

**BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Jot Travis Student Union, Auditorium
University of Nevada, Reno
1664 North Virginia Street, Reno
Thursday-Friday, August 16-17, 2007

Members Present:

Mr. Michael B. Wixom, Chair
Mr. Howard Rosenberg, Vice Chair
Mr. Mark Alden
Dr. Stavros S. Anthony
Mr. Cedric Crear
Dr. Thalia M. Dondero
Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher
Dr. Jason Geddes
Mr. Ron Knecht
Mr. James Dean Leavitt
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Bret Whipple

Others Present:

Chancellor James E. Rogers
Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mike Reed
Interim Vice Chancellor, Health Sciences System, Marcia Turner
Interim Vice Chancellor, Technology, Kenneth McCollum
Chief Counsel Bart Patterson
Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen
Interim President Michael D. Richards, CSN
President Stephen G. Wells, DRI
President Paul T. Killpatrick, GBC
President Fred J. Maryanski, NSC
Interim President Delores Sanford, TMCC
President David B. Ashley, UNLV
President Milton D. Glick, UNR
President Carol A. Lucey, WNC
Chief Executive Officer of the Board Scott Wasserman

Also present were faculty senate chairs Ms. Judy Stewart, CSN; Dr. Bill Albright, DRI; Mr. Ed Nickel, GBC; Mr. Steven Bale, TMCC; Dr. Bryan Spangelo, UNLV; Dr. Stephen Rock, UNR; Dr. Doris Dwyer, WNC; and Mr. Brian Campbell, System Administration. Dr. Kebret Kebede represented NSC. Student government leaders present included Mr. Taylor Gray, CSN; Mr. Richie LeSpade, GBC; Ms. Tiffany Pollard, NSC; Mr. Michael Thomas, UNLV; Mr. Jeremy Houska, UNLV-GPSA; Ms. Sarah Ragsdale, UNR; Mrs. Rebecca Bevans, UNR-GSA; and Ms. Hope Manzano, WNC.

Chair Michael B. Wixom called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m., on Thursday, August 16, 2007, with all members present except Regents Anthony, Knecht, Leavitt and Schofield.

Regent Alden led the pledge of allegiance.

Rabbi Myra Soifer from Temple Sinai offered the invocation.

1. Information Only-Introductions – President Ashley introduced Dr. Christine Clark, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion-UNLV.

Regents Knecht and Leavitt entered the meeting.

President Maryanski introduced NSC Provost, Dr. Lesley DiMare and student representative Ms. Tiffany Pollard, Chair of the Capital Improvement Committee.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Interim President Richards introduced CSN Student Body President, Mr. Taylor Gray, and Dr. Carlos Campo, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs-CSN.

President Lucey introduced WNC Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Doris Dwyer, WNC Student Body President, Ms. Hope Manzano and Ms. Danielle Mariezcurrena representing WNC's Fallon campus.

Chair Wixom introduced Ms. Hatice Gecol, Director, Nevada State Office of Energy and Science Advisor to the Governor.

2. Information Only-Chair's Report – As part of the Chair's report, Chair Michael B. Wixom requested that the President of each hosting institution introduce one student and one faculty member to discuss a topic of the hosting President's choosing to help provide Board members with a focus on the reasons they serve as Board members. He also discussed current NSHE events and his current activities as Chair.

Dr. Paul F. Starrs was recently named as Foundation Professor of Geography at UNR, where he embraces cultural and historical themes and enjoys teaching his classes. He has received awards for teaching at the college, university, national and international levels, including the Regents' Teaching Award and the CASE-Carnegie Nevada Professor of the Year. The geography undergraduate advisor has also written books about ranching, the Black Rock country in northern Nevada, film noir and is currently writing about the 394 distinct crops that define California agriculture. His presentation, "*Come on: Let's make it graphic ...*" addressed how to make students better learners with graphics (*presentation on file in the Board office*).

Mr. Matt Fockler recently completed his master's degree in geography at UNR. A life-long Reno resident, Mr. Fockler taught at Sparks High School for six years prior to returning to graduate school, where he not only produced exceptional work as a student, but also honed his teaching skills with two years as a teaching assistant in the largest lower-division classes that geography offers. He was acknowledged this year as one of

2. Information Only-Chair's Report – (Cont'd.)

the outstanding teaching assistants in the sciences at UNR. Mr. Fockler presented an excerpt from his thesis, "*Plumbing the Truckee Meadows.*"

Chair Wixom reported that his first six weeks as Board Chair had been very positive and productive. He expressed his appreciation to Regent Whipple for providing a smooth transition to Board Chair, Regent Rosenberg for his assistance as Vice Chair, Board staff for their support and efforts as well as all of the Regents for their outpouring of support. He reported that the TMCC President search was underway, chaired by Vice Chair Rosenberg. The CSN President search will begin shortly. Chair Wixom noted a lengthy Investment Committee had occurred recently and expressed his gratitude to Committee Chair Dondero and Committee members, especially for their efforts on the Walker River Basin Project.

Regent Sisolak commended Board staff member Ms. Nancy Stone for sitting through a very long Committee meeting. Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich commended Board staff for preparing an early excerpt of the Committee meeting minutes to be presented to the State Legislature's Interim Finance Committee (*IFC*).

The meeting recessed at 8:30 a.m. and reconvened at 12:59 p.m. with all members present except Regents Anthony, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda item #4) – None.

4. Information Only-Chancellor's Report (Agenda item #3) – Chancellor James E. Rogers provided an update on the University of Nevada Health Sciences System (*UNHSS*). He also discussed fundraising within the Nevada System of Higher Education as well as relationships among the eight NSHE institutions and their relationships with their respective communities.

Chancellor Rogers related that Nevada's unique structure of one Board of Regents governing the higher education institutions of the entire state prompted a very interesting response to recruitment efforts in the search for a new Health Sciences System Vice Chancellor. The new Health Sciences System Vice Chancellor will need to work collaboratively with all of the institutions. The search committee received very enthusiastic support from the applicants due to this lack of bureaucracy in Nevada. Most applicants viewed the position as a great opportunity.

Chancellor Rogers related that eighty-seven educators from across the country participated on his recent fishing trip. During the trip, discussion included the direction of the Health Sciences System and fundraising. He was pleased with the results of these discussions.

Regents Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple entered the meeting.

5. Approved-Appointment, Vice Chancellor Health Sciences, System Administration (Agenda item #7) – The Board approved Chancellor James E. Rogers’ request for the appointment of a Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences. Terms and conditions of the appointment were provided at the meeting.

Regent Gallagher named the members of the search committee, praising their efforts. Twelve candidates of exceptional quality were initially interviewed. Regent Gallagher announced that Dr. Maurizio Trevisan, founding Dean of the School of Public Health at the State University of New York at Buffalo, had accepted the position of Vice Chancellor of the Health Sciences System pending approval by the Board of Regents. Regent Gallagher presented the terms of the contract:

- Four year contract.
- \$415,000 annual compensation.
- Annual COLA and merit adjustments if awarded.
- Tenure upon hire at the University of Nevada School of Medicine subject to the normal approval process for tenure upon hire.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the appointment of Dr. Maurizio Trevisan as Vice Chancellor of the Health Sciences System. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Chair Wixom thanked Regents Gallagher and Leavitt for their efforts on the Health Sciences System Committee.

In answer to Regent Whipple’s question, Regent Gallagher related that the Committee discussed Dr. Trevisan’s qualifications and how his European education would impact his ability to serve the NSHE at great length. She indicated that the School of Public Health in New York was very sad to be losing Dr. Trevisan. The search committee determined that his enthusiasm and ability to build consensus would serve the System well.

Chancellor Rogers related that Presidents Ashley and Glick performed substantial research on Dr. Trevisan and found his references and credentials to be impeccable.

Regent Whipple felt that this position would be one of the most difficult in the System and he wished Dr. Trevisan well.

Regent Crear applauded the search committee’s ability to obtain a person of such fine caliber. He noted that Dr. Trevisan would become the spokesperson for healthcare in the state.

Regent Gallagher urged the Regents to support this position, stressing the need for concurrence in order for the project to succeed.

Regent Rosenberg concurred and asked how the salary for this position was budgeted.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that \$1.5 million in undistributed income from the investment pool had been devoted to fund operating expenses for the HSS, with a

5. Approved-Appointment, Vice Chancellor Health Sciences, System Administration (Agenda item #7) – (Cont'd.)

condition for a match from the HSS Foundation for the following biennium. Future operating funds will be included in the 2009-11 budget requests.

Regent Rosenberg expressed concern for making a commitment to the salary with only a budget covering 2007-09.

Regent Geddes agreed with Regent Gallagher's comments, though he also expressed concern for the amount of the salary and requested feedback from the Presidents. President Ashley related that his contacts had indicated that Dr. Trevisan is a wonderful collaborator and colleague. Everyone agreed that he only gets better with time. He said it was a remarkable set of comments that provided him with a good level of comfort.

Regent Sisolak observed that this is a supplemental contract (*to commence October 1, 2007*). Mr. Patterson acknowledged that he did not include the language from the standard employment contract that every employee must sign. Regent Sisolak observed that the ending date of the contract was in error. Mr. Patterson agreed to correct the date. He also noted that the automobile and housing allowances are an exception to Board policy. There is no salary range for this type of position. He related the position is equivalent to a dean of a school of medicine.

Regent Knecht was concerned about receiving the information shortly before voting upon the matter. He was hopeful to avoid such rush situations in the future.

Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda item #4) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Wasserman related that a trial disc containing the agenda had been produced for this meeting. SCS has ordered the laptops and duplicators for the paperless transition. Sample carrying cases were on display for the Regents' consideration. Board staff will be contacting the Regents for group training sessions prior to the mailing of the next meeting's discs. Individual training will also be provided.

Regent Leavitt asked whether a computer would be set up at Board meetings to prevent Regents from having to bring their own laptops. Mr. Wasserman replied that would entail shipping the laptops to each of the campus sites for the meetings if the Regents did not bring them themselves.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether the disc would be Apple compatible. Mr. Wasserman replied that it should be.

Regent Geddes related that the information would need to be saved to the hard drive in order to save any notes. Mr. Wasserman related that was another advantage to having the Regents bring the laptops to each meeting.

6. Approved-Consent Agenda (Agenda item #5) – The Board approved the Consent Agenda (*Consent Agenda on file in the Board office*) with the exception of items #3 (*Tenure Recommendation, UNLV*), #8 (*Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNR*) and #9 (*New Endowments, CSN*), which were approved separately.
 - (1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the regular Board of Regents’ meetings held March 15-16, and June 21-22, 2007, the joint meeting with the State Board of Education held March 16, 2007, the special Board of Regents’ meeting held May 2, 2007, and the Foundations Workshop held June 20, 2007 (*Ref. C-1a, Ref. C-1b, Ref. C-1c, Ref. C-1d, and Ref. C-1e on file in the Board office*).
 - (2) Approved-Appointment, WestEd Board of Directors – The Board approved the appointment to the WestEd Board of Directors of Dr. M. Christopher Brown II, Dean, UNLV College of Education. WestEd is a nonprofit research, development and service agency that enhances and increases education and human development within schools, families and communities. The Board of Regents appoints three members of the Board to represent the Nevada System of Higher Education. Dr. Brown will immediately fill a vacancy in one of the Board’s three appointed members.
 - (4) Accepted-Annual Reports of Tenure Granted to Academic Faculty Upon Hire – The Board accepted the annual reports to the Board of Regents from the Presidents of each institution naming any individual to whom tenure upon hire was granted pursuant to the provisions of Title 2, Chapter 3, Section 3.3.1(b2) as presented by Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents (*Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office*).
 - (5) Approved-Handbook Revision, Clarification of Military Differential Compensation – The Board approved amending the *Handbook (Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 17)* by inserting the military differential compensation policy from the *Procedures and Guidelines Manual (Chapter 13, Section 1)* to reflect the differential compensation policy made permanent by the Board in June 2007 (*Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office*).
 - (6) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, GBC – The Board approved GBC President Paul T. Killpatrick’s request for the revised Great Basin College Bylaws (*Title 5, Chapter 3*) (*Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office*).
 - (7) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for revisions to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Graduate and Professional Student Association Constitution (*Title 5, Chapter 15, Articles I-III*) (*Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #3 (*Tenure Recommendation, UNLV*), #8 (*Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNR*) and #9 (*New Endowments, CSN*). Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Anthony was absent.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY:

6. Approved-Consent Agenda (Agenda item #5) – (Cont'd.)
- (8) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNR – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick's request for amendments to the Constitution of the Associated Students of the University of Nevada, Reno (*Title 5, Chapter 16*) (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office).

UNR Student Body President, Ms. Sarah Ragsdale, presented the ASUN Constitution and urged the Board's support.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the *Handbook* revision for UNR. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

- (3) Approved-Tenure Recommendation, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request for tenure for Associate Professor David Schmoeller, Department of Film, College of Fine Arts, effective July 1, 2007, (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak asked about the frequency of such requests based on appeal. President Ashley replied that Mr. Schmoeller appealed UNLV's decision to deny tenure. Upon further review of the merits of the case it was determined that Mr. Schmoeller was worthy of receiving tenure. This was the first such occurrence that President Ashley could recall. He noted that not every denial of tenure results in an appeal.

Dr. Michael Bowers, Associate Vice Provost-UNLV, reported that twelve of the sixty applications for tenure and/or promotion were declined. This was the only instance in which an appeal resulted in a reversal. He reported that approximately half of those individuals who are denied tenure file an appeal.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the tenure recommendation for UNLV. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

- (9) Approved-New Endowments, CSN – The Board approved CSN Interim President Michael D. Richards' request to accept six new endowments to benefit the students of the College of Southern Nevada (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office).
- Nevada Power Company, \$10,000, to support CSN's Applied Science HVAC Program.
 - HSBC Bank Nevada, \$10,000, to endow scholarships to need-based Nevada resident students pursuing Business degrees.
 - CSN Resorts and Gaming Department/Russell's Restaurant, \$11,000, to endow the Russell's Restaurant Customer Appreciation Scholarship.
 - Food & Beverage Directors Association of Southern Nevada (*FBDASN*), \$11,000, to endow the FBDASN Scholarship Program.
 - Las Vegas Branch of International Food Service Executives Association (*IFSEA*), \$10,000, to endow the Shawn Martin Memorial Fund/Las Vegas Branch of IFSEA.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY:

6. Approved-Consent Agenda (Agenda item #5) – (Cont’d.)
- (9) Approved-New Endowments, CSN – (Cont’d.)
- American Culinary Federation Chefs of Las Vegas, \$11,000, to establish a scholarship program for students pursuing a Certificate of Achievement or Associate of Applied Science degree in the Hotel, Restaurant or Casino programs for Culinary or Pastry Arts.

Chair Wixom requested that letters of appreciation be sent to the donors on behalf of the Board.

Regent Geddes moved approval of the new endowments for CSN with the understanding that thank you letters would be prepared for the donors on behalf of the Board. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

7. Information Only-Pre-Service Teacher Education Program Update (Agenda item #6) - Dr. Francine Mayfield, Dean, College of Education-NSC, and Dr. Mary Pierczynski, Superintendent, Carson City School District, updated the Board on the ongoing conversations between NSHE teacher education programs and Nevada K-12 District Superintendents addressing the challenges related to the preparation of highly qualified teachers and other educational personnel for K-12. Chancellor James E. Rogers initiated a dialogue between the two groups in February, and this report highlights the collaborative conversations to date, updates the Board on the recently established joint task forces, and delineates the actions already taken by NSHE teacher preparation programs (Ref. A on file in the Board office).

Dr. Mayfield related that all NSHE teacher preparation programs are working with all seventeen school districts to determine and meet the needs of Nevada’s students. She reported that Chancellor Rogers started the effort with a luncheon to support the notion that all NSHE teacher preparation programs be responsive to the needs of the local and state communities they serve. The participants agreed they held a common vision: the creation and renewal of a teaching and educational professional force that will provide outstanding educational programs for the children of the state of Nevada. Several task forces were formed to address specific challenge areas (*e.g., recruitment and retention of teachers, data collection and analysis, creating highly qualified teachers of math, science and special education*). Deans and directors are preparing reports describing the programs already in existence and in the planning stages:

- Distance education for principal preparation.
- Alternative routes to licensure.
- Recruitment efforts for minority teachers.
- Dual enrollment efforts with high schools.
- ELL preparation for all teacher candidates.
- Professional development activities designed for math and science teachers.

Dr. Mary Pierczynski, Superintendent, Carson City School District and President of the Nevada Association of School Superintendents, expressed her gratitude to Chancellor

7. Information Only-Pre-Service Teacher Education Program Update (Agenda item #6) – (Cont’d.)

Rogers for his efforts in starting the process, adding that she was looking forward to future meetings. She introduced Mr. Ben Zunino, Superintendent, Eureka County School District and co-chair of several of the Association’s committees.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich acknowledged the effort involved in reaching out to smaller counties while still addressing the growing concerns of the larger counties.

Regent Crear asked if follow-up could be provided to the Board on the Council’s accomplishments with perhaps some recommendations on how the Board can further enhance the Council’s objectives.

Chair Wixom noted the importance of improved communication between the two entities. Vice Chancellor Nichols observed that the Chancellor and Board had sent a very strong message indicating their expectation for increased communication. Ongoing dialog is planned with a future intent for Board approval of a task force that will provide regular reports to the Board.

Chair Wixom asked how this group interfaces with the legislative P-16 Council. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that remains unknown until notification is received from the Governor’s office. The System plans to assist and be responsive in any manner possible. To her knowledge, this program will be addressing issues that are not currently on the P-16 Council’s agenda.

In answer to Regent Dondero’s question, Chancellor Rogers indicated there are eleven members on the P-16 Council. Chair Wixom indicated that of those eleven, some are appointed by the Governor and some by the Legislature.

Chair Wixom requested a report at the January Board meeting to follow-up with and outline procedures for facilitating ongoing communication efforts between higher education and the K-12 system.

8. Approved-Employment Contract Amendment, Head football Coach, UNR – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for an amendment to the employment contract of Head Football Coach Chris Ault to extend the contract for three years and to provide for a set annual increase of \$25,000, in lieu of COLA and merit, beginning July 1, 2008 (Ref. B on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the employment contract amendment for UNR. Regent Crear seconded.

President Glick said that the contract amendments include an extension to 2012. He related that Coach Ault has been in two consecutive bowl games and is also a member of the NCAA Coaching Hall of Fame.

Regent Sisolak asked about the increase of \$25,000 per year in lieu of merit and COLA. Ms. Cary Groth, Athletic Director-UNR, related that there is a very similar clause (*of*

8. Approved-Employment Contract Amendment, Head football Coach, UNR – (Cont'd.)
varying amounts) in other coaching contracts. If COLA and merit were to be more than \$25,000, he would get the larger amount. It is not likely that Coach Ault's merit and COLA would exceed \$25,000. They are working towards consistent inclusion of this clause in all coaching contracts.

Motion carried. Regent Geddes voted no. Regent Anthony was absent.

5. Approved-Appointment, Vice Chancellor Health Sciences, System Administration (Agenda item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher related that she had spoken with Dr. Trevisan and he expressed his delight with joining the NSHE.

9. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule, Nursing, NSC – The Board approved NSC President Fred J. Maryanski's request for the hiring of the following nursing faculty above the salary range. During the recruiting process, it has been difficult to attract more than a handful of quality applicants. The need to stay competitive with the market for master's qualified nurses drove the salaries above the prescribed range (*Ref. C on file in the Board office*).

- Amy Chaffin, Associate Professor, 12 months, \$102,000, effective July 2007.
- Ginette Martinez, Lecturer, 12 months, \$93,750, effective August 2007.
- Janine Saulpaugh, Lecturer, \$65,000, effective August 2007.
- Sha Vickery, Lecturer, \$65,000, effective August 2007.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the salary schedules are reviewed every four years. Vice Chancellor Nichols' staff has prepared a draft of the revised salary schedule that has been circulated to the presidents, human resources and the faculty senate chairs. The revised schedules will be more in line with current market expectations and such requests will become less frequent. It was anticipated that the schedules will be presented to the Board in October.

Regent Alden asked whether Vice Chancellor Reed had reviewed the nursing contracts. Vice Chancellor Reed said he had not. He felt the Presidents would not be making such a request if the funds were not available in their budgets.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that nursing faculty has been a particularly troublesome area to fill. Resources are being diverted from other areas to support these programs.

Regent Alden moved simultaneous approval of agenda items #9 through #12.

Chair Wixom requested that the items be considered separately, specifically agenda item #9.

Regent Alden withdrew his motion.

President Maryanski noted two errors in the reference material: 1) Dr. Judith Melvin's salary is within the approved maximum and should not have been included on the agenda

9. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule, Nursing, NSC – (Cont'd.)

and 2) Ms. Martinez's actual salary is \$93,750, slightly less than the number indicated in the reference material. These positions are funded from resources reallocated from other areas of the college.

Regent Gallagher asked if adjustments to the salary schedule should be conducted more frequently than every four years. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that reviewing the salary schedules is very tedious and a tremendous burden on staff. He and Vice Chancellor Nichols will watch the appropriateness of every four years but asked that the policy not be changed at this time.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern that NSC was paying a lecturer more than UNLV. President Maryanski related that NSC's salaries are approximately 84% of the salaries offered at UNLV. In the case of nursing lecturers the institutions are competing for the same set of faculty with the same set of responsibilities. In order to be competitive, NSC's nursing salary structure needs to be closer to the university salaries.

Chair Wixom observed that the salary schedules should consider such exceptions.

Vice Chancellor Nichols said that the revised salary schedules will be presented this fall. She related that the System has been struggling with the issue of nursing salaries. In Las Vegas the extreme competition for nursing faculty is pushing the salaries higher. System staff have been working with the Presidents to derive some solution for this category of faculty.

Regent Geddes asked if the salary escalation is due to outside competition or the competition between the System's institutions. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that when considering peer institutions across the nation a basis for raising the level of salaries could not be found. The nursing market is being affected by the difficulty in attracting nursing faculty to come to and remain in Las Vegas. The only field the Legislature funds for summer school is nursing. There is something different about this field. Regent Geddes asked whether it was a pay situation (losing nurses to hospitals). Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that nurses are in an enviable field. Hospitals are paying more and recruiting them away from us.

Regent Sisolak asked if we could not go to the lower markets. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that we are recruiting from institutions across the country. It is a very competitive market.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern that the long-serving faculty is missing out on the extreme acceleration of the salary schedules. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that when the Board approves adjustments to the salary schedule the policy requires the institutions to perform an equity study. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich said that the Chancellor's committee was formed to study these issues, but was derailed by the legislative session. They have not been able to arrive upon viable solutions. Regent Sisolak said that the process should be conveyed to the existing faculty. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that as soon as a new salary schedule is approved, Board policy requires the Presidents to review their salaries for any necessary adjustments. Regent Sisolak asked if faculty

9. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule, Nursing, NSC – *(Cont'd.)*

members currently know that there is a study under review so they are not contemplating leaving. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that when the policy was adopted, there was a core discussion about not leaving long-time serving employees behind.

Dr. Stephen Rock, Faculty Senate Chair-UNR, related that the UNR faculty is aware of the salary review schedule. President Glick said that UNR recently completed such a study and made a small number of adjustments.

Regent Gallagher observed that this problem has been in existence for quite some time, though the nursing shortage brought it to the Board's attention.

Regent Alden requested that undergraduate programs in the areas of nursing and teaching be reviewed to ensure that they are offered at the appropriate institution.

President Maryanski stated that, in addition to the three public institutions, there are also private institutions in the Las Vegas area that have been hiring new faculty. He added that an adjustment in the nursing salary at NSC was made as recently as last fiscal year.

Regent Alden moved approval of the nursing faculty hires above salary schedule for NSC as presented with amendments as presented by President Maryanski. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

10. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule, Nursing, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request to extend an employment offer to the following individuals in the UNLV School of Nursing, at a 12-month base salary, effective for the 2007-08 academic year:

- Janice Haley, Assistant Professor, \$110,000 (*Ref. D-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Alan Jauregui, Lecturer, \$97,000 (*Ref. D-2 on file in the Board office*).
- Patrick Kuritz, Assistant Professor in Residence, \$105,000 (*Ref. D-3 on file in the Board office*).
- Mary Jo Russo, Lecturer, \$95,000 (*Ref. D-4 on file in the Board office*).
- Nancy York, Assistant Professor, \$114,240 (*Ref. D-5 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the nursing faculty hires above salary schedule for UNLV. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether Ms. York was currently a UNLV faculty member. Associate Vice Provost Bowers explained that Ms. York was being moved to a tenure track position. Regent Sisolak stated that it appeared she was already in the position and questioned why she would be paid more money.

Regents Alden and Gallagher withdrew their motion and second until an answer could be determined.

11. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule, UNR – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request to extend an employment offer to the following individuals, at a 12-month base salary:
- Dr. Joseph Kindel, Director, Nevada Terawatt Facility, \$175,000 (*Ref. E-1 on file in the Board office*).
 - Ms. Jean Regan, MBA, CPA, Chief Financial Officer, School of Medicine, \$200,000 (*Ref. E-2 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the faculty hires above salary schedule for UNR.

Regent Sisolak asked how Dr. Kindel’s salary was determined. President Glick related that it was determined as a result of current market conditions and is slightly higher than his predecessor. This is a critical position at UNR that has experienced frequent turnover. Regent Sisolak asked how it is known this is what the market requires. President Glick replied that a search and a survey were conducted. Regent Sisolak asked what the predecessor was paid. President Glick stated it was \$175,000, adding that this is what it took to fill the position. He acknowledged that salary negotiation that exceeds the salary schedule does create some tension within the institution.

Regent Alden asked whether the Chief Financial Officer was a new position. Dr. John McDonald, Vice President, Health Sciences and Dean of the School of Medicine-UNR, said that the position has been in existence for three years but had remained unfilled until an appropriate person with this candidate’s qualifications could be found.

Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

12. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule & Reimbursement of Certain Expenses, Physician, UNR – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for the hire of Dr. Michael Jakoby IV at the Associate Professor level at a salary of \$230,000, which exceeds the established maximum salary of \$224,692 and the reimbursement of \$12,933 for his malpractice tail coverage over a three-year period (*Ref. F on file in the Board office*). Dr. Jakoby’s salary will be predominately derived from clinical income, with some state support for teaching.

Regent Alden moved approval of the physician faculty hire above salary schedule and reimbursement of malpractice tail coverage for UNR. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

13. Approved-Reimbursement of Certain Expenses, Physicians, UNR – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for the reimbursement of the following new physicians’ malpractice tail insurance coverage over a three-year period. The funds for reimbursing the malpractice tail insurance will be derived from clinical income.
- Dr. Amir Aftab, Internal Medicine, Las Vegas, \$31,000 (*Ref. G-1 on file in the Board office*).

13. Approved-Reimbursement of Certain Expenses, Physicians, UNR – (Cont'd.)

- Dr. Abdulelah Abu Qare, Internal Medicine, Las Vegas, \$26,371 (*Ref. G-2 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the reimbursement of malpractice tail insurance coverage for UNR. Regent Geddes seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked why tail coverage was being provided for current faculty members. President Glick clarified that these physicians had been recently hired within the salary schedule which did not require Board approval. Dean McDonald related that the School of Medicine's contracts expressly require the approval of tail coverage by the Board of Directors. There has been an enormous need to recruit positions quickly to provide service at University Medical Center. Tail coverage is part of the negotiation process and considered carefully.

Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

14. Information Only-Handbook Revision, Committee Charge, Research & Economic Development Committee (Agenda item #21) – The Board discussed Chair Michael B. Wixom's request for an amendment to the charge of the Research & Economic Development Committee (Title 1, Article VI, Section 3(g) (5)) to ensure an appropriate forum for Foundation-related issues. This was the first reading of a Bylaw revision. Final action may be requested at the October 2007 meeting (Ref. M on file in the Board office).

Regent Crear felt that the Board Development Committee might be a more appropriate venue.

Regent Sisolak expressed similar concerns, adding that money and property asset issues should continue to be addressed by the Investment Committee.

Chair Wixom related that bringing Foundations under the Research and Economic Development Committee provided a forum to discuss the relationship between the Foundations and the System, not to discuss financial issues. The objective is not to create an additional standing committee. He also expressed concern that the Investment Committee already had multiple tasks before them.

Regent Dondero felt that property issues should first be brought before the Investment Committee and then presented to the full Board. Chair Wixom indicated that property items could still be investigated through the Investment Committee.

Regent Rosenberg observed this would not preclude discussion of Foundation-related issues at other committees.

Regent Sisolak said he did not want to circumvent Regent Dondero's efforts to get the property inventory under control, including Foundation holdings.

Chair Wixom requested that the next Investment Committee agenda specifically address Foundation-related property issues. The revision requested today will be with the specific

14. Information Only-Handbook Revision, Committee Charge, Research & Economic Development Committee (Agenda item #21) – (Cont'd.)

understanding that the focus of the Research and Economic Development Committee will solely be to discuss Foundation/System relationships.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich observed that many issues cross committee lines, noting that Mr. Wasserman takes extraordinary effort to ensure the items appear on the proper agenda.

In answer to Chair Wixom's question, Regent Whipple indicated that he had no concerns and did not object to the direction in which they were headed.

15. Information Only-Handbook Revision, Health Sciences System Committee (Agenda item #22) – The Board discussed Chair Michael B. Wixom's request for an amendment to the *Handbook (Title 1, Article VI, Section 3)* to establish the Health Sciences System Committee as a standing committee of the Board. This was the first reading of a Bylaw revision. Final action may be requested at the October 2007 meeting (*Ref. N on file in the Board office*).

Regent Gallagher observed that this will be an ongoing project and as such, would be more appropriately handled by a standing committee.

Regent Leavitt concurred that it is an enormous project that will take some time. He asked if the Committee will address the role of the advisory committee.

Chair Wixom stated that Regent Gallagher will address the scope and responsibility of the advisory committee at the Health Sciences System Committee's first meeting.

Mr. Wasserman related that ad-hoc committees are typically created for issues lasting less than one year. A standing committee should be established for any issue lasting more than one year.

Chancellor Rogers said he was very much in favor of this change.

16. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, PERS Rehire Policy (Agenda item #23) – The Board approved Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen's request for an addition to the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual (Chapter 2, New Section 4)* providing a policy on recertification of a PERS rehire as per Board request (*Ref. O on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* revision concerning a policy on recertification of PERS rehires. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern for the conditions that will prompt a "search." He asked if subsequent searches are being conducted before each recertification. Ms. Nielsen replied that a search is not required but included as an option for the institutions to exercise should they desire to do. State law does not require a search. She related that PERS rehires were created to address critical labor shortages that may be resolved over a period of time. Every institution is asked to review the factors every two years to

16. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, PERS Rehire Policy (Agenda item #23)
– (Cont'd.)

determine if the labor shortage still exists, which must then be certified by the appointing authority (*in this case the Board of Regents*). In response to Regent Sisolak's question, Ms. Nielsen related that institutions must present reasons for the recertification (*including unresolved market conditions*), thereby presenting validation for the rehire without the necessity of a search.

Regent Knecht related that the Board must provide certification to PERS derived from some evidence that a shortage still exists. He asked if a search is not conducted, upon what basis the Board has to provide that certification. Ms. Nielsen replied that the institutions conduct surveys of the market to determine if more candidates are available. In most cases, the people filling these positions possess some unique characteristics that provide justification to rehire. In some cases a search may be a waste of resources.

Regent Knecht observed that the Board must view the evidence skeptically when a search is not conducted. Ms. Nielsen agreed.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the policy was created in an effort to set forth some criteria for the Board to use over and above simply conducting another search. This policy will provide the Board with some basis of comparison.

Regent Sisolak asked what the cost would be to conduct a search for such a position. President Glick replied that a typical search for a faculty member would be approximately \$3,000 (*advertisement, candidate transportation and faculty time*). Regent Sisolak observed that an institution would incur a majority of the expense to determine if there is still a critical need and did not understand why a search is not conducted.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Sisolak voted no. Regent Anthony was absent.

The meeting recessed at 3:04 p.m. and reconvened at 3:17 p.m. with all members present except Regents Anthony, Geddes, Leavitt and Whipple.

10. Approved-Faculty Hire Above Salary Schedule, Nursing, UNLV – (Cont'd.)

President Ashley reported that Ms. Nancy York joined UNLV as a Visiting Lecturer prior to completing her doctorate. After completing her doctorate, Ms. York was promoted to a Visiting Assistant in Residence. Regent Sisolak asked if her duties were the same. Vice Provost Bowers replied that without the doctorate she could not teach the doctoral courses. She now teaches undergraduate and doctorate courses. Her starting salary was \$110,000.

Regent Alden moved approval of the faculty hires for UNLV. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony, Geddes, Leavitt and Whipple were absent.

Regents Geddes and Whipple entered the meeting.

17. Information Only-Labor Union Apprenticeship Training Program, CSN (Agenda item #15) - CSN provided the Board with an update on the status of the labor union apprenticeship training program at CSN.

Interim President Richards reported through a variety of events and actions, CSN's relationship with the Western Apprenticeship Coordinators Association (WACA) had significantly deteriorated by the end of June 2007. Agreements with eleven of the trade unions were set to expire and support of the training programs was at risk. At a summit meeting held July 11, 2007, the issues and frustrations were laid out and the following commitments were made:

- A change in direction from the April 6, 2007, meeting that would have transferred the program to Nevada State College.
- Development of revised written agreements with each participating trade union.
- Establishment of an Office of Apprenticeship Studies within Academic Affairs at CSN.
- Personnel actions to staff the office and to meet WACA expectations.
- Encouragement and participation in 2+2 and 3+1 programs with Nevada State College and the National Labor College so students can pursue bachelor's degrees.
- Changes in curriculum and programming to better meet WACA needs.
- Changes in organizational structure.

As a result of these resolutions, a GBC employee goes to CSN and a renewal of joint development of bachelor's degrees with NSC becomes more salient. Revised agreements were signed and student enrollments have begun. The program is now on track, about 6,000 students will be better served and the agreements provide for improved communication, monitoring, curriculum safeguards, management and conflict resolution. CSN also sponsors a non-union apprenticeship program and has balanced the interests of the non-union program for equitable treatment of both programs.

Interim President Richards recognized Chair Wixom, Regent Sisolak, Chancellor Rogers and Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich for their participation in this resolution.

Regent Rosenberg asked what entailed a 3+1 program. Interim President Richards replied that a 3+1 program is a relationship where CSN provides the first three years of instruction and the affiliated degree institution provides the fourth year.

Regent Sisolak thanked Ms. Jo Ann Prevetti, Executive Director of Chancellor Affairs, for her role in this effort.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda item #4) – (Cont'd.)

Ms. Lee Rowland, Staff Attorney-ACLU, indicated that the University Admission Impact Report revealed that minority enrollment has been severely impacted by the increased university admissions standards. She expressed concerns for providing equal access and encouraged a more holistic approach to admission standards. She asked that the Regents not only consider delaying the increase in GPA but to consider a re-evaluation of the overall admissions process.

Regent Leavitt entered the meeting.

18. Approved-University Admission Impact Report (Agenda item #14) – The Board approved confirming a 3.0 GPA admissions requirement by 2008 and increasing alternate enrollments to 15% of the prior year's admissions. Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presented an overview of the preliminary report regarding the impact of the increased university admission standards effective in Fall 2006, as mandated by the Board (*Title 4, Chapter 16, Section 4*). Since Fall 2006, students seeking admission to the two Nevada System of Higher Education universities have been required to have at least a 2.75 high school grade point average in thirteen required core courses, an increase from the previous 2.5 overall grade point average requirement (*Title 4, Chapter 16, Section 3*). At the Board's request, this preliminary report provided a look at the enrollment of minority students after the first year of that change. Presidents David B. Ashley and Milton D. Glick provided proposals for the Board's consideration to address the impact of the new admissions standards as discussed in this report (*Ref. H on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that in 2002, the Board approved new admissions standards based upon an overall GPA to go into effect in 2006 and 2010. In June 2006, the universities requested a number of changes including implementing the second stage of the GPA requirement in 2007 rather than 2010. The Board approved a 2008 implementation with a weighted GPA in the required courses. At that time, the Board added an option for allowing admission with certain ACT/SAT scores. In the summer of 2006, the System sent letters to all high school principals, students and parents notifying them of admissions and Millennium Scholarship changes. In July of 2007, as required by the Board's motion in 2006, the System's staff submitted a study on the impact of the new criteria in the fall of 2006 - 2007. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that the study was written with as much cautionary language as possible to reflect that there were other factors driving the change in student enrollment such as changes in Millennium Scholarship requirements and other higher education issues being debated by the Legislature. Also in 2006, the Board considered a lengthy list of alternate means of admissions for students (*e.g., special talent, special circumstances*). The study indicated that enrollment had decreased overall at the two universities (-2.6% at UNR and -14.4% at UNLV). UNR had fewer Hispanic students enroll from the previous fall. Fewer Hispanic, Black and American Indian students enrolled at UNLV from the previous fall.

Vice Chancellor Nichols felt that part of the enrollment dilemma is that families are confused about the many changes in the requirements that have taken place over the last few years. She suggested that many alternatives were available for consideration including a broader admissions policy that minimizes any negative connotation related with special or alternative admissions.

Chair Wixom recalled the Board had devoted significant time to ensure that it was responsive to the concerns of community and minority groups. He expressed his appreciation of the Board's foresight to request an evaluation at this time.

President Ashley said that UNLV is committed to increasing the academic achievement of the students, adding that they are gravely concerned about the impact to underrepresented groups. Delaying the next admission increase in the GPA standard or

18. Approved-University Admission Impact Report (Agenda item #14) – (Cont'd.)

increasing the number of exceptions are two viable options. UNLV and UNR will work together to implement the decision of the Board. The delay is a preferred alternative because it is consistent to the previous statement by the Board to address any negative impact. He felt that implementing the GPA increase in 2008 would further exasperate the impact to the minority communities.

President Glick related that he and President Ashley were committed to moving forward together, feeling it is in the best interest of the State. Although he would be comfortable with either decision, UNR leans more to increasing the number of exceptions. He is concerned with sending the right message to the community. There are a number of Anglos and minorities who are not attending the universities that are qualified at the 3.0 to do so. His concern is how to capture those students. He suggested that the term “special admits” be removed and the Board adopt a more holistic approach that addresses students with special talents or skills. He proposed that the universities develop new terminology within one year that better communicates their support for students to attend and succeed in higher education. He felt that the amount of outreach that has been conducted prevented the numbers from dropping even lower.

Regent Whipple asked Chancellor Rogers about the legislative directive and its significance. Chancellor Rogers indicated that he is working with the public and business communities to invest in the future of the System and state. He often points to raising the admissions standards as a selling point. He expressed concern for the problems associated with grade inflation. In balancing the need to address the needs of minorities, he dislikes going backwards feeling that it sends the message we are not interested in building a world class organization. He was hopeful that a methodology could be derived that addresses both concerns.

Regent Whipple recalled a legislative request to increase the standards by a certain time. Chancellor Rogers acknowledged that backing away from the 3.0 requirement was a cause of great concern for the legislators. Regent Whipple stated that he favors the increase of special admissions from 10% to 15%, adding that he was concerned about putting the Legislature off once again.

Regent Alden observed that K-12 is in distress and that admitting students who are not prepared to perform at the college level was an injustice to the students. He strongly urged that the Board remain on track. He too was concerned about the legislative intent. He said that students could take six or less credits and then prove themselves to be admitted full-time. He felt that lowering the expectations was not the answer.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich recalled that in 2006, the Board met a legislative request to accelerate Millennium Scholarship requirements and cautioned the Board about confusing the two issues. Any decisions made today will not affect the requirements of the Millennium Scholarship.

Regent Rosenberg noted the importance for students to consider the option of beginning their college educations at a community or state college to better prepare them for performing at the university level. He too favored greater consideration of special

18. Approved-University Admission Impact Report (Agenda item #14) – (Cont'd.)

admissions for a more holistic approach. He did not want to see a delay of the increased GPA requirement.

Regent Crear felt that race or color should not be a basis for any considerations about future action. Rather, there should be greater consideration as to why overall enrollment has decreased. He felt there should be a study of the process in other states as well as a review of the entire admissions policy. Regent Crear questioned UNLV admissions criteria being based on three core standards whereas other universities are based on 14 core standards. There is also no cumulative way to come in with a GPA just after the core courses and SAT/ACT scores are only used for placement. He expressed his support for raising the GPA standards.

Regent Gallagher expressed concern for admitting students who are not ready to perform at the university level. She felt the standards should be increased and that the Presidents should consider other special considerations for admission. She was very concerned about losing students forever when they fail at the university level.

Regent Sisolak asked whether special exceptions would be provided for every student or only for minorities. He was concerned that all students be treated equally regardless of their race. He felt that Regent Crear had made some very valid points.

Chair Wixom observed that the Board had provided direction to System staff to report the impact of the increased admissions standards with specific consideration given to underrepresented groups. The report is phrased in a way to respond to the Regents' request.

Regent Crear stressed that GPA standards is one aspect of the overall admission criteria. He felt that minority students are disenfranchised beginning in the K-12 system. There is a need for remedial education, especially for those students on the cusp. There should be a focus on the K-12 system and on the overall admission standards.

President Ashley said there have been many comments about a more holistic approach. One of the outcomes of this discussion will be to work diligently with Academic Affairs to develop a system that considers more than just GPA, SAT and ACT scores. He related that the University of California Berkeley website states their admission criteria is 2.8 with the consideration of other non-academic factors including honors, community service, work experience and character, as well as academic and socio-economic environment. The 14 criteria that Regent Crear referenced includes factors such as first generation students, overcoming hardship and leadership abilities. In his experience, these additional criteria were successful. Every student who is admitted should have every opportunity to succeed. Regent Crear agreed that individuals possess many qualities that should be evaluated as part of the admissions process.

Regent Sisolak clarified that the admissions exceptions would apply to all students and not just the underrepresented groups.

18. Approved-University Admission Impact Report (Agenda item #14) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Whipple moved approval of confirming the 3.0 GPA admission requirement by 2008 and increasing alternate admissions to 15%. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Vice Chancellor Nichols clarified that the policy is currently 10% of the previous year's freshmen enrollments. It would be more helpful to the Presidents to have 15% of the previous year's freshmen admittance.

Regents Whipple and Rosenberg accepted the friendly amendment

Vice Chancellor Nichols reported that the Board's policy on alternative admission includes test scores, special talents and/or abilities, other evidence of potential for success, improvement of high school performance over time, overcoming adversity or hardship or any other special circumstances.

Regent Sisolak asked if it was 15% of the headcount or FTE. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that it was 15% of the headcount. Regent Sisolak asked what percentage of the special admissions was used by athletics. President Glick indicated that athletics used 22 of the 300 special admissions (*less than 10%*), of those approximately 23% or 60 students were minorities.

Regent Sisolak asked how many students applied for special admission status. President Glick indicated that at UNR no one applies for special admission. If a student does not make the 2.75 GPA requirement their applications are automatically reviewed for other qualifying admission criteria.

President Ashley stated that UNLV intends to follow UNR's approach. Currently, if a student is not accepted on their GPA score they are denied and can appeal, at which point more information is requested. With UNR's approach, the student will never know the difference between first admit or special admit. This academic year UNLV was eligible for 586 special admissions, only 450 were used. Regent Sisolak asked why there was a request for an increase if they were not currently using all they are eligible for. Chancellor Rogers indicated that they wanted to be sure there were enough in the future.

Regent Knecht expressed concern with Vice Chancellor Nichols' proposed change from a percentage of enrollments to admissions. He stated this would reflect a 2 ½ fold increase in the number of special admits. He felt that students were not being left out, but rather steered to a venue where they can perform better and succeed. The issue is one of principle, of academic excellence at the two universities. He was opposed to reducing the 3.0 GPA requirement. He was willing to accept 15% in special admissions but only if it is based on 10 - 15% of the previous year's enrollment, not admissions. He felt the Board had made a number of accommodations, adding that anything more would dilute the quality.

Regent Rosenberg supported an increase in special admission, adding that this will allow the universities the flexibility and capability even if all of them are not used.

18. Approved-University Admission Impact Report (Agenda item #14) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Crear stated that he could not support the motion as stated. He felt that the Board needed more information and better understanding of the standards at other like institutions.

Regent Sisolak stated that he could support the increase based on enrolled rather than admitted. He asked how students are notified that they have been denied admission. Dr. Shannon Ellis, Vice President for Student Services, UNR, indicated that written notification is not used very often but when it is used, a list of the six criteria for special admission is provided, urging the student to consider one of the other institutions in the System. They encourage the student to attend a community college in their area and the university works very closely with the community college for individual follow-up. President Glick noted that the letter lists the special admission criteria because sometimes students do not initially provide all their information to the institutions.

Regent Sisolak asked if the names of the students that are denied by the universities are forwarded to the community colleges. Dr. Ellis indicated that they are. Regent Sisolak then asked if the community colleges follow up. Interim President Sanford stated that TMCC follows up with every student via a phone call and written information that asks them to attend a Saturday meeting for special admission.

Regent Sisolak asked how many referrals NSC receives from UNLV. President Maryanski was unsure of the exact number but they do have a similar arrangement with UNLV as UNR has with the northern community colleges. Dr. Art Byrd, Vice President, CSN, indicated that they do not track whether referred students actually enroll. President Ashley related that UNLV has referred approximately 1,300 students to the community college or state college. Regent Sisolak asked whether the information could be tracked. Dr. Byrd related it would not be difficult to develop a method of tracking.

Chancellor Rogers related that the community colleges are doing a much better job of contacting students at the high schools prior to high school graduation. He told Regent Crear that he has suggested that alternative criteria be only one consideration for admission. Typically the top 5-10% of high school graduates are admitted to the University of California System. He felt that due to grade inflation, keeping the GPA at 2.75 results in dropping to the 75th percentile, which is too diluted. There has to be a starting point to raise the standards to improve the universities and allow them to compete against other institutions such as the institutions in the University of California System.

Regent Knecht stated that even if it was known exactly what the effects were from last year's changes, it would still not be possible to predict the effect of changes scheduled for next year. He requested that Presidents Ashley and Glick provide answers to the effect had the standard been 3.0 rather than 2.75. Presidents Glick and Ashley indicated they had already performed that analysis. Regent Knecht agreed that alternative admissions should be considered but felt the standard GPA should not be reduced.

Regent Dondero felt the standards should be kept up, noting the importance of effective student counseling.

18. Approved-University Admission Impact Report (Agenda item #14) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher stated that it should be easier for the institutions to track student enrollment with the implementation of the Student Services module (*iNtegrate project*).

Regent Schofield agreed with the increased standards, adding that the many variables in the students' lives should also be considered.

Chair Wixom questioned the level of outreach to the community and encouraged the System to continue those efforts.

Regent Sisolak asked that there be a retroactive search for and follow up with those students that were referred from the universities to the community colleges or state college. Chair Wixom asked Vice Chancellor Nichols to follow up with the individual institutions and report back to the Board.

Motion carried. Regents Crear and Knecht voted no. Regent Anthony was absent.

The meeting recessed at 4:57 p.m., on Thursday, August 16, 2007, and reconvened at 8:16 a.m., on Friday, August 17, 2007, with all members present except Regent Geddes.

Chair Wixom thanked President Glick for hosting the meeting and for the copy of *Sweet Promised Land* by Robert Laxalt. President Glick related the campus is using the book to help promote a culture of belonging with incoming students.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda item #4) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Anthony asked about UNR's ranking in a U.S. News and World Report. President Glick related that U.S. News ranks U.S. universities among four tiers. This year, one of the questions asked was whether the institution uses ACT or SAT scores for admissions, to which the university responded they did not due to the Board's current policy. U.S. News decided not to rank UNR as a result of the response. Had UNR been ranked, they would have remained within the third tier.

19. Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of the Board of Regents' & Chancellor's Roles in the Discipline of Presidents (Agenda item #17) – The Board approved a modification to the roles of the Chancellor and the Board regarding the discipline, including termination, of NSHE Presidents, requiring the Chancellor to consult with the Board Chair. The discussion included a review of the most recent revision to the Board of Regents' Bylaws concerning these roles (Title 1, Article 7, Sections 2-4) (Ref. 1 on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden stated that the Board's primary responsibility is to set policy. He advocated for one person being in charge and reporting to the Board of Regents. He felt the current model was the right one and that it works.

Regent Rosenberg advocated for the Board hiring and firing the Chancellor and the Presidents in order to provide the proper checks and balances. He felt the Chancellor should approach the Board to recommend termination of a President.

19. Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of the Board of Regents' & Chancellor's Roles in the Discipline of Presidents (Agenda item #17) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht agreed with Regent Rosenberg. He felt this was not a matter of micromanaging. He noted the Board's unique role in that it is a controlling Board with the Chancellor acting as CEO for the System, with the Presidents reporting to the Chancellor as well as the Board. He felt an internal solution was necessary, rather than looking for a national model to follow. He observed the Board had sustained a pendulum swing of control and advocated for a more balanced position.

Regent Whipple observed that the Board supports Mr. Rogers as their Chancellor, adding that the modification has nothing to do with the man personally. He felt the Regents are elected to do the people's work in their elected positions.

Regent Crear felt there was no reason to change the current method of operation. He thought it stemmed more from personal reasons than any operational failure.

Regent Sisolak agreed with Regent Crear. He felt that any change would indicate a symbolic lack of support in the Chancellor. He did not feel it was necessary to make a change.

Regent Rosenberg disagreed. He said that a Chancellor relied upon the respect of the Presidents reporting to the position. He said it had nothing to do with personalities, but more a matter of the role and responsibility of the Board.

Regent Schofield opposed the proposed change. He felt the changes the Board made have resulted in a positive change for the System, moving it in a positive direction. He advocated for a student-friendly System of higher education.

Regent Alden observed that the Board's next Chancellor would need to know what the Board's expectations are and that changing the rules would make it difficult to recruit. He felt the change in the Chancellor's authority had resulted in improved presidential behavior.

Regent Geddes entered the meeting.

Regent Knecht clarified that this action was not about the man personally and agreed that the Board would require well established ground rules in order to recruit the next Chancellor. He objected to any inferences that the proposed action was motivated by personal feelings or partisan politics.

Regent Gallagher said she had been very concerned about the way the Board was viewed, adding that the Board has a poor reputation for the manner in which it treats its Chancellors. She objected to the timing of the change, feeling it would be more appropriate to change the role of the Chancellor when the incumbent retires. She felt it did not reflect positively on the Board to do otherwise.

Regent Leavitt felt that the timing for the change was appropriate considering the impending presidential searches. He felt the proposed change would provide the

19. Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of the Board of Regents' & Chancellor's Roles in the Discipline of Presidents (Agenda item #17) – (Cont'd.)

necessary checks and balances. He felt the pendulum had swung too far and expressed his support for the proposed change.

Chair Wixom observed a balance of power between Chancellors and Presidents across the country, noting the power shifts to the Presidents when the Board has the authority to hire and fire. He asked whether requiring the Chancellor to consult with the Board Chair and Vice Chair prior to firing a President would ease some of the concerns expressed.

Regent Knecht felt it would address the concerns of the current item but asked how it would apply to the following item. Chair Wixom asked to focus on this agenda item. He asked whether the Board would be inadvertently shifting power to the Presidents by removing power from the Chancellor. Regent Knecht replied that it was an expected outcome of the proposed action. He felt the matter merited further consideration and he was not adverse to putting this item over to the October meeting to consider additional options.

Regent Sisolak felt a decision needed to be made so as not to belabor the point at future meetings.

Chancellor Rogers felt that the matter was personal. This Board does not have a good reputation, adding that the problem with losing credibility is that it can never be regained. He is troubled by the Board's reputation. He related that previously no one was really in charge and that the eight Presidents were able to manipulate the thirteen Regents. He felt that previous Chancellors were not given the authority to do what was necessary. He felt it was important for the Legislature and the public to have confidence in the Board of Regents. He assured the Board that he would never fire a President as a knee-jerk reaction, adding that he did not believe that any Chancellor would do so. He felt that people generally cause themselves to be fired by their own actions. He felt it was better to approach a President, outline the problems and suggest that they leave so as to avoid any public display. He said he had a conversation with the previous Board Chair prior to firing the previous two Presidents. The Board has a reputation for hiring a strong Chancellor when it is in trouble and then removes the power when it is comfortable again. The Board then meddles in the day-to-day operations of the System. He felt that removing the authority and the power of the Chancellor at this point would negatively impact the perception of the Board. By doing so, the next Chancellor will be reduced to the role of coordinator. He felt that reducing the role of the Chancellor would destroy much of the progress that had been made.

Regent Whipple felt it was inherent for a person to enjoy power. He felt the Board had been brave in its action to unilaterally give this power to the Chancellor. He disagreed with the Chancellor's characterization of the Board's reputation. He felt the Board should be proud of the work it has accomplished.

Regent Knecht felt this item had returned for further discussion at multiple meetings not because it was being unduly prosecuted but rather because it was a *Handbook* change requiring two appearances. While he understood Chancellor Rogers' feeling that this was

19. Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of the Board of Regents' & Chancellor's Roles in the Discipline of Presidents (Agenda item #17) – (Cont'd.)

a personal matter, he assured him that for him, it was not, adding that he looks forward to working with the Chancellor during the remainder of his term. He agreed with Regent Whipple's perception of the Board's reputation. He felt the Board's reputation had been steadily increasing due to the leadership of the Board's past Chairs. He felt that withholding action to arrive at a compromise action was a better alternative. He requested that references to personal agendas cease.

Regent Knecht moved approval of holding the matter until compromising language could be derived.

Regent Knecht offered to seek language that could bring about the desired compromise.

Regent Alden wanted to vote on the proposed language.

Regent Sisolak asked whether changes could be proposed and voted upon that day. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that the Board could amend the language and vote upon it the same day. He recommended that suggestion for consultation be restricted to only the Board Chair.

Regent Knecht withdrew his motion.

The meeting recessed at 9:07 a.m. and reconvened at 9:19 a.m. with all members present.

19. Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of the Board of Regents' & Chancellor's Roles in the Discipline of Presidents (Agenda item #17) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht requested that Chief Counsel Patterson read the amended language. Chief Counsel Patterson indicated that a sentence will be added to Article VII, Section 4 (14)(a), last line of the first paragraph, to read "Any disciplinary action shall only be taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Board."

Regent Knecht moved approval of the proposed change to include any disciplinary action shall only be taken after consultation with the Board Chair (Section 14.A). Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Crear objected to voting upon a last minute change. He would not support the proposed change. He felt it made the Board appear indecisive.

Regent Leavitt was concerned about the word "consultation" and favored "approval".

Regent Anthony said he originally opposed the change but would agree to the new language. This still allows the Chancellor to do what ever he/she deems appropriate, while still providing the Board Chair some notice.

19. Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of the Board of Regents' & Chancellor's Roles in the Discipline of Presidents (Agenda item #17) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher queried if this would truly be in consultation with the Board Chair, adding that Chair approval would require a vote of the full Board.

Regent Sisolak felt it would appear the Board is taking power and authority away from the Chancellor. He noted the Chancellor had already indicated that termination of a president had never occurred without involving the Board Chair.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Anthony, Dondero, Gallagher, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Rosenberg, Schofield, Whipple and Wixom voted yes. Regents Alden, Crear and Sisolak voted no.

In answer to Regent Gallagher's question related to Article VII, Section 4 (14)(a), Chief Counsel Patterson indicated that there is a typographical error for which corrections will be made to accurately reflect what the Board had previously approved.

Regent Whipple left the meeting.

20. Denied -Handbook Revision, Duties of the Chancellor (Agenda item #18) – The Board denied modifications to the roles of the Chancellor and the Board in relation to the Chancellor's authority to establish new positions within the Nevada System of Higher Education and to set the salary, terms and conditions of their employment (Title 1, Article 7, Section 3) (Ref. J on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden opposed the change.

Chief Counsel Patterson related that the policy is currently structured in a way that requires the Board to approve only the salary for the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and the budget for the System Office. Except for the Chancellor's position, The Board is not involved in hiring or termination. This proposal would require the Board to approve the position itself, not a certain individual to fill the position.

Regent Crear asked why there is the position of Chancellor if the Chancellor is required to ask for the Board's approval each time. He felt this issue stemmed from a hire made prior to the legislative session. He believed such action should only be taken if there has been some misbehavior.

Regent Rosenberg stated that the Board just hired a Vice Chancellor at a salary of \$415,000 annually. He felt it would have been a good idea for the Board to have been asked prior to voting if they could afford it.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the proposed *Handbook* revision concerning the duties of the Chancellor.

20. Denied -Handbook Revision, Duties of the Chancellor (Agenda item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht asked Counsel to confirm that the proposed language would have no effect upon the choice of the person hired, only upon approval of new positions going forward. Chief Counsel Patterson confirmed that the change would require the Board to approve the creation of new positions at a grade level of four and above. It also requires approval of a change in pay greater than 10% of the base compensation.

Regent Knecht stated that this revision is in no way intended to bind the Chancellor's hands in the appropriate function of hiring a person for a position. This addresses the creation of new, senior-level positions and/or special compensation.

Regent Geddes asked if the Board would be required to approve instances when the negotiated salary pushes the budget over the approved total System budget. Chief Counsel Patterson indicated that although the Board approves the total budget, the Chancellor has the authority to move funds around to make the budget work. Regent Geddes stated he was opposed to the motion.

Regent Gallagher questioned the fairness to require Board approval for new System office positions created by the Chancellor while not requiring the same approval for the Presidents at the institution level. Chief Counsel Patterson reminded the Board that any salary that exceeds the current salary schedule comes before the Board for approval though the position itself is not currently approved by the Board.

Regent Schofield said he is proud of the Board and the headway the System has made under the leadership of Chancellor Rogers. He was opposed to taking away his authority or discouraging his incentive. He felt it was important for the Board to allow the Chancellor the authority to move the System forward as he sees fit.

Chancellor Rogers asked for an example of a position that the Board may have a better idea of when the Chancellor is overseeing that position on a day-to-day basis. Regent Knecht indicated the intent is to change only the position approval process. It is not aimed at substituting the Board's judgment for the Chancellor's. He expected the Board would support the Chancellor in the overwhelming majority of cases. Chancellor Rogers asked if the need for a new position is urgent, should he request the Board to call a special meeting, or should he wait for a regular meeting before hiring, which could take up to two months. Chancellor Rogers felt this is about cutting the power of the Chancellor. Regent Knecht related that this change would move some oversight to the Board and slightly decrease the power of the Chancellor.

Regent Anthony expressed his opposition to the change. The Regents are not in a position to evaluate when the Chancellor wants to create a new position. He suggested that there may be value in having the Chancellor consult with the Board Chair when he wants to create a new position above the level four.

Regent Knecht observed there was not a second to the current motion.

Regent Sisolak called a point of order to clarify the current motion. Chair Wixom clarified the motion is to approve the proposed change without any amendments. Regent Sisolak offered to second the motion.

20. Denied -Handbook Revision, Duties of the Chancellor (Agenda item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht called a point of order and requested clarification of the rules for the appropriate use of a point order. Chief Counsel Patterson stated that a point of order was a personal privilege and once that privilege is resolved, the floor would return to the speaker.

Regent Knecht withdrew his motion and moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning the Chancellor's authority to establish new positions within NSHE and to set the salary, terms and conditions of their employment in consultation with the Board Chair. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Chair Wixom said he would oppose this motion feeling that it would prevent the Chancellor from performing his duties. He was willing to compromise on the previous item to memorialize a process that was already taking place.

Regents Knecht and Rosenberg withdrew their motion.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of clarification if this item would return for discussion at the October meeting, even if it was voted down at this meeting. Chair Wixom indicated that it could be brought back. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that the item could be brought back before the Board for reconsideration.

Regent Alden moved approval of the proposed *Handbook* revision concerning the duties of the Chancellor. Regent Rosenberg voted yes. Regent Crear seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion failed. Regents Anthony, Crear, Dondero, Gallagher, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Schofield, Sisolak, Wixom and Alden voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning the Chancellor's authority to establish new positions within NSHE and to set the salary, terms and conditions of their employment in consultation with the Board Chair. Regent Alden seconded.

Chief Counsel Patterson stated this amounts to a reconsideration of the Board's action which would require notice of one meeting. The Board took action on the subject matter but it is at the pleasure of the Board to override their procedural rule and vote on the motion.

Chair Wixom clarified that the motion on the floor was to move approval with the qualification that the chancellor could take such action after consultation with the chair.

20. Denied -Handbook Revision, Duties of the Chancellor (Agenda item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht noted a point of order indicating that the Board would have to vote for reconsideration, or perhaps reopen this item before reconsidering. Chair Wixom indicated that he had not closed this item.

Regent Alden opposed the motion.

Regent Sisolak noted that historically, the Board has voted a motion down, made a subsequent motion and voted without reconsideration. Regent Wixom agreed that this has been the process in the past. In reviewing the process, Chief Counsel Patterson indicated that the previous motion is not a repeal or rescission and the Board can make further motion.

Regent Sisolak stated he will oppose the motion.

Regent Knecht moved to table further discussion. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion failed. Regents Knecht and Rosenberg voted yes. Regents Alden, Anthony, Crear, Dondero, Gallagher, Geddes, Leavitt, Schofield, Sisolak, Wixom, Alden, Anthony voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

Chair Wixom requested a roll call vote to move approval of this item with the qualification that the chancellor could take such action after consultation with the Board Chair.

Upon a roll vote the motion failed. Regents Dondero, Knecht and Rosenberg voted yes. Regents Gallagher, Geddes, Leavitt, Schofield, Sisolak, Wixom, Alden, Anthony and Crear voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

21. Information Only-Strategies for Higher Education in Nevada (Agenda item #16) – The Board heard a report concerning future directions and potential policies addressing student access and success, student recruitment, retention, graduation rates, workforce development and research. NSHE Presidents presented strategies for student access and success, including tuition and fee policies, current and potential funding models, and other matters related to student enrollments. Matters including student recruitment, retention, graduation rates, workforce development and research were also reviewed.

Regent Alden moved approval of sending the matter to a work session. Regent Dondero seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion failed. Regents Alden and Dondero voted yes. Regents Gallagher, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Rosenberg, Schofield, Sisolak, Wixom, Anthony and Crear voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

21. Information Only-Strategies for Higher Education in Nevada (Agenda item #16) – (Cont’d.)

President Glick related that UNR will increase enrollment and achieve goals by increasing early outreach (*e.g., Hug High School mentors*), increasing recruitment area and increasing student success. To enhance student success UNR will increase faculty size selectively, enhance advising, enhance financial aid, and increase the average class load of students. He stated that the more credits a student takes the more likely they are to succeed. There is a unique opportunity with the opening of the new student union and knowledge center to create a “sticky” campus. They need to substantially improve financial aid to help those students who are ready to go to college but cannot afford to do so.

Dr. Neal Smatresk, Executive Vice President and Provost, UNLV, stated that UNLV is engaging in a planning process that will better connect the institution to the needs of the students. These initiatives will address student readiness, recruitment and retention. Student readiness will include the expansion of outreach activities, improving partnerships and the development of admissions criteria that allow better prediction of college readiness. Student recruitment will better promote and communicate the high quality educational opportunities at UNLV, improve the admission and recruitment infrastructure as well as improve management with long-term goals of increasing need and merit-based support to improve student access. Student retention will focus on the identity and values of the institution and assessment of core competencies and values to weave into the curriculum. UNLV will open a first year center in 2008 that will provide new students with the learning support they need and one stop shopping for routine needs. Deans will be assessing their advising programs. They are working to identify skills gaps in students and providing them with learning support to be successful. There is a long range goal to create first year learning communities to help get students off to a good start (*handout available in the Board office*).

Regent Crear asked how many students quit without seeking help. Provost Smatresk said it was an embarrassingly high number. UNLV wants to be a pump rather than a filter. He related that every student should be treated as they would treat their own children and they should be treated as future alumni. Regent Crear said it was tough for students to make it through the bureaucracy. Dr. Smatresk indicated that the first year center should help prevent students from becoming dejected.

Regent Schofield complimented UNLV’s efforts and encouraged them to follow through.

President Wells reported that DRI brings value to the System by having students enrolled at other institutions working with DRI faculty. DRI faculty are involved in many teaching programs at UNR (*2-3 FTE in atmospheric sciences, hydrological sciences, geology, biology and engineering*), UNLV (*1 FTE in water resources management, chemistry and anthropology*) and NSC (*1 FTE anthropology, biology, chemistry, climate and meteorology*). They feel very strongly that through their relationship with these institutions, they are recruiting students to DRI for great research opportunities. They have about 70 students, approximately 30% are from foreign countries, 40% hold a PhD, 90% are at UNR and 10% are at UNLV. They would like to increase the number of students participating from UNLV. DRI provides

21. Information Only-Strategies for Higher Education in Nevada (Agenda item #16) –
(Cont'd.)

total graduate funding as well as additional support for research money (*DRI invests \$1.7 million per year into education*).

President Maryanski related that two-thirds of first year students that leave NSC have zero GPA's, indicating that they have just walked away. He stated that NSC is implementing student retention initiatives such as peer mentoring, early warning systems to identify students that are struggling and the creation of learning communities. They have established a scholarship for all community college graduates that transfer to NSC. They are initiating a group to help NSC to become a minority serving institution. They are considering the on-line market and are offering on-line degree programs. There is a focus on a quality student experience. They are revitalizing general education offerings as well as policies and procedures to reduce and streamline processes.

Interim President Richards related that CSN is employing two fronts: 1) student retention and 2) planning. To address student retention CSN has initiated an in-person student orientation session and an early warning system to identify students that are at risk. Through that system, students are evaluated using the Student Success Factors Index which considers eight points of student success to tailor an advising and academic program to the student. Undecided students are provided career assessment and direction. CSN is dramatically expanding their on on-line offerings. In the area of academics and engagement of learning, they have strengthened curriculum and have expanded support for learning by expanding technology. They have linked general learning outcomes with holistic assessment of general education. They have expanded the use of community advisory committees particularly in occupational disciplines. CSN's future planning principles are to provide multiple facets of intervention for student success; multiple opportunities to intervene; technology as a tool for learning and faculty driven experimentation in learning is encouraged. He felt assessment cannot be overestimated and must be used for continual improvement.

President Killpatrick introduced Mr. Ed Nickel, Faculty Senate Chair-GBC. President Killpatrick related that in the winter of 2007, he established an ad-hoc committee to address declining enrollments. The committee's recommendations included the hiring of an admissions recruiter and advisor at the Pahrump campus in addition to two new full-time faculty members. They are recruiting for the position of Retention Coordinator for the Elko campus. They are considering the purchase of software to track potential and existing students. GBC has established a student life center to address extracurricular activities and they are working to create a campus where students want to hang around and be involved. They are providing skill assessment and additional training for local business and industry and offering additional hours and classrooms as well as distance learning courses.

Interim President Sanford reported that TMCC is developing a seamless transition model from high school to college by positioning counselors in the local high schools. Beginning this fall, TMCC has joined with Washoe County School District to add a program in technical and vocation areas. Last year TMCC began investigating student

21. Information Only-Strategies for Higher Education in Nevada (Agenda item #16) –
(Cont'd.)

applications that did not lead to enrollment. Twenty-four percent of the 2,384 students that applied but did not enroll last fall did enroll after being directly contacted by TMCC. Forty-one percent of the students referred to TMCC by UNR enrolled. TMCC is also ensuring that students transferring to UNR are equally successful. They are working toward improved student success by implementing a mandatory program for all degree seeking students that includes a placement test, advising for their class level and an in-person orientation program. They have extended advisement hours at all campuses and have implemented on-line testing and orientation at every campus. This fall they are also offering 24/7 on-line help to every enrolled student.

President Lucey related that the first goal of WNC's strategic plan is student success. In order to track the success of their actions, an annual report is produced to document quantitative and qualitative results. She invited the Regents to access WNC's institutional research home page through their website www.wnc.edu, and entering "IR Home" in the site search box. There are several reports available on this web page including an institutional portfolio that has tracked all of their success indicators longitudinally over the last 10 years. In one year, this information allowed them to make changes that resulted in increased retention and course completion rates. Over the last 10 years, there has been a 50% increase in their minority and 18-24 year old populations. They have also quadrupled their financial aid awards. Their early warning system and bridge to success efforts have proven helpful and are working. Student success is evidenced by their high school capture rate (15-30%) and course completion rates. She stated that students involved in athletics and student government are doing better than those not involved and student nurses outperform all other students. She related that in 2006 approximately 100 more students graduated than did in 1996.

Chair Wixom observed the positive relationship between UNR and TMCC and encouraged other institutions to follow that example. He expressed appreciation for focus on technology and retention and asked that there be an emphasis on these aspects going forward.

Regent Dondero expressed her appreciation for the institutions' focus on student retention.

The meeting recessed at 10:30 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m. with all members present except Regents Knecht and Whipple.

Chair Wixom related that there is an article highlighting Davidson Academy, associated with the University of Nevada, Reno, in the August 2007 issue of the TIME Magazine (*article available in the Board office*).

22. Approved-Handbook Revision, Resident Tuition for Members of the Armed Forces (Agenda item #19) – The Board approved a revision to the Board's policy concerning the resident tuition for the spouse, children and legal guardians of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States (*Title 4, Chapter 15, Section 3*) as proposed by Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols. Specifically, the proposal provides that for members of the

22. Approved-Handbook Revision, Resident Tuition for Members of the Armed Forces (Agenda item #19) – (Cont'd.)

Armed Forces stationed in Nevada who are subsequently reassigned for permanent duty in another state, the spouse, child or legal guardian of the member shall not be charged tuition if the spouse, child or legal guardian of the member remains continuously enrolled at an NSHE institution (Ref. K on file in the Board office).

Regent Anthony moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning resident tuition for members of the Armed Forces. Regent Crear seconded.

Regent Knecht entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern for those stationed at Pickle Meadows, California. Vice Chancellor Nichols said that this is not a change in current practice, but rather clarifies that in-state residency is permanent for applicable dependents. Once a student is classified at any NSHE institution they are classified at all. Those stationed at Pickle Meadows are covered by that portion of the policy. Military personnel asked for this classification for their dependents even if they are relocated. Regent Sisolak asked if it would be acceptable to amend the policy to be clear that the policy applies to a member stationed at the Marine Corps Warfare Mountain Training Center at Pickle Meadows, California. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that would be an appropriate amendment.

Regents Anthony and Crear accepted the friendly amendment. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

23. Approved-Board Meeting Locations 2008 (Agenda item #26) – The Board approved proposed locations for the Board of Regents' meetings in 2008. Recommended meeting locations are as follows:

- February 7-8 – CSN West Charleston Campus
- April 3-4 – WNC Carson City Campus
- June 12-13 – TMCC
- August 7-8 – UNR
- October 2-3 – DRI-Las Vegas
- December 4-5 – UNLV

Regent Alden indicated opposition to the item solely in support of his belief for quarterly meetings.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the 2008 Board meeting locations. Regent Dondero seconded.

In answer to Regent Crear's question, Chair Wixom indicated that Great Basin College is scheduled to host a Board meeting in 2009.

23. Approved-Board Meeting Locations 2008 (Agenda item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked when a meeting can be scheduled at NSC. President Maryanski indicated that there is not currently, nor will there be in the first building, a facility that will accommodate a full Board meeting. President Ashley has offered to hold a meeting at UNLV on behalf of NSC. Regent Sisolak asked if a meeting could be held at CCSN's Henderson campus given its closer proximity to NSC and then perhaps a reception could be held at NSC in support of the faculty and students.

Regent Crear asked what the cost is to hold a Board of Regents' meeting. Regent Alden indicated that several years ago the per day cost of a meeting was \$90,000.

Chair Wixom requested that the System and President Maryanski investigate the possibility of NSC hosting a Regents' meeting at a facility that would allow for a reception or tour of the NSC campus.

Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

24. Approved-Handbook Revision, Dependent Grant-in-Aid Benefits for ROTC Military Personnel (Agenda item #20) – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's and UNR President Milton D. Glick's joint request for a revision to the NSHE Grant-in-Aid (GIA) policy for faculty and professional staff to authorize GIA benefits for the dependents of military personnel assigned to ROTC detachments within the NSHE on the same basis as regular full-time academic faculty and professional staff, for the duration of their assignments to the ROTC detachment, in order to extend the incidental rights and privileges of faculty employment to ROTC detachment personnel (*Title 4, Chapter 18, Section 5*) (Ref. L on file in the Board office). Dependent GIA benefits among all eligible faculty and professional staff for FY06 averaged approximately \$110 per eligible employee. There are currently five full-time military personnel assigned to each of the ROTC detachments at UNLV and UNR, for a total of ten personnel combined. The long-term average cost will be approximately \$1,100 per year for both ROTC detachments combined.

Regent Alden moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning dependent grant-in-aid for ROTC military personnel. Regent Knecht seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked which employee categories receive personal benefits versus family benefits. President Glick replied that classified staff is eligible for personal benefits and administrative staff and faculty are eligible for both personal and family benefits. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that part-time faculty is eligible for one free class for each class they teach, adding that this can be carried forward for two consecutive semesters. Regent Sisolak expressed concern that the policy be clear. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that the policy can be reviewed and brought forward to the Board for an overview. This particular change gives ROTC the same benefit as all other faculty. Regent Sisolak requested a future agenda item to review what benefits each type of employee receives. Chair Wixom requested that this item be addressed at the next scheduled Student and

24. Approved-Handbook Revision, Dependent Grant-in-Aid Benefits for ROTC Military Personnel (Agenda item #20) – (Cont'd.)

Academic Affairs Committee. Regent Sisolak asked that representatives of each employee type be present for the discussion.

Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

25. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Management of Host Expenditures, Table Purchases (Agenda item #24) – The Board discussed Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich's request for a revision to the Board's current policies and procedures, *Procedures & Guidelines Manual (Chapter 5, Section 1)* regarding the use of host funds for table purchases. The proposed revision was requested by the NSHE Presidents to increase the current limit on table purchases from \$30,000 to \$100,000, remove the prohibition against the purchase of tables at other NSHE institutional events, and further provide for a waiver of the limit under certain circumstances (*Ref. P on file in the Board office*). No action was taken on the item.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the Board voted to move several items out of the *Handbook* into the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual*, which can be amended by the Chancellor without the Board's approval. Staff has since discovered that some items moved into *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* were items that the Board had previously reviewed and acted upon very carefully. This is one such item, and as such, he is requesting that the Chancellor secure Board approval prior to making an amendment.

President Ashley related that UNLV often expends its full limit before the end of the fiscal year. Although some increase would be appreciated, he was not sure \$100,000 would be necessary. He suggested an increase to \$50,000 with the ability for the Chancellor to approve exceptions.

President Glick agreed with President Ashley. He thanked Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich for working with the Presidents on this issue. He explained that with the evolution of the Health Sciences System, the universities are being asked to participate in more fundraising activities.

President Wells also supported President Ashley's suggestion.

Regent Geddes requested an example for when an institution would require a waiver. President Ashley replied that a waiver would be sought when the maximum has already been expended or in an effort to participate in another institution's event.

Regent Sisolak observed that having the Presidents purchase tables at each others events may create some uncomfortable positions. In regards to the issue of raising the cap, he felt that more damage can be done by declining to buy tables at different events. There is also the issue of putting the institutions in a tough situation when Regents are honored or participating in charity events.

Chancellor Rogers advocated for the increase to allow greater participation by the institutions within the community.

25. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Management of Host Expenditures, Table Purchases (Agenda item #24) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom observed that Regent Sisolak was concerned about inter-institution transfer of funds and potential conflicts of interest. Regent Sisolak agreed, adding that he understood the importance for the institutions to get out into the communities. He suggested the Foundations could purchase the tables. President Glick replied that presently the Foundations do purchase the tables for UNLV and UNR but they must also abide by the cap.

Chancellor Rogers said that it is important that Regents and/or Presidents attend these events to show joint support across the System. The purpose is to cultivate relationships.

Regent Schofield felt this was an investment, adding that the exposure is important.

Regent Crear clarified that \$30,000 was an annual limit. He indicated there should be a history of previous purchases from which to establish an annual budget and prioritize.

Regent Gallagher asked whether the Legislature ever questions these expenditures. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated that host funds were not discussed during the last session. In previous years, it was made clear that these purchases were not made with state funds. He said that many legislators attend these same events.

Regent Sisolak observed that although legislators may be in attendance, they typically attend as guests and are not asked to purchase tables.

President Maryanski suggested that it may be easier for the Presidents to informally provide tickets to one another rather than purchase them from each other.

Chair Wixom suggested a motion to increase the cap from \$30,000 to \$50,000 and to include in the proposal that the institutions provide tickets to each other's events. In regard to a potential conflict of interest, Chief Counsel Patterson related that the current policy contains general statements prohibiting using influence for personal gain.

Chancellor Rogers related that in the past, all of the institutions acted separately and apart from the others and did not want one another at the events. In recent years he has insisted that the Presidents attend one another's events. There is a general feeling that the institutions do not like, support or work with one another. An emphasis needs to be placed on getting the right people to attend.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich clarified that there are three changes being proposed: 1) an inter-institution ban, 2) a change in the current limit and 3) discretion from the Chancellor to approve exceptions. President Maryanski has suggested the institutions will make reasonable allowances for the other institutions at their events.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Sisolak felt a further review of who attends which events was necessary. He agreed that the institutions need to work together and increase their visibility in the community. He requested more information regarding past purchases.

25. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Management of Host Expenditures, Table Purchases (Agenda item #24) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom suggested that this item be held over until more information can be made available.

Regent Sisolak requested that when this item returns for discussion, that the reference materials include data on which individuals attended what event.

Regent Geddes cautioned the Board not to question the Presidents' decisions about who attended which event.

Chair Wixom requested that this item be held over to the next meeting with further discussion to include information about inter-institution attendance, conflict of interest, an analysis of individuals attending as well as an appropriate annual purchasing limit.

Regent Sisolak asked how the Health Sciences System is affected by this policy. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated that would need to be considered for future discussion.

The meeting recessed at 11:32 a.m. and reconvened at 11:44 a.m. with all members present except Regents Alden and Whipple.

26. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Fee Redistribution (Agenda item #25) – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich's request for the redistribution of previously approved student fees to meet legislatively approved revenues in the 2007-09 biennial budget. In addition, the proposed redistribution includes small changes in institutionally retained categories necessary for the institutions to operate. The changes will be reflected in the Procedures & Guidelines Manual (Chapter 7, Section 12) (Ref. Q on file in the Board office).

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that at the last meeting of the Board, the Regents' approved the redistribution of fees for the 2005-07 biennium in accordance with the closing actions of the 2007 Legislative session. Reference material for this item includes information on currently approved fees as well as the redistribution of fees in accordance with the gross fee redistribution approved at the last meeting as well as an option that will provide greater flexibility from which the Presidents could operate. He noted that the institutions did not reduce funds designated for student access services.

Regent Sisolak asked why so much more of the GBC and CSN upper division fees were going to student associations than at WNC. He then asked where university undergraduate student association fees were reflected and why there was a difference between UNLV and UNR fees. Ms. Sarah Ragsdale, Student Body President, UNR, related that the student association fee is currently \$2.84 per credit. In 2008 this will increase by .50 per credit.

Regent Wixom held further discussion over until UNLV's student association fee could be determined.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda item #4) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Geddes requested that copies of all the Committee reports be provided Thursday night or Friday morning to the Regents.

Chair Wixom congratulated Ms. Christina Littlefield, Las Vegas Sun reporter for acceptance to Cambridge University to pursue her doctoral studies.

Chair Wixom thanked President Glick and the staff at UNR for all of their efforts in hosting a successful meeting.

26. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Fee Redistribution (Agenda item #25) – (Cont'd.)

President Ashley reported that UNLV's student association fee is currently \$2.40 per credit, adding that this will not increase in 2008. Regent Sisolak asked if this is a negotiated amount. President Ashley replied that each institution sets their respective fees with student input.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated the fee setting process includes student input with ultimate approval required by the Board of Regents. He noted there is more student input in the fee increase process than in the fee distribution aspect. Regent Sisolak asked if the students are aware of the distribution of fees at other institutions. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the respective institutional committees meet separately but any student is allowed to attend any institution's committee meeting.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* revision concerning the redistribution of previously approved student fees. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Whipple were absent.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda item #4) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom announced that day was Regent Schofield's 66th wedding anniversary.

27. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations – Committee Chair Ron Knecht reported the Audit Committee met August 16, 2007, and received reports from the Chief Counsel Bart Patterson on the use of NSHE facilities for political events and the acceptance of gifts by employees. Regent Knecht requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. A-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended approval of the following internal audit reports (*Ref. Audit Summary on file in the Board office*):
 - ✓ Equestrian Center, UNR (*Ref. A-2 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Parking & Transportation Services, UNR (*Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Center on Aging, UNLV (*Ref. A-4 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Department of Public Safety, TMCC (*Ref. A-5 on file in the Board office*).

27. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

- Audit Exception Report - The Committee recommended approval of the Audit Exception Report for the six months ending June 30, 2007 (*Ref. Bound Report on file in the Board office*).
- Moss Adams Fee Increase – The Committee recommended approval of an additional fee of \$40,000 for additional testing for the year ending June 30, 2007, to complete the review of the TRIO program (*Ref. A-7 on file in the Board office*).
- Establish Reporting Policy – The Committee recommended approval of a policy to have the status of institution bank reconciliations reported to the Committee on a quarterly basis. Financial reporting for the University of Nevada School of Medicine Practice Plan and the University of Nevada, Reno Fire Science Academy will report to the Budget & Finance Committee through the regular exception reporting process.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Geddes seconded.

Regent Sisolak questioned the second increase of \$40,000 by Moss Adams. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Internal Audit, explained that due to a reportable condition in grants and contracts, additional work would need to be performed. The System requires one clean year in order to avoid having the work performed in 2008.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Whipple were absent.

28. Approved-Cultural Diversity and Security Committee Recommendations (Agenda item #29) – Regent Cedric Crear reported the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee met August 16, 2007, and examined security measures at Board meetings and discussed the level of security that should be in place. Institutional representatives provided a review of their response plans in the event of a pandemic. Institutions have worked cooperatively with regional health authorities and organizations to establish procedures to successfully respond to and minimize the impact of a pandemic. Regent Crear requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. CDS-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Board of Regents' Meeting Security – The Committee recommended approval of a recommendation for Board Chief Executive Officer Wasserman to work with the institution hosting each Board meeting to ensure that there is an adequate plan for security at each Board meeting.

Regent Crear moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.
Regents Alden and Whipple were absent.

29. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations (Agenda item #28) – Committee Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Budget & Finance Committee met August 16, 2007, and heard the following reports:
- The current status of the School of Medicine’s billed receivables for the University Medical Center and the Sunrise and Veterans Administration hospitals.
 - Self-supporting budget revisions of NSHE institutions for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006-07.
 - State-supported operating budget transfers of NSHE institutions for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2006-07.
 - Institutional resource reassignment/allocation between institutions and units of the NSHE for fiscal year 2006-07.
 - Transfers of non-state expenditures to state funds after May 1, 2007, for fiscal year 2006-07.

Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. BF-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Fiscal Year 2007-08 NSHE Self-Supporting Budget – The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2007-08 NSHE Self-Supporting Budget (*Ref. Bound Report on file in the Board office*).
- Fiscal Year 2007-08 NSHE State Supported Operating Budget – The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2007-08 NSHE State-Supported Operating Budget (*Ref. Bound Report on file in the Board office*).
- Fiscal Year 2007-08 State Accountability Report Reconciling Legislative Approved to Board of Regents’ Approved Budget – The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2007-08 Accountability Report reconciling the NSHE legislative approved operating budget to the Board of Regents’ approved operating budget (*Ref. Bound Report on file in the Board office*).

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Whipple were absent.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

30. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations – Committee Chair Jack Lund Schofield reported the Student and Academic Affairs Committee met August 16, 2007. Ms. Stacey Ellmore, Senior Consultant for ACT, Inc., presented a report highlighting the need for a rigorous high school curriculum to better prepare students for college. Ms. Ellmore also presented data showing the results of Nevada students who took the ACT test in spring 2007. Of the 5,562 students in Nevada who took the test, the median score was 21.5, higher than the national average of 21.2. Ms. Crystal Abba, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs, presented a report, *First in My Family: A Profile of First-Generation College Students at Four-year Institutions Since 1971*, which examined survey data collected over the last 30 years for first-generation college students and their peers. The report included information on items such as demographic characteristics, parental encouragement and financial

30. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

considerations. Regent Schofield requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the June 21, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. SAA-1 on file in the Board office*).
- New Degree Proposals – The Committee recommended approval of the following new degree proposals:
 - ✓ B.S., Entertainment Engineering and Design, UNLV (*Ref. SAA-2 on file in the Board office*).
- New Major Proposal – The Committee recommended approval of the following new major proposal:
 - ✓ A.A.S., Human Services, GBC (*Ref. SAA-4 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Schofield moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.
Regents Alden, Crear and Whipple were absent.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that there were very good suggestions regarding the forms provided by the campuses. He will work with Vice Chancellor Nichols to create a more “user-friendly” form that will incorporate the questions raised by the Committee and made a part of the Committee and the Board’s records.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

31. Approved-Research and Economic Development Committee Recommendations – Committee Chair Jason Geddes reported the Research and Economic Development Committee met August 9, 2007, and received an update on the Walker River Basin Project from Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich. The research projects identified within the Project are well under way and plans for the acquisition of water rights to promote the flow of additional water into Walker Lake are occurring. Nevada’s Attorney General determined that the Project stakeholder meetings are not subject to the Open Meeting Law; however, the meetings have been and will continue to be publicly noticed and held in rotating locations throughout the Basin.

The committee heard a proposed definition of “confidential research information” that augments the Board policy on restricted access research. This additional category provides further protection for research in progress but not yet disclosed or published. It further specifically protects against release of medical records. This was the first reading of a proposed Code change with final action anticipated at the October 2007 meeting.

Two reports were presented for Committee consideration. The first, presented by Dr. Penny Amy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, highlighted the inventions and copyrightable works throughout the System for the recently completed fiscal year. She also provided information regarding technology transfer activities at the three research institutions. The second report, presented by Dr. Jim Kenyon, Professor, Physiology and Cell Biology, University of Nevada School of

31. Approved-Research and Economic Development Committee Recommendations –
(Cont'd.)

Medicine, provided a review of the Nevada IDeA program, which is part of the larger Nevada EPSCoR efforts and provides support to biomedical research throughout Nevada.

The Committee discussed the confidential nature of campus policies governing System employees' potential conflicts of interest through employment or contracts with outside companies. Committee Chair Geddes directed staff to bring back for the Committee's consideration: 1) a survey of how other institutions maintain and report possible conflicts of interest and outside employment, 2) a new disclosure method that may be used by all institutions that incorporates a separate section indicating if the disclosure may be made public or must be kept as a private personnel matter and 3) the types of aggregate data that could be made public without jeopardizing confidentiality of private interactions, including consulting. Regent Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the June 14, 2007, Committee meeting (Ref. RED-1 on file in the Board office).

Regent Geddes moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report.

Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Crear, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

32. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations – Committee Chair Thalia M.

Dondero reported the Investment Committee met August 10, 2007, and discussed recommendations concerning the strategic ranges for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds. The Committee heard a report from staff regarding the endowment categories and their status in the current fund. Regent Dondero requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the May 23, and June 19, 2007, Committee meetings (Ref. INV-1a and Ref. INV-1b on file in the Board office).
- Walker River, Water Rights and Real Property Interests – The Committee recommended approval of permitting the Chancellor's office the authority to negotiate and acquire options in water rights and real property interests to the extent funded solely from Walker River federal grant funds (Ref. INV-7 on file in the Board office).
- Investment Pool Funds – The Committee recommended approval of the following recommendations concerning the undistributed balance of the operating pool fund: \$1.5 million to the Health Sciences System, \$5 million to the iNtegrate project and \$10 million to the campuses. Additionally the Committee recommended continuing the discussion at the October 2007 Committee meeting regarding further distribution.
- Planning Money for the Proposed Spanish Springs Campus, TMCC – The Committee recommended approval of withdrawing \$500,000 from available estate tax funds to match the legislative appropriation to TMCC to plan for the proposed Spanish Springs campus, contingent upon approval from the IFC and the Council of Presidents.

32. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

- Wolf Run Golf Course – The Committee recommended approval of terminating the Agreement for the Lease of Water Rights, dated March 29, 2006, for the Wolf Run Golf Course.
- Sale of Sahara Dental Clinic Properties, UNLV – The Committee recommended approval of entering into a lease and purchase agreement with the Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth concerning two properties previously used as faculty practice clinics by the School of Dental Medicine (*Ref. INV-6 on file in the Board office*).
- Lease for Retail Space in Joe Crowley Student Union, Silver State Schools' Credit Union, UNR – The Committee recommended approval of a lease with Silver State Schools' Credit Union to operate a retail banking operation in the Joe Crowley Student Union (*Ref. INV-8 on file in the Board office*).
- Lease for Retail Space in Joe Crowley Student Union, Kaplan, Inc., UNR – The Committee recommended approval of a lease with Kaplan, Inc., to operate a retail test preparation operation in the Joe Crowley Student Union (*Ref. INV-9 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Dondero moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Knecht seconded.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reported that the Council of Presidents had approved the use of funds for TMCC and that the request had been forwarded to the IFC for consideration at their September 6, 2007, meeting. The results of the IFC meeting will be reported to the Board.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Crear, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

33. Approved-TMCC President Search Committee Recommendation - Chair Howard Rosenberg reported the TMCC President Search Committee met August 8, 2007. Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer of the Board, explained the roles of the Regents' Committee and the Advisory Committee and presented six steps to conducting a President search, including:

- Appointment of a Regents' Committee and Institutional Advisory Committee.
- Determination of whether to use the services of a search consultant.
- Selection of a search consultant.
- Development of a leadership statement/position description.
- Interview and evaluation of candidates.
- Institutional Advisory Committee makes recommendation to the Regents' Committee; Regents' Committee makes recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Chief Counsel Patterson discussed the Open Meeting Law as it related to the President search procedure. Mr. Wasserman provided the President Leadership Profile from the previous search for Committee members to review. The Committee set Friday, September 7, 2007, at 10:00 a.m. as the next scheduled meeting.

33. Approved-TMCC President Search Committee Recommendation – (Cont'.d)

Regent Rosenberg requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- Search Consultant – The Committees recommended approval of hiring a search consultant and directed staff to send out an RFQ to known search consultants and bring forward the top five responses to the next meeting.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Crear, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

34. Information Only-New Business – None.

Chair Wixom thanked Vice Chair Rosenberg for hosting a reception the previous evening at his home.

The meeting adjourned at 12:19 p.m.

Scott G. Wasserman
Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents

Approved by the Board of Regents at the October 11-12, 2007, meeting