov called attention to a needed modification to a case citation within Section 2 which had a typo. Nevada Policy Research Institute versus Miller should read 558 P.3d instead of 335 P.3d. She asked that any motion for approval include direction to staff to make that correction.

Regent Downs moved approval of revisions to Title 3 of the *Board of Regents Handbook* including the correction to the Nevada Policy Research Institute v. Miller case citation. Regent Del Carlo seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

35. Approved-Code Amendment, Student Government Constitutions – The Board of Regents approved revisions to the Code *(Title 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.3.6)* regarding student government constitutions, as amended *(Ref. BOR-35 on file in the Board office)*.

Assistant System Counsel Melissa Barnard noted the proposed revisions aim to conform to best practices and create a more efficient and expedient process for adopting or repealing amendments to government constitutions. The changes would minimize subsequent votes

35. Approved-Code Amendment, Student Government Constitutions – *(Continued)*

by the student body or student government. She pointed out that the changes were only intended to add additional review at the institution level and not to add any layers of approval by anyone else. She stated that approval still resided with the student body government or the students themselves, and ultimately with the Chancellor.

Ms. Barnard mentioned that she had met that morning with the graduate and undergraduate student body presidents and they requested that the proposal be amended to include a time period for the review at the institution level.

Regent Carvalho asked for student leaders present to share their input. Mr. Kelechi Odunze noted they wanted to make sure proposed constitutional revisions are reviewed promptly. Mr. Braden Bolton supported the change and noted it enhances shared governance.

Ms. Barnard noted the second sentence of Section 1.3.6 would be amended to read: "Prior to a vote of the students, the student government shall provide the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal of the constitution to the institution general counsel and institution vice president of student affairs/student services or dean of the graduate school as applicable, and they shall review any such proposed revisions promptly after receiving the proposed revisions from the student government."

Regent Carvalho moved approval of revisions to the Code *(Title 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.3.6)* regarding student government constitutions, as amended. Regent Downs seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

36. Approved-Code Amendment, Rules of Conduct and Procedures for Students – The Board of Regents approved an amendment to the Code *(Title 2, Chapter 10, Section 10.2.1)* related to peer-on-peer harassment and protected speech consistent with the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Pursuant to NRS 281A, Regent Carvalho disclosed that she was a graduate student at UNLV. She stated she believed that the independent judgment of a reasonable person in her situation would not be materially affected by the information presented in the agenda item and that she would be voting.

Assistant System Counsel Carrie Parker explained that courts recognized the needs of educational institutions to protect their students from potentially harmful conduct. She asserted that lawful limits on expressive conduct must also comply with the First Amendment. She stated that these provisions balanced those two interests. Regent McGrath expressed her appreciation for the Code being revised to reflect current federal law consistent with the Constitution.

Regent McGrath moved approval of an amendment to the NSHE Code related to peer-on-peer harassment and protected speech consistent with the

36. Approved-Code Amendment, Rules of Conduct and Procedures for Students – *(Continued)*

First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Regent Arrascada seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

37. Approved-*Handbook* Revision, Policy Against Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment, and Code Amendment, Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Faculty – The Board of Regents approved a revision to Board policy *(Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 13)* and conforming amendments to the NSHE Code *(Title 2, Chapter 6, Section 6.2.1 and Title 2, Chapter 8, Sections 8.3.2 and 8.3.4)* to incorporate the definition of power-based violence from NRS 396.1285 and adopt the updated definition of fondling consistent with revisions by the National Incident-Based Reporting System, ensuring consistency across policies and alignment with applicable federal standards including Title IX *(Ref. BOR-37on file in the Board Office)*.

Chief Human Resources Officer Yonata Rubin stated the proposed revisions were consistent with recent statutory and regulatory requirements. She asserted that the revisions aligned with applicable laws and regulations including Title IX and supported clear, consistent policy implementation across NSHE institutions. She defined power-based violence as any form of interpersonal violence to control, inundate, or harm another person through the assertion of power over the person. She noted that this included, without limitation, dating violence, domestic violence, family violence, gender-based violence, and violence based on sexual orientation or gender identity or expression. She added that it also included sexual assault, sexual harassment, stalking, and/or the observation of another person naked or in sexual behavior without consent. She defined fondling as the intentional touching of clothed or unclothed parts of a person or forced touching by the victim of the actor's clothed or unclothed body parts without consent for the purpose of sexual gratification. She stated that the proposed amendments formally incorporated updated definitions into policy and disciplinary procedures to ensure clarity, consistency, and compliance with state and federal requirements.

Regent Downs moved approval a revision to Board policy and conforming amendments to the NSHE Code to incorporate the definition of power-based violence from NRS 396.1285 and adopt the updated definition of fondling consistent with revisions by the National Incident-Based Reporting System, ensuring consistency across policies and alignment with applicable federal standards including Title IX. Regent McGrath seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

38. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, Athletic Coach and Director Employment Agreements – The Board of Regents approved a revision to the *Procedures and Guidelines Manual* *(Chapter 5, Section 14)* updating the templates for Head Coach and Director of Athletics employment agreements *(Ref. BOR-38 on file in the Board Office)*.

38. Approved-*Procedures and Guidelines Manual* Revision, Athletic Coach and Director Employment Agreements – *(Continued)*

Chief Human Resources Officer Rubin recalled the Board approved a policy in September 2016 delegating authority to institution presidents to approve employment agreements for athletic personnel, provided they used the Board-approved templates. She mentioned that during the audit covering July 1, 2023, through March 31, 2025, auditors identified outdated language in Section 5.4 of both templates. She pointed out that the templates currently referenced personal automobile insurance coverage that institutions no longer provided. She asserted that as a result, the template language was no longer aligned with current institutional practice.

Ms. Rubin stated the proposed revisions would align the agreement templates with current institutional practices and prevent institutions from being required to provide insurance that was no longer offered.

Regent Downs moved approval a revision to the *Procedures and Guidelines Manual* updating the templates for Head Coach and Director of Athletics employment agreements. Regent Bautista seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

The meeting recessed at 2:36 p.m. and reconvened at 2:59 p.m. with all members present except Regent Boylan.

39. Action Taken-Election of Officers – The Board of Regents elected Regent Carol Del Carlo to a one-year term as Board Vice Chair, commencing July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2027. The Board Chair election was moved to the June 22, 2026, special meeting after neither nominee received the required seven affirmative votes.

- Board Chair

Regent Brager nominated Vice Chair Goodman. Regent Fernandez nominated Regent Carvalho.

Upon a roll call vote, neither candidate received the required seven affirmative votes. Vice Chair Goodman and Regents Brager, Del Carlo, Downs, Goicoechea, and McGrath voted for Vice Chair Goodman. Chair Brooks and Regents Arrascada, Bautista, Brown, Carvalho, and Fernandez voted for Regent Carvalho. Regent Boylan was absent.

Upon a second roll call vote, neither candidate received the required seven affirmative votes. Vice Chair Goodman and Regents Brager, Del Carlo, Downs, Goicoechea, and McGrath voted for Vice Chair Goodman. Chair Brooks and Regents

39. Action Taken-Election of Officers – *(Continued)*

Arrascada, Bautista, Brown, Carvalho, and Fernandez voted for Regent Carvalho. Regent Boylan was absent.

- Vice Chair

Regent Bautista nominated Regent Brown. Vice Chair Goodman nominated Regent Del Carlo.

Upon a roll call vote, Regent Del Carlo was elected Board Vice Chair. Vice Chair Goodman and Regents Arrascada, Brager, Del Carlo, Downs, Goicoechea, and McGrath voted for Regent Del Carlo. Chair Brooks and Regents Bautista, Brown, Carvalho and Fernandez voted for Regent Brown. Regent Boylan was absent.

Agenda Items 40-45 were taken together.

40. Approved-Investment Committee Report – The Board accepted the report of the Investment Committee and approved the Committee recommendations *(Committee report on file in the Board Office)*.

The Committee met on March 12, 2026, and heard the following:

Information Items

- Chair Downs introduced Mr. Bryton Lewis from TIAA Wealth Management as a new advisory member to the Investment Committee.
- Ms. Wendy Walker with Cambridge Associates presented a report on asset allocations and investment returns for the Pooled Endowment Fund as of December 31, 2025. The endowment achieved a 15.1% return in 2025, significantly exceeding its 50-year historical average. The fund trailed its policy benchmark by 200 basis points due to a performance mismatch between private holdings and rapidly rallying public indices. However, it remains committed to its high allocation in alternative assets in hedge funds and private equity. The endowment prioritizes long-term value-add and volatility mitigation, and leverages its perpetual nature and low liquidity demands of less than 5%. She additionally noted that early 2026 data already show signs of a thawing in private markets.
- Ms. Walker presented a comparison report of the endowment pool performance for the Nevada System of Higher Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas and University of Nevada, Reno as of June 30, 2025. Ms. Walker observed that despite having varied asset allocations and investment strategies to meet spending mandates, the endowments achieved consistent long-term results within a narrow 40-basis-point margin. This performance suggests that each institution is successfully managing its specific requirements while maintaining portfolios that remain in very close shape overall.

40. Approved-Investment Committee Report – *(Continued)*

Action Items
The Board approved the following recommendations of the Investment Committee:

- Approval of the September 30, 2025, meeting minutes *(Ref. INV-2 on file in the Board Office).*
- Approval of the following revised rebalancing actions:
    - $20.0 million trim from Metis US Index Fund
    - $4.0 million trim from Vanguard Developed Markets Index
    - $15.0 million add to Vanguard Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities
    - $9.0 million add to PIMCO Total Return

41. Approved-ad hoc Nevada State University Presidential Search Committee Report – The Board accepted the report of the ad hoc Nevada State University Presidential Search Committee and approved the Committee recommendation *(Committee report on file in the Board Office).*

The Committee met on April 30, 2026, and heard the following:

Information Items
- Chair Amy J. Carvalho along with Dr. Gabriel Esteban and Mary Kennard from Academic Search provided a brief review of the search process to date and announced the names of the final candidates:
    - Susan L. Elrod, Ph.D. *(Ref. NSU PSC-3a on file in the Board Office)*
    - Timothy J. Purnell, Ed.D. *(Ref. NSU PSC-3b on file in the Board Office)*
    - Sandra B. Richtermeyer, Ph.D. *(Ref. NSU PSC-3c on file in the Board Office)*
    - Suzanne R. Smith, Ph.D. *(Ref. NSU PSC-3d on file in the Board Office)*
- Chair Carvalho led a discussion on the interview process and assigned questions to members of the search advisory committee.
- Dr. Gabriel Esteban and Ms. Mary Kennard reported on the campus visits and forums, and also provided an overview of each finalist including their background, qualifications, reference and forum feedback. Each finalist was interviewed.
- Search advisory committee members discussed the finalists and provided the Regents' Committee with their assessment of the candidates.
- The Regents' Committee discussed and assessed the finalists and recommended that Dr. Sandra B. Richtermeyer and Dr. Suzanne R. Smith be moved forward to the Board of Regents for consideration of appointment as the next President of Nevada State University at a special meeting to be held on Friday, May 1, 2026.

Action Item
The Board approved the following recommendation of the ad hoc Nevada State University Presidential Search Committee:

- Approval of the February 6, 2026, meeting minutes *(Ref. NSU PSC-2 on file in the Board Office).*

42. Approved-Audit, Compliance and Title IX Committee Report – The Board accepted the report of the Audit, Compliance and Title IX Committee and approved the Committee recommendations *(Committee report on file in the Board Office).*

The Committee met on June 4, 2026, and heard the following:

Information Items

- Dr. Shawn Gerstenberger, Officer in Charge of the UNLV School of Dental Medicine, provided an update on the progress of audit findings identified in the July 1, 2024, through May 31, 2025, audit report that was presented at the February 26, 2026, Audit, Compliance and Title IX Committee meeting.
- Chief Internal Auditor Lauren Tripp provided general remarks regarding departmental updates, initiatives, and alignment related to ongoing risk assessments and themes observed.

Action Items

The Board approved the following recommendations of the Audit, Compliance and Title IX Committee:

- Approval of the minutes from the February 26, 2026, meeting *(Ref. AC-2a on file in the Board Office).*
- Acceptance of the UNLV Intercollegiate Athletics follow-up responses for the period of July 1, 2023, through March 31, 2025 *(Ref. AC-2b on file in the Board Office).*
- Acceptance of the NSU Facilities Contract follow-up responses for the period of July 1, 2022, through March 31, 2025 *(Ref. AC-2c on file in the Board Office).*
- The report and institutional responses to the TMCC Change in Leadership audit for the period of July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2025 *(Ref. AC-3 on file in the Board Office).*
- Revision to the Code *(Title 2, Chapter 9, Section 9.2)* to provide clarification on documentation within the department and the confidentiality of department documentation that was previously presented for initial discussion at the February 26, 2026, meeting *(Ref. AC-5 on file in the Board Office).*

43. Approved-Health Sciences System Committee Report – The Board accepted the report of the Health Sciences System Committee and approved the Committee recommendation *(Committee report on file in the Board Office).*

The Committee met on June 4, 2026, and heard the following:

Information Items

- Dr. Paul J. Hauptman, Dean of the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine, presented a report on the School's programs and finances. His presentation included updates on Undergraduate Medical Education (UME) and Graduate Medical Education (GME), research and community outreach activities, clinical services, and the School's affiliation with Renown Health. He also provided updates on the Physician Assistant and Speech Pathology programs. At Chair Goodman's request, Dean Hauptman shared information regarding the School's recent LCME accreditation site visit and related follow-up activities. In addition, he highlighted a retirement celebration honoring Dr. Tom Kozel, a longtime faculty member who taught UNRSOM students for 54 years *(Ref. HSS-4 on file in the Board Office).*

43. Approved-Health Sciences System Committee Report – *(Continued)*

- Dr. Michelle Paul, Assistant Vice President of Mental and Behavioral Health at UNLV and Workday Endowed Executive Director of UNLV PRACTICE, provided an overview of SB 353, legislation enacted during the 83rd Session of the Nevada Legislature with support from the Nevada Health Authority (NVHA). The legislation authorizes the NVHA to submit a State Plan Amendment that could enable enhanced reimbursement for mental and behavioral health services provided at university-based clinics, subject to CMS approval. Dr. Paul discussed the need for enhanced reimbursement rates and outlined potential benefits for programs at UNLV, UNR, and NSU. Representatives from UNR and NSU were also present to provide additional information regarding the impact on their current and future programs *(Ref. HSS-5 on file in the Board Office).*
- Dr. Marcia Turner, NSHE Associate Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, provided an update on the Nevada Rural Health Transformation Request for Application (RFA) process. She introduced members of the Rural Health Transformation Coordinating Council and summarized the Council's activities. Dr. Turner also reviewed NSHE institutions' efforts to develop and submit proposals for Nevada Health Authority Rural Health Transformation funding opportunities aimed at advancing rural healthcare and health workforce development in Nevada. She noted that the grant process is highly competitive and that a significant portion of the funding is intended to support the sustainability of rural hospitals and clinical providers *(Ref. HSS-6 on file in the Board Office).*

Action Items

The Board approved the following recommendation of the Health Sciences System Committee:

- Approval of the February 26, 2026, meeting minutes *(Ref. HSS-2 on file in the Board Office).*

44. Approved-Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee Report – The Board accepted the report of the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee and approved the Committee recommendations *(Committee report on file in the Board Office).*

The Committee met on June 11, 2026, and heard the following:

Information Items

- Director of Student Affairs Ashley Salisbury presented highlights from the 2024-25 NSHE Financial Aid Report, including data on financial aid programs, recipient attributes, and awards distributed across the System, as well as NSHE total financial aid disbursed by category, source, and type. In addition, the presentation included general information on financial aid concepts and the variety of programs available to support students *(Refs. ARSA-10a and ARSA-10b on file in the Board Office)*.
- Director of Nevada System Sponsored Programs and EPSCoR Marcie Jackson presented highlights from the 2024-25 NSHE Sponsored Funding Annual Report. The report included information on sponsored programs, awards and expenditures for all NSHE institutions *(Refs. ARSA-11a and ARSA- 11b on file in the Board Office)*.

44. Approved-Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee Report – *(Continued)*

Action Items

The Board approved the following recommendations of the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee:

- Approval of the March 5, 2026, meeting minutes *(Ref. ARSA-2a on file in the Board Office).*
- Elimination of the Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Cardiorespiratory Sciences at CSN as the degree is no longer required by the industry nor the accrediting body. There are no students enrolled *(Ref. ARSA-2b on file in the Board Office).*
- Elimination of the Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Food and Beverage Management at CSN as a college degree is no longer required for a management position *(Ref. ARSA-2c on file in the Board Office).*
- Elimination of the Bachelor of Applied Science (B.A.S.) in Food Service Operations at CSN as a college degree is no longer required for a management position *(Ref. ARSA-2d on file in the Board Office).*
- Elimination of the Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Real Estate at CSN due to low interest in the program. Additionally, the institution is unable to retain a qualified faculty member to maintain eligibility for inclusion in the Nevada Real Estate providers list *(Ref. ARSA-2e on file in the Board Office).*
- A Bachelor of Science in Children's Behavioral Health Psychology at UNLV providing a broad and balanced treatment of knowledge, skills, professional dispositions, and cultural competencies necessary to promote well-being and prevent and intervene to support the behavioral health of preschool through grade 12 children. In particular, the program focuses on addictions and neurodevelopmental assessment of youth exposed to substances *(Ref. ARSA-3 on file in the Board Office).*
- A Bachelor of Science in Sport Hospitality Management at UNLV combining the knowledge and skills from the sport, entertainment, and hospitality management perspectives. This program will allow students to manage sport organizations, events, and services within this industry *(Ref. ARSA-4 on file in the Board Office).*
- A Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D) in Clinical Psychology at UNLV to prepare individuals for competent and ethical generalist practice as clinical psychologists. This program supports Nevada's strategic priorities to grow its health workforce and respond to the opioid crisis. Nevada funded the development of the program's structure and curriculum through the Department of Justice Settlement Agreement. The program is constructed to meet accreditation standards set by the American Psychological Association *(Ref. ARSA-5 on file in the Board Office).*
- An Associate of Science (A.S.) in Cybersecurity at CSN preparing students for immediate entry into the cybersecurity workforce. The program also prepares students for transfer into bachelor's programs at UNLV and UNR. Students will be trained in the knowledge of computers, networks, and risk and security management to meet the needs of the local, state, regional and national workforce *(Ref. ARSA-6 on file in the Board Office).*
- A Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Animal Science at UNR preparing students for careers in livestock production, food manufacturing, and related fields. The program covers animal husbandry, genetics, reproduction, meat processing, and

44. Approved-Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee Report – *(Continued)*

behavior, equipping graduates with critical thinking skills and a solid understanding of the biological and chemical process affecting animals *(Ref. ARSA-7 on file in the Board Office).*

- Authorization to begin the accreditation process and the search and hire of a planning dean for a School of Veterinary Medicine at UNR *(Ref. ARSA-8 on file in the Board Office).*
- A revision to Board policy *(Title 4, Chapter 12, Sections 2 and 8)*. The revision delineates the distribution of Net Income received from Intellectual Property, updating the division of such between the inventor, academic department or unit, institution, and the Institutional Proof of Concept Fund *(Ref. ARSA-9 on file in the Board Office).*

45. Approved-Business, Finance and Facilities Committee Report – The Board accepted the report of the Business, Finance and Facilities Committee and approved the Committee recommendations *(Committee report on file in the Board Office).*

The Committee met on June 11, 2026, and heard the following:

Action Items
The Board approved the following recommendations of the Business, Finance and Facilities Committee:

- The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 5, 2026, Business, Finance and Facilities Committee meeting *(Ref. BFF-2a on file in the Board Office)*.
- The Committee recommended acceptance of the Third Quarter Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Report of Budget Transfers of State Supported or Self-Supporting Operating Budget Funds between Functions *(Ref. BFF-2b on file in the Board Office)*.
- The Committee recommended acceptance of the Third Quarter Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Report of Fiscal Exceptions on Self-Supporting Budgets *(Ref. BFF-2c on file in the Board Office)*.
- The Committee recommended approval of a Resolution approving the deed transfer of real property located at 634 Ryland Street (APN 013-013-31) in Reno, Nevada from the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation to the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno; and the naming of 634 Ryland Street in Reno, Nevada, as the John Iliescu Physical Therapy Building. The Committee also recommended that the Chancellor or designee be granted authority to execute the transfer deed, review and approve environmental condition reports, and sign any nonmaterial amendments or ancillary documents required to finalize the transfer of real property. All such documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and the NSHE Chief General Counsel to ensure they align with the terms approved by the Board of Regents *(Ref. BFF-3 on file in the Board Office)*.
- The Committee recommended approval of two Ground Lease Agreements between the University of Nevada, Reno and the Doral Academy of Northern Nevada and Sierra Surf Soccer Club involving a 40-acre parcel adjacent to the Main Station Field Laboratory, and the Affiliation Agreement between the University of Nevada,

45. Approved-Business, Finance and Facilities Committee Report – *(Continued)*

Reno and the Doral Academy of Northern Nevada. The Committee also recommended that the Chancellor or designee be granted authority to execute the Ground Lease Agreements and the Affiliation Agreement, any non-material or corrective amendments to the Ground Lease Agreements or the Affiliation Agreement, and any other ancillary agreements, documents, or applications that may be required to implement the Ground Lease Agreements or the Affiliation Agreement. All such amendments and ancillary documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and NSHE Chief General Counsel, or, at the NSHE Chief General Counsel's request, NSHE Special Real Property Counsel, to confirm they are necessary to implement the terms and conditions required to finalize the Ground Lease Agreements and Affiliation Agreement, as approved by the Board of Regents *(Ref. BFF-4 on file in the Board Office)*.

- The Committee recommended approval of a Tri-Party Agreement between the University of Nevada, Reno Extension, Eureka County, and the Boys & Girls Club of Truckee Meadows, and a separate Lease Agreement between the University of Nevada, Reno Extension and the Boys & Girls Club of Truckee Meadows. The Committee also recommended that the Chancellor be granted the authority to execute the Tri-Party Agreement, Lease Agreement, any non-material or corrective amendments thereto; and any other ancillary documents as may be required to implement the Agreements. All such documents shall be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and the NSHE Chief General Counsel to ensure they align with the terms approved by the Board of Regents *(Ref. BFF-6 on file in the Board Office)*.
- The Committee recommended approval of the following actions in connection with the proposed acquisition of approximately 1.69 acres of real property and improvements located at 555 Reactor Way, Reno, Nevada (Washoe County Assessor Parcel No. 012-363-21) (the "Property") from High Sierra Industries, Inc., a Nevada nonprofit corporation (the "Seller"), for a purchase price of $6,900,000 *(Refs. BFF-7a through BFF-7e on file in the Board Office)*:
    1. Adopt the Purchase Resolution (attached as Exhibit A), approving the purchase of the Property from the Seller for a cash purchase price of $6,900,000 on the terms and conditions of the Purchase and Sale Agreement (attached as Exhibit B), together with, as additional consideration, the assumption by NSHE of the Seller's Construction Grant Agreement dated August 26, 2015 with The William N. Pennington Foundation (the "Construction Grant Agreement") pursuant to the Assignment and Assumption of Construction Grant Agreement (attached as Exhibit C), subject to amendments to the Construction Grant Agreement that remove any restriction limiting NSHE's use of the Property and otherwise modify or remove provisions as the Chancellor or designee determines necessary; title to be acquired in the name of the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of Truckee Meadows Community College, consistent with Title 4, Chapter 10, Table 9.1 of the *Handbook.*

45. Approved-Business, Finance and Facilities Committee Report – *(Continued)*

2. Adopt the Resolution of Finance (attached as Exhibit D) authorizing the issuance and sale of one or more promissory notes of NSHE in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $6,900,000 (the "Note") to finance the acquisition and related capital improvements at the William N. Pennington Applied Technology Center campus (the "Project"); designating U.S. Bank National Association as paying agent and registrar for the Note; approving the use of TMCC's Capital Improvement Fee, General Improvement Fee, and institutional reserves for debt service on the Note pursuant to Title 4, Chapter 10, Sections 12(3)(h) and 13(4) of the *Handbook;* setting forth the form of the Note substantially in the form attached to that Resolution; and authorizing the Chair of the Board, the Chancellor (as ex officio Treasurer), and the Chief of Staff to the Board (as ex officio Secretary) to execute and deliver the Note and related closing certificates; and
3. Adopt the Reimbursement Resolution (attached as Exhibit E), declaring NSHE's "official intent" under Treasury Regulation Section 1.150-2 to reimburse, from proceeds of the Note in an amount up to $6,900,000, expenditures made for the Project prior to issuance of the Note, and authorizing the Vice Chancellor for budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer to specify the method of sale, the terms of the Note, the date of sale, the final principal amount, the terms of repayment, and the security therefor, subject to NRS Chapter 396 and to subsequent action by the Board.

In adopting each of the foregoing resolutions, the Board authorizes the Chancellor, or designee, on behalf of the Board, to negotiate and sign any non-material or corrective amendments, and any other ancillary agreements, documents, certificates, or applications, that may be required to implement and consummate the acquisition of the Property, the assumption of the Construction Grant Agreement, and the issuance and sale of the Note.

- The Committee recommended acceptance of the $150,000 gift from Harold Bollenbacher to establish the Bollenbacher Family Trust endowment *(Ref. BFF-8 on file in the Board Office)*.
- The Committee recommended approval of a listing/leasing agreement between the Board of Regents, on behalf of TMCC, and Logic Reno LLC dba Logic Commercial Real Estate to provide listing and leasing services for real property located at 5250 Neil Road in Reno, Nevada. The Committee also recommended that the Chancellor be granted authority to execute the listing/leasing agreement and Schedule of Commissions following review and approval by the Chancellor and NSHE Chief General Counsel *(Ref. BFF-9 on file in the Board Office)*

Regent Downs moved to accept the committee reports and approve the committee recommendations under Agenda Items 40-45. Regent Baustista seconded. Motion carried. Regent Boylan was absent.

45. Information Only-New Business – Regent Downs requested the Board review binding arbitration and take a position. The discussion should include both sides of the issue. He suggested that it might take an outside body to present one of the two sides.

Regent Del Carlo requested a review of the emeritus policy, including peer comparisons for both community colleges and universities, with a recommendation brought back to the Board. She also requested a presentation at a future meeting on System Administration staffing and whether it was adequate compared to other systems of similar size.

Regent Arrascada requested a full report on the accessibility of and renovations required to the NSHE Carson City office, noting this should be done before the legislative session.

46. Information Only-Public Comment – Mr. Aidan Casey, UNR-ASUN, reminded the Regents of the rising costs of being a college student. He mentioned that over 40% of students already felt financial pressure from the cost of housing and food according to the most recent ASUN issues and priorities needs assessment. He asserted that these combined rising costs would seriously impact both in-state and out-of-state students at UNR and all institutions. He noted that the Nevada legislative session was rapidly approaching in February 2027 and that legislative agendas were being discussed. He argued that they needed help to push towards solutions that would benefit students academically and economically in the legislative session to retain the state's status of affordability. He concluded by thanking Regents for their time and dedication to Nevada's higher education and stated they looked forward to working with them in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Prepared by:	Klaas H. Van Der Wey Special Assistant and Coordinator to the Board of Regents
Submitted for approval by:	Keri D. Nikolajewski Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents