

BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Building D, Room D101
College of Southern Nevada
6375 West Charleston Blvd., Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, February 7-8, 2008

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
 Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, UNHSS, Maurizio Trevisan
 Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
 Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mike Reed
 Chief Counsel Bart Patterson
 Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen
 Interim President Michael D. Richards, CSN
 President Stephen G. Wells, DRI
 President Paul 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; Dr. Lawrence Rudd, NSC; Mr. Steven Bale, TMCC; Dr. Bryan Spangelo, UNLV; Dr. Stephen Rock, UNR; Dr. Doris Dwyer, WNC; and Mr. Brian Campbell, System Administration. Student government leaders present included Mr. Taylor Gray, CSN; Mr. Richie LeSpade, GBC; Mr. Ryan Crowell, NSC; Mr. Nick Chrysanthou, TMCC; Mr. Adriel Espinoza, UNLV; Mr. Jeremy Houska, UNLV-GPSA; Ms. Sarah Ragsdale, UNR; and Ms. Hope Manzano, WNC.

Chair Michael B. Wixom called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., on Thursday, February 7, 2008, with all members present except Regents Alden, Sisolak and Whipple.

Regent Crear led the pledge of allegiance.

Reverend Jerry Blankenship, Chaplain for Sunrise Hospital, offered the invocation.

1. Information Only-Introductions – President Wells introduced Mr. Nate Cooper, Assistant Vice President for Development (*Emeritus*)-DRI, who was instrumental in securing the Sulo and Aileen Maki Endowment for DRI. President Wells bestowed the President Medal upon Mr. Cooper. Mr. Cooper expressed his appreciation to the Makis for their generous contribution.

President Lucey introduced Mrs. Katie Leao, Coordinator of Student Life-WNC.

President Richards introduced Mr. RaQuan Snead, Student Body Secretary-CSN; Dr. Diane Waryas, Assessment Coordinator-CSN; and Mr. Ken Schott, Electronic Services Librarian-CSN.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

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.

Mr. RaQuan Snead, Student Body Secretary-CSN, was born in Las Vegas, Nevada. He graduated from Cheyenne High School playing varsity football and varsity volleyball as well as being part of six clubs and organizations. After graduating as the senior class vice president in the top 15% of his class, he began his college career at CSN as a Political Science major. He plans to become a district attorney for the criminal division for Las Vegas. Upon joining student government, Mr. Snead and fellow students changed the name of the college from CCSN to CSN. As the Secretary, he is responsible for all of the minutes, agendas and records for student government. Mr. Snead is also involved with the Planning and Awards Committee and Funding Proposal Committee Chairperson where he oversees all of the programs that student government produces as well as funding opportunities for college clubs. Mr. Snead takes five classes per semester, maintains a 3.0 GPA and participates in community service through his Grace Christian Fellowship church. Mr. Snead also has a full-time job where he works the graveyard shift for Chrysalis, an organization that helps mentally challenged individuals to function on their own.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Dr. Diane Waryas, Assessment Coordinator-CSN, has served as CSN's Assessment Coordinator since 2006 following a return to the college from the University of Utah where she also directed assessment. Previously, Dr. Waryas was Communication Faculty at CSN and has also taught in California, Michigan and Ohio.

In her role at CSN, Dr. Waryas manages all assessment activities at the college, including faculty and staff training and related assessment analysis and reporting. She also

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

represents CSN as regional and national Assessment Chair of several professional boards. She holds a Ph.D. in Communication from Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan.

Mr. Ken Schott, Electronic Services Librarian-CSN, has served as a reference librarian at CSN for over fifteen years. Most recently, he has assumed the role of Electronic Services Librarian, responsible for web page and database maintenance as well as various digital library projects. Prior to coming to CSN, Mr. Schott was the Head Government Documents Librarian at UNLV. Mr. Schott holds a master's degree in Library and Information Science from Florida State University.

Chair Wixom asked if information regarding electronic services was included in student orientation. Mr. Schott related that the counselors and students were kept constantly informed about the available services. Dr. Waryas added that such information was also disseminated through various programs.

Chair Wixom asked about efforts to inform area high school students. Dr. Waryas replied that CSN's Student Services and recruitment offices are making such efforts.

Regent Dondero asked if resources for the new library could be collected while it is still under construction. Mr. Schott indicated that it was possible, adding that they are trying to make as many resources available as possible through electronic means.

Chair Wixom expressed his appreciation to CSN for hosting the meeting, noting that the meeting was being telecast live over the internet.

Chair Wixom expressed his appreciation to Vice Chancellors Reed and Nichols for their efforts in conducting the off-cycle committee meetings in a most productive manner.

The meeting recessed at 9:00 a.m. and reconvened at 1:34 p.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2008, with all members present except Regents Anthony, Leavitt, Schofield and Whipple.

Chair Wixom stated that this meeting was being streamed on the internet to expand public access to the meeting and indicated that for political, practical and economic benefit, this forum would be investigated further for all Board meetings.

3. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda Item #4) – Ms. Laura McBride, Instructor, Department of English-CSN, expressed dismay regarding the 4.5% budget reduction requested from all of the campuses, feeling that it was especially unjust for CSN.

Regent Anthony entered the meeting.

Ms. McBride related that CSN has the highest number of students with the greatest need and lamented that the gap grows larger every year. She reported that CSN has had the greatest number of Presidents and that key leaders were currently filling vulnerable interim positions. She said it was up to the Regents and Chancellor to vigorously defend those who are poorer and have less than any other institution in the System. She felt it was impossible for CSN to absorb such a cut without hurting the students. Ms. McBride asked the Board to defend CSN against cuts of this magnitude.

Regent Leavitt entered the meeting.

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

Regent Sisolak suggested a video transcript of the passionate public comments be made available to the Governor and legislators.

Mr. Taylor Gray, Student Body President-CSN, addressed the impact of a 4.5% budget reduction to CSN. He said that CSN is under-funded and treated inequitably with regard to state funding levels. He felt the legislators and Governor are primarily responsible. Noting that the Board had determined that each institution budget should be reduced evenly, Mr. Gray felt this was especially unfair to CSN. He asked the Board to consider the effect on the students the Board represents. He felt that CSN's diverse population felt the ramifications of such reductions more severely than others.

Chair Wixom assured those present that the Board and Chancellor had worked diligently to minimize the impact to all of the institutions, adding that no one relished the idea of reducing the budgets.

4. Information Only-Chancellor's Report (Agenda Item #3) - Chancellor James E. Rogers discussed the aftermath of budget reductions and where the NSHE will go next, including donor contributions.

Chancellor Rogers said he could not recall missing a day of work in his work history. He was surprised by his doctor's diagnosis. After consulting with the Nevada Cancer Institute, it was recommended that he seek a specialist at the University of Southern California Medical School. He was told by the specialist that he needs to be both emotionally and physically strong in order to face the treatment that lies ahead. Chancellor Rogers related that he did not want to relinquish his current position and that he looked forward to the job helping him keep his mind off of his cancer treatment. He expressed his appreciation for all of the good wishes conveyed.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Chancellor Rogers stated that the NSHE is very important to him. He expressed concern for the System's practice of patching problems along the way as opposed to actually addressing them. He said that Nevada has to begin thinking beyond two-year terms. He lamented that the NSHE does not plan for the future or maintain long-term goals. He discussed plans occurring at the University of Arizona law school, a top forty law school ranked 15th or 16th amongst public schools, in which they determined that their ranking could be improved by increasing contributions to the university's law library and by increasing its class size.

Chancellor Rogers related that Arizona, New Mexico and the University of Nevada's medical schools were formed at about the same time. Arizona's is now one of the top fifty in the nation. New Mexico's budget is significantly higher than Nevada's even though both schools started at approximately the same time. He recommended that Nevada attempt to determine the amount of money and investment required to raise the School of Medicine to the level of Arizona, New Mexico or Utah.

4. Information Only-Chancellor's Report (Agenda Item #3) – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Rogers related that Berkley's law school has been ranked in the top 5 to 6 for a number of years. When their rankings slipped, a large campaign was launched to increase the rankings by promising results and telling donors what their investments would do for improving the law school. He recommended that Nevada identify a comparison entity to which they can aspire. Chancellor Rogers said the System would not continue if Nevada continues to sustain the "brain drain" from the state. He felt that Nevada should aspire to be better than, or as good as, some of the top ranked institutions in the nation, noting that improvement will require investment. Nevada needs to be able to show the donors what their donations will accomplish. He noted that California spends money on improving their institutions. Nevada needs to be both a public and a private school system in order to keep students in the state. He expressed his displeasure with the fact that faculty have not been in the past.

Chancellor Rogers noted a great disparity between Nevada's mean household income and the level of funding for higher education, feeling it was shameful. He said Nevada needs to identify the institutions with whom they wish to compete and recommended the Board develop a ten-year plan.

Chair Wixom related the Board would continue this discussion at future Board meetings.

Regent Knecht agreed with Chancellor Rogers' remarks relative to setting goals and establishing measurement metrics. He felt that establishing priorities was a good starting point.

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

CSN student, Ms. Sara Soncini, asked the Board to reconsider the budget reductions for CSN, which would allow the respiratory therapy program to thrive. As a native Nevadan she has a grave desire to remain in Nevada to continue her education. She asked the Board to give the students a reason to stay in the state to complete their educations.

Mr. James Dickinson noted the difference in funding levels between UNLV and CSN, adding that CSN provides a better teacher-to-student ratio. He said that students enrolled in CSN's healthcare programs are trying to increase the level of healthcare provided throughout the state.

Mr. Christian Watts, Student Body Vice President-CSN, thanked the Board for their efforts. He said the students trust their elected officials to do the right thing and represent the students fairly.

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #6 (*Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CSN*), #7 (*New Endowment, UNR*), #8 (*New Endowment, DRI*) and #9 (*New Endowment, DRI*), which were approved separately (*Consent Agenda on file in the Board office*):

(1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the regular Board of Regents' meeting held November 29-30, 2007, and the special Board meeting held January 7, 2008 (*Ref. C-1a; Ref. C-1b on file in the Board office*).

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (Cont'd.)
- (2) Approved-Handbook Revision, Review of Salaries Paid to Part-Time Instructors – The Board approved a change in Board policy (*Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.5*) to specify that the review of salary schedules that must occur every four years shall include a review of salaries paid to part-time instructors. This revision was made at the request of the Board during the first hearing at the October 2007 meeting when the 2008-09 salary schedule was reviewed and approved. Final action was requested on this second reading of a Code change (*Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office*).
- (3) Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Government Association Constitution, GBC – The Board approved President Paul Killpatrick's request, on behalf of Mr. Richie LeSpade, President of GBC's Student Government Association, for revisions to the GBC Student Government Association Constitution (*Title 5, Chapter 11*) (*Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office*).
- (4) Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Constitution, WNC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey's request for revisions to the Associated Students of Western Nevada Constitution (*Title 5, Chapter 19*) (*Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office*).
- (5) Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich's request for the summer term salary schedules for 2008 (*Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 3, Section 5*) (*Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #6 (*Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CSN*), #7 (*New Endowment, UNR*), #8 (*New Endowment, DRI*) and #9 (*New Endowment, DRI*). Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY:

- (6) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CSN – The Board approved CSN Interim President Michael Richards' request for the use of \$1,020,000 in Capital Improvement Fee funds for the following projects (*Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office*):
 - Off-site construction to complete the Transportation Technology building project. \$650,000
 - Improve campus internet and inter-campus connections. \$80,000
 - Complete the Data Consolidation project by increasing the original budget by \$290,000 to provide for an emergency operations center, centralized computer replacement staging area and emergency power. \$290,000

TOTAL: \$1,020,000

Regent Sisolak asked whether any of the requested items could be delayed. Ms. Patty Charlton Dayar, Vice President, Finance & Budget-CSN, replied that the technology improvements were desperately needed and impacted all of the campuses, adding that all of their internet service is trafficked through the Cheyenne campus.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY: *(Cont'd.)*(6) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CSN – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Sisolak asked several questions to identify the specific off-site construction project. Vice President Charlton Dayar replied the request was due in part to a lack of funding for the Phase II portion of the project, specifying that it also involved a dirt road that required paving following installation of sewer connections. Regent Sisolak asked about the possibility of obtaining municipal funds. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich felt the issue needed to be researched further before determining an answer. Vice President Charlton Dayar indicated that other sources of funding were investigated.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Capital Improvement Fee funds expenditure for CSN. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

(7) Approved-New Endowment, UNR – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed's request to accept a \$10,800 donation from Regent Howard Rosenberg and friends to establish a new endowment account in memory of his sister, Patti S. Egger. The donors expressly requested this endowment account to be invested in and managed by NSHE's endowment pool. The endowment will be named "The Patti Egger Memorial Endowed Graduate Art Scholarship," which will benefit the graduate students of UNR's Department of Art *(Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office)*.

Chair Wixom and Regents Crear, Knecht and Sisolak thanked Regent Rosenberg for the generous gift, agreeing that it was a wonderful memorial for his sister. Chair Wixom requested that a formal letter of thanks be prepared on behalf of the Board for each of the endowment donations.

Regent Alden moved approval of the new endowment for UNR. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

(8) Approved-New Endowment, DRI – The Board approved DRI President Stephen G. Wells' request to establish the Clark J. Guild, Jr. Endowed Chair in Watershed Sciences to endow the Senior Director of the Chair of Watersheds and Environmental Sustainability *(Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office)*.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the new endowment for DRI. Regent Dondero seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

(9) Approved-New Endowment, DRI – The Board approved DRI President Stephen G. Wells' request to establish the Sulo and Aileen Maki Endowment, which will be distributed to DRI for exclusive use of growing water resources programs in southern Nevada *(Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office)*.

Regent Alden moved approval of the new endowment for DRI. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

6. Approved-Resolution #08-01, Bank Financing for Signage, Revenue Generating Signs, UNLV – The Board approved the Budget & Finance Committee’s recommendation regarding UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education, on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to secure bank financing up to the sum of \$2,600,000 for the construction and acquisition of revenue generating signs at UNLV athletic facilities (*Ref. BF-5 on file in the Board office*). Bank financing will be repaid from additional revenues generated from outsourcing athletic corporate sales. Estimated repayment costs for the loan are projected to be \$350,000 per year for ten years and are subject to the terms and conditions negotiated with the lending institution selected.

Regent Alden said this item had been discussed during the Budget & Finance Committee meeting. He believed that he had received misinformation and would, therefore, be voting in opposition to the item.

Mr. Gerry Bomotti, Senior Vice President, Finance & Business-UNLV, reported the item entailed a request for ten-year bank financing to purchase signage for the Athletic Department/Thomas & Mack Center. The Budget & Finance Committee discussion included a question regarding whether or not the Thomas & Mack Center Facilities Manager supported this contract. Mr. Bomotti believed the response provided was that the Facilities Manager had been involved in the evaluation process of the vendor, though did not sign the recommendation. Mr. Bomotti noted that the Facilities Manager reports to the Athletic Director who had recommended approval of this vendor. UNLV believes it is a good business plan for more money than has been realized in the past.

Regent Sisolak clarified that the Budget & Finance Committee discussed the matter earlier that day. There was a difference of opinion regarding whether the Facilities Manager had been involved with, or approved, the discussion. Regent Alden felt that he had been misled in terms of the Facilities Manager’s involvement. Regent Sisolak stated that Vice President Bomotti had since attempted to clarify the matter with Regent Alden who still felt that he had received misinformation.

Regent Sisolak wanted UNLV to ensure that the commitment made to the donor for naming the original scoreboard was honored.

Regent Geddes moved approval of Resolution #08-01 allowing bank financing for the construction and acquisition of revenue generating signs at UNLV athletic facilities. Regent Sisolak seconded with a friendly amendment to include researching and honoring any naming agreement made with Mr. Si Redd.

Regent Crear asked about control of the advertising displayed. Vice President Bomotti replied that UNLV would retain approval of advertisements placed on the sign.

Regent Sisolak asked about content-based veto power. Vice President Bomotti replied that the marketing firm acts as UNLV’s agent to seek revenue sources for advertising that is subject to UNLV’s approval. The contract includes a stipulation for UNLV’s approval of advertising material.

6. Approved-Resolution #08-01, Bank Financing for Signage, Revenue Generating Signs, UNLV – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg observed that the matter of honoring the naming commitment was part of a broader conversation relative to donations made and expectations of the donors that may not be in written form. He suggested a future agenda item to address this matter. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that staff was researching the policies regarding naming opportunities at the institutions. He related that Vice Chancellor Reed would be addressing the matter with the business officers. Vice President Bomotti said he would ensure that the commitments made to the Redd family would be honored.

Chair Wixom asked about the form of the agreement. Vice President Bomotti replied it was a negotiated contract; bids were solicited and total revenue was evaluated for each contract. This agreement was negotiated with the recommended vendor. Chair Wixom established that the vendor agreed to provide a minimum of \$350,000 per year for the signage component. Vice President Bomotti clarified it also included an additional guaranteed minimum per year as revenue and a split on revenues above a certain threshold within a year. Chair Wixom asked whether the guarantee was conditional. Vice President Bomotti replied that the minimum guarantee was not conditional.

Regent Crear clarified that UNLV would buy \$2.9 million in signage from this vendor and the vendor would provide \$350,000 per year for ten years to upgrade the signs. Vice President Bomotti replied that the primary vendor would provide \$350,000 per year. They do not sell the signs, but work with a secondary vendor who does. This provides the amount of money necessary to retire the debt to install the new signs. It is believed these new signs will bring in more revenue. Regent Crear established there was a minimum guarantee for revenue with revenues to be split above a certain threshold.

Vice President Bomotti replied that the agreement is at least \$330,000 per year more than what UNLV had been earning, adding that it is projected to increase by approximately \$100,000 per year over the contract term.

Regent Knecht asked about the recourse the lending institution would have against the System, university or other general funds. Vice President Bomotti replied the recourse was the value of the signage. Regent Knecht asked whether any other assets could be attached. Vice President Bomotti replied that bank financing was non-recourse. If the university failed to pay, the equipment could be taken as recourse.

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

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich presented for information only the recommendations of the Tuition and Fees Committee for tuition and fees adjustments for academic years 2009-10 and 2010-11. Final action on the proposed tuition and fee increases will be taken at the April 2008 meeting of the Board (Ref. B on file in the Board office).

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reported that prior to 1996, no process existed for making gradual tuition and fee increases with any degree of predictability. As a result, tuition and fees were often increased in an irregular fashion. Years of no increase were

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – (Cont'd.)

sometimes followed by a large increase, ranging in magnitude from 10% to 36%, resulting in an uneven burden to students and making it more difficult to plan their educational expenses. Current Board policy provides a method for regular and predictable tuition and fee increases. Tuition and registration fees are set two years in advance by the Board of Regents and the recommended amounts are used to determine estimated revenues for the next biennial budget. The Chancellor convenes a System-wide committee to review comparative data and to consider potential adjustments to tuition and fee levels for the following biennium. The Tuition and Fees Committee makes a final recommendation to the Board for its consideration. Campus hearings are held to gather student input on the committee's recommendation.

The 2007 Tuition and Fees Committee was comprised of: President Milton Glick, UNR; President Fred Maryanski, NSC; President Carol Lucey, WNC; Mr. Taylor Anderson, UNR (*undergraduate representative*); Mr. Jeremy Houska, UNLV (*graduate representative*); and Ms. Hope Manzano, WNC (*community college representative*).

The committee reviewed WICHE (*Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education*) and NSHE historical data, credit distributions by level and institution, the legislative letter of intent and discussed at length the distribution of registration fee increases between the state and NSHE institutions, as well as examined data on varying percentage increases for 2009-10 and 2010-11.

With the help of student body presidents, nine student hearings were held in December with at least one hearing held at every NSHE institution. The committee's recommendation was formally presented to each group, followed by an opportunity for student questions and feedback. Students were most interested in how fee increases will be used to benefit students.

In order to meet the goals of the NSHE Master Plan a three-way compact is required comprised of the NSHE, the state of Nevada and students. NSHE students pay approximately 20% of the cost of their education through registration fees. Nationally, students pay 21-31%, depending on the type of institution attended. Board of Regents' policy (*Title 4, Chapter 17*) states that the charge for full-time attendance is equivalent to the median of state averages published by WICHE for two-year and four-year colleges, respectively, using a three-year lag. Because WICHE does not differentially distinguish tuition and fees for upper-division courses at two-year colleges or for state colleges, the registration fees for these categories in the NSHE will be set at the midpoint between lower-division fees for community colleges and undergraduate-level fees at the universities.

The general philosophy for non-resident tuition has been that non-resident students must pay the full cost of instruction. This philosophy is commonly held among all states that support public higher education institutions with tax dollars.

Board policy regarding financial aid (*student access*) (*Title 4, Chapter 17*) states that in order to improve the access of all students to higher education, an amount up to 50% of all registration fee increases, net the amounts distributed to other fee categories, will be dedicated to student financial assistance. At least 90% is need-based, with the remainder

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – (Cont'd.)

for “access-oriented” financial assistance. Students can be assured that any increases in tuition and fees are balanced by appropriate increases in need-based financial aid.

Proposed In-State Fees:

- Community Colleges, 2009-11:
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2009-10 = \$60.00; a \$2.75 per credit increase (4.8%).
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2010-11 = \$63.00; a \$3.00 per credit increase (5.0%).
- State College and Community College Upper-Division, 2009-11:
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2009-10 = \$98.25; a \$4.75 per credit increase (5.1%).
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2010-11 = \$103.25; a \$5.00 per credit increase (5.1%).
- University Undergraduate, 2009-11:
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2009-10 = \$136.00; a \$6.50 per credit increase (5.0%).
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2010-11 = \$142.75; a \$6.75 per credit increase (5.0%).
- University Graduate, 2009-11:
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2009-10 = \$217.75; a \$19.75 per credit increase (10.0%).
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2010-11 = \$239.50; a \$21.75 per credit increase (10.0%).
- State College Graduate, 2009-11:
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2009-10 = \$160.25; a \$14.50 per credit increase (9.9%).
 - ✓ Per credit fee for academic year 2010-11 = \$176.25; a \$16.00 per credit increase (10.0%).

Proposed Non-Resident Tuition Rates:

Per Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 17*), non-resident full-time students pay the in-state registration fees plus an annual flat tuition charge. Non-resident tuition for full-time students (*enrolled in 7 or more credits*) will equal the WICHE median for non-resident tuition (*using a three-year lag*) times 120%. Non-resident tuition for part-time students (*enrolled in fewer than 7 credits*) will equal an amount calculated by multiplying the registration fees time 110%.

- Full-Time Non-Resident Students:
 - ✓ Community Colleges, 2009-10 = \$6,188 (8.4% increase).
 - ✓ Community Colleges, 2010-11 = \$6,347 (2.6% increase).
 - ✓ Community College Upper-Division and NSC, 2009-10 = \$9,264 (10.3% increase).
 - ✓ Community College Upper-Division and NSC, 2010-11 = \$9,818 (6.0% increase).
 - ✓ Universities, 2009-10 = \$12,340 (11.2% increase).
 - ✓ Universities, 2010-11 = \$13,290 (7.7% increase).

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – (Cont'd.)

➤ Part-Time Non-Resident Students:

- ✓ Community Colleges, 2009-10 = \$66.00 per credit (3.0% increase).
- ✓ Community Colleges, 2010-11 = \$69.25 per credit (3.25% increase).
- ✓ Community College Upper-Division and NSC, 2009-10 = \$108.00 per credit (5.25% increase).
- ✓ Community College Upper-Division and NSC, 2010-11 = \$113.50 per credit (5.5% increase).
- ✓ University Undergraduate, 2009-10 = \$149.50 per credit (7.0% increase).
- ✓ University Undergraduate, 2010-11 = \$157.00 per credit (7.5% increase).
- ✓ University Graduate, 2009-10 = \$239.50 per credit (21.75% increase).
- ✓ University Graduate, 2010-11 = \$263.50 per credit (24.0% increase).
- ✓ State College Graduate, 2009-10 = \$176.25 (16.0% increase).
- ✓ State College Graduate, 2010-11 = 194.00 (17.75% increase).

Discounted Tuition Rates:

- Good Neighbor Tuition – Students enrolling under the Good Neighbor classification will, in addition to registration fees, pay a discounted tuition charge. Community college and state college Good Neighbor tuition is calculated by multiplying the registration fees times 60%. University Good Neighbor tuition is calculated by multiplying the registration fees times 110%.
- Children of Alumni Tuition (*universities*) – Undergraduate students enrolling under this classification, in addition to registration fees, pay a tuition charge equaling an amount calculated by multiplying the registration fees times 60%.
- Distance Education – Non-resident students enrolled exclusively in distance education courses, in addition to registration fees, pay a tuition charge equaling the registration fees times 50%.

Financial Aid Revenues:

- The state general fund provides financial aid through the scholarship function of the NSHE budget. Student fee increases generate additional financial aid. By Board policy, at least 90% of such aid is need-based and the remainder is non-need based. At the June 2008 Board meeting, the distribution of fees, including that portion dedicated to financial aid, will be determined.

In summary, the recommended tuition and fees are less than the WICHE median with a three-year lag, are still less than other comparable public institutions, contribute to need-based financial aid, accomplish progress towards the goals of the Master Plan and meet the expectations of the Legislature for students to do their part to support higher education in Nevada.

Regent Knecht indicated that, at his request, an extended comparison (*Page 23 of Reference B*) was created and asked that information be provided to all members of the Board. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich agreed to so. Regent Knecht stated that in April when a vote will be requested, he will need to see what the tangible results, goals, and so forth, will be with sustained increases. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated that the Presidents have started that discussion.

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht requested that, in regards to the letter of intent, the Board be updated on progress that is made. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the Chancellor has discussed the letter of intent and the need to raise tuition and to keep the bulk of the increase on the respective campuses. The recent budget situation has overshadowed this issue but he fully intends to pursue those discussions.

Regent Knecht noted that 21% to 31% has been cited as the national average range by which the student registration and tuition fees pay for the cost of education. He then indicated that 20.53% had been cited for NSHE institutions. Based on the claim that out-of-state students pay for the full cost of their education, the cost of education for undergraduate students is more on the order of 25% and 22% for graduate students. This still means that the taxpayers of Nevada are subsidizing students between 75% and 78% of the cost of education. He asked that it be kept in mind that there is a significant public subsidy to the students of higher education in the State of Nevada.

Regent Geddes noted that as fees increase, additional funds will need to be dedicated to need-based financial aid. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that this is correct for 2008-09 but reminded the Regents that these are projections for which they are not requesting a distribution at this point.

Vice Chancellor Nichols added that student financial aid has remained the same since the estate tax was eliminated. It is anticipated that student funded financial aid will increase as tuition increases.

Chair Wixom indicated that he is aware that Senator Reid and Congressman Porter have been working on several financial aid initiatives with their respective constituencies and asked that the System follow-up with their offices so that financial aid decisions are made with the most current information available.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that one challenge to NSHE campuses is with regard to graduate assistants. As graduate tuition increases, campuses must then pay more to their graduate assistants. The System is considering the concept of using a portion of that financial aid to assist the best and brightest graduate assistants. A report will be provided to the Board when discussions are finalized.

Chair Wixom asked the Presidents to take note of the Regents' questions and requested that each be addressed during further discussion at the April meeting.

Regent Alden expressed concern for the number of fees this entails, adding that for in-state tuition, he is opposed to anything beyond COLA.

Regent Rosenberg expressed concern for the students' ability to handle these tuition increases. He acknowledged the need to increase tuition, and asked about the Board's intent to maintain regular increases upon which the students can budget and plan. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that tuition has increased regularly, though not in the previously planned increments. Regent Rosenberg stated that the System needs to work to help students realize there is money available to help those with the greatest need. He did not like the idea of raising tuition.

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak questioned the percentage increase differences between one fiscal year and the next in regards to non-resident tuition. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied it was based upon the WICHE average with a three year lag. There is not the same gap with universities as there is with the community colleges. Regent Sisolak asked whether non-resident tuition could be increased slightly to allow a portion to be devoted to resident student financial aid. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that under current budgeting rules, non-resident tuition goes to the state. Regent Sisolak asked that this approach be researched with the Legislature.

Regent Sisolak suggested changing the name of financial aid to something else in order to maintain the dignity of those people who need to apply. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich agreed that a serious negative stigma of financial aid exists in rural Nevada that the NSHE needs to overcome.

President Lucey related that is not a stigma unique to Nevada. WNC has had better luck referring to financial aid as scholarships.

Regent Crear stated that it is a standard process to fill out financial aid forms in order to receive scholarship funds. Regent Sisolak noted that students may have difficulty asking their parents to provide their income information.

President Killpatrick was unsure that renaming the forms would alleviate any level of embarrassment.

Mr. Richie LeSpade said that it could be difficult for students to obtain the information from their parents. Parents are often embarrassed to provide the information. Mr. LeSpade suggested simplifying the process.

Regent Sisolak advocated for changing the name in order to make it more palatable.

Regent Rosenberg stated that it was important for students to realize they have a responsibility to do what is necessary to get it done.

Regent Gallagher recalled a time when the Legislature insisted either the System increase the tuition or the System's budget would be reduced accordingly. She asked whether tuition was increased every three years. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied it was increased every two years.

Regent Leavitt stated that everything possible should be done, including offering scholarships, to non-resident students as incentive to remain in the state after graduation.

Regent Knecht felt it was fruitless to change the name of financial assistance. Students should be encouraged to do what is necessary to seek and secure financial assistance.

Regent Crear advocated for a more comprehensive advertising campaign to the K-16 age group that financial assistance is available.

Ms. Hope Manzano added that there is also an issue of students that do complete the forms but are not eligible because their parents are on the financial cusp.

7. Information Only-Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2009-11 (Agenda Item 8) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Taylor Anderson, ASUN Senator-UNR, stated that the students originally agreed to a 9% increase on the condition the Chancellor continue discussions with the Legislature regarding the institutions maintaining control over a greater portion of tuition increases. A 5% increase covers inflation. The students were not opposed to increases so long as the students realized a benefit.

Regent Dondero noted that she was disturbed by some of the inequities in the distribution and hoped that proposed increases would be fair across all of the institutions.

The meeting recessed at 3:34 p.m. and reconvened at 3:41 p.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2008, with all members present except Regent Whipple.

8. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Tuition & Fees, William S. Boyd School of Law & UNLV School of Dental Medicine, 2009-11, UNLV (Agenda Item 9) - President David B. Ashley presented for information the proposed tuition and fee structure for the 2009-11 biennia for the William S. Boyd School of Law and the UNLV School of Dental Medicine. Final action on the proposed tuition and fees will be taken at the April 2008 meeting of the Board (Ref. C on file in the Board office).

Dean John Valery White, Boyd School of Law-UNLV, reported a necessary increase in tuition. When the School was first formed, it was #5 within its peer group of 13. They are currently ranked #12. Their proposal would help to return them to the ranking of #5, though it will not be implemented until 2009, which could further impact ranking somewhat. They have been blessed with tremendous support from the private sector which has allowed them to aggressively grow several programs. That has created a situation in which several successful programs are being funded with non-recurring funds including academic support programs. Dean White also reported that their career planning and placement office is inadequately staffed and there is not an alumni office to contact and cultivate the now 850 alumni.

Their plan for the law school is to provide high quality, accessible education, including evening programs. Their current ratio of students to faculty is 12:1. However, it is their hope to achieve between a 10.5 or 11:1 ratio, adding that their overall goal is to improve quality.

Regent Geddes asked for the breakdown of in-state versus out-of-state students. Dean White replied that their student body is approximately 74% in-state students although they heavily recruit out-of-state students. If out-of-state tuition continues to double, it would place the fees above many private institutions in the region and possibly make their program inaccessible.

Regent Sisolak related that he has received several concerns from students stating that they are denied input on the tuition increase and there is a lack of value for their money. Their perception is that they are paying for the speakers brought onto campus. Dean White replied that speakers are funded primarily by gift funds. The student speakers are organized by the student organizations and funded by gift funds. The School is aware that a substantial increase is being requested. They would like to grandfather existing students, but that is not financially feasible. They have compromised on a partial

8. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Tuition & Fees, William S. Boyd School of Law & UNLV School of Dental Medicine, 2009-11, UNLV (Agenda Item 9) – (Cont'd.)

grandfathering process for which they have not heard significant opposition from the Legislature. Their main goal is to stabilize the evening program without sacrificing quality.

Regent Sisolak asked about the attendance levels at their student forums. Dean White replied that forums are held every three weeks at different times of day for both the day and evening students. In the current semester, two forums have been conducted that included the proposed tuition increase. The evening forums had a turnout of approximately 25-30 students. There was a much smaller cadre of students in attendance at the day student forums.

Chancellor Rogers stated that he was unaware of any law school that enjoyed the level of local support as the Boyd School of Law, with the exception of the Yale type schools. He felt that it was appropriate for students to bear the burden of a significant portion of the cost of their professional degrees, adding that their investment will result in a significant income flow once the degree is obtained.

Regent Sisolak felt that philosophy made a great deal of sense and suggested that the Chancellor discuss the tuition increase with the students. Chancellor Rogers observed that the private sector and state were subsidizing a portion of the cost and the students should as well.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich recalled a level of resistance from the previous legislative session when a blanket exemption was proposed for existing law students.

Regent Crear expressed his support for the proposed increase. He felt it was important for the school to live up to the expectations placed upon it and provide a value education.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether a more modest increase would be more prudent. Dean White replied that given the four-year program and biennium funding, there will always be an existing class of students who will want or expect grandfathering rights. The size of the increase relates to market realities that are faced. Nevada is a small state with a small number of LSAT takers. In that market place, the school cannot afford to lose the best students to competitive schools when trying to make the moves in ranking to which the Boyd School aspires.

Chancellor Rogers expressed his support for the proposed tuition increase, feeling that students should pay their fair share.

Dean Karen West, School of Dental Medicine-UNLV, proposed a \$150 per semester increase for allocation to student access activities. She indicated that this increase will generate \$125,000 per year, adding that there has not been an increase since the school was established. They would like to offer scholarships to compete with other regional dental schools and to recruit and maintain a diversified student body.

Regent Geddes asked whether the increase was sufficient. Dean West replied it was likely not enough but would be a good place to start.

8. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Tuition & Fees, William S. Boyd School of Law & UNLV School of Dental Medicine, 2009-11, UNLV (Agenda Item 9) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Dondero asked about recruiting faculty from the rural areas. Dean West replied that they currently enjoyed a very diverse faculty. However, their student body was not as diverse and they are attempting to rectify that situation.

Regent Sisolak did not understand the difference in proposed increases between the professional schools, noting that they all hold higher earning potential. Dean West replied that UNLV is very close to the mean. She wished it to remain there until the program had established itself. Regent Sisolak stated he would be more comfortable with a more equal increase.

Regent Sisolak noted that an equal percentage-based increase for both non-resident and resident tuition would potentially generate additional funds that could be used for financial scholarships. Dean West replied that a 2% increase for in-state and out-of-state residents would increase out-of-state tuition significantly more.

Regent Rosenberg asked how much was necessary to endow a scholarship. Dean West replied the minimum was \$25,000.

Regent Leavitt related that the professional schools have different histories and he hoped that all programs are not treated the same.

Regent Gallagher agreed that these were two different schools, adding that she did not want the Board to treat every professional school the same.

Regent Knecht also agreed, noting that a greater increase was not being proposed for the dental school because their tuition was sufficient when compared to its costs. Whereas, the law school still needs to catch up to its costs. Tuition should not be similar but rather in line with their associated costs.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern that in five years the dental school will be in a position to require a larger increase in order to keep pace, adding that large increases are difficult for students to adjust to.

Chancellor Rogers asked what the per student costs were for the dental school. Dean West replied that it costs more to educate a dentist than it does a physician. Chancellor Rogers requested that the actual figures be reported to the Board at a future meeting. He felt that the tuition should be somewhat proportional to the actual costs. Regent Sisolak requested that the per student cost for the other professional programs also be presented.

9. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Tuition & Fees, University of Nevada School of Medicine, 2009-11, UNR (Agenda Item 10) - President Milton D. Glick presented for information the proposed tuition and fee structure for the 2009-11 biennia for the University of Nevada School of Medicine (UNSOM). Final action on the proposed tuition and fees will be taken at the April 2008 meeting of the Board (Ref. D on file in the Board office). One-half of the increase in tuition will lower the state contribution to the School of Medicine state appropriation; the other half will increase UNSOM student access funds.

9. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Tuition & Fees, University of Nevada School of Medicine, 2009-11, UNR (Agenda Item 10) – (Cont'd.)

Dean John McDonald, School of Medicine-UNR, reported the SOM receives \$33 million from the state with which to train 62 physicians. The state's \$33 million investment is returned five-fold in economic development including education, research and outreach. Although it would be difficult to determine the actual cost to educate each student, he estimated it to be \$100,000 to \$120,000 per student. In general, their tuition is lower than most western public schools. However, their students graduate with more debt, believed to be attributed in part to the cost of living and travel between Reno and Las Vegas.

The proposed 5% per year increase will help them work towards the WICHE median. He cautioned that medical school students continue to accumulate debt after medical school graduation due to three to five more years of post graduate training.

Regent Sisolak asked if medical students could pay back their tuition after they begin practicing privately. Dean McDonald related that there are few physicians that earn \$500,000 per year. The potential to accumulate higher debt will impact the career paths of individuals. Regent Sisolak asked why service in rural locations could not be used to offset educational debt. Dean McDonald said there were state and federal loan programs already offered in return for service. Regent Sisolak asked if specialty careers could pay their loans in cash while primary practice careers could pay their loans in service. Dean McDonald noted that if Nevada were to adopt that approach, it would be the only school employing such a model. He also noted that the higher the tuition, the more anglo-dominated the program will become and that diversity should be considered.

Regent Sisolak asked where the funds come from to recruit faculty. Dean McDonald replied that their past hires have all been taken from reserve operating funds.

Regent Gallagher noted that many graduates open their own practices which requires even further debt.

Chancellor Rogers felt there must be some elasticity upon demand for those attending medical school. An Osteopathic school in Las Vegas charges \$40,000 per year whereas the UNSOM charges \$12,000 per year. He asked how many applications were received for the 62 medical school spots. Dean McDonald replied there are only approximately 150 qualified applicants per year. Chancellor Rogers asked if any research had been conducted as to what would happen if the tuition was increased from \$12,000 to \$25,000 or \$40,000 per year. President Glick noted that the UNSOM accepts primarily Nevada residents while the other school admits predominantly non-residents. He felt that the UNSOM has an obligation to serve the Nevada community and to maintain diversity.

Chancellor Rogers agreed, adding that he was trying to determine whether raising the tuition, and thereby the income, would allow the school to increase the number of students allowed in the program. Dean McDonald replied that he wished that were the case except that every dollar raised is returned to the state general fund. Chancellor Rogers stated that the primary issue should be that if tuition was raised, assuming the UNSOM could retain the funds, what would that do for the school. Dean McDonald stated that because they have a small class and a large budget, the tuition would have to be significantly increased to make a difference. Chancellor Rogers noted that increasing the class size from 62 to 100 would make a difference of \$1 million per year.

9. Information Only-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Tuition & Fees, University of Nevada School of Medicine, 2009-11, UNR (Agenda Item 10) – (Cont'd.)

Dean McDonald stated that research grants and practice plans are responsible for over 80% of their annual budget. Chancellor Rogers noted that if the tuition was increased proportionately, the practice plan may not have to subsidize the students' tuition. Dean McDonald stated that such a hypothesis has never been investigated but he would like to test its viability in surveys rather than in actual practice. The UNSOM's tuition is approximately 31% lower than their median peer group.

Regent Dondero asked whether the residency program brought any revenue to the program. Dean McDonald replied that because residents are unlicensed physicians, they cannot bill for their services. The hospital returns to the university what it costs to pay the residents' small salary and fringe benefit whether their program is in a public or private hospital.

Regent Sisolak established that fees (*internal mentoring, and health programs*) are different from tuition in that the school is allowed to retain the money.

10. Approved-Employment Contract, Clinical Sciences, UNLV (Agenda Item 12) – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request for the employment salary above schedule for Dr. Daniel L. Orr III, D.D.S., M.D., in the UNLV School of Dental Medicine, as Professor-in-Residence of Clinical Sciences (Oral Maxillofacial Surgery) (Ref. F on file in the Board office). Current faculty salary budgets are sufficient to support this offer.

Regent Sisolak asked why tail coverage was not requested. Dr. Karen West, Dean, School of Dental Medicine-UNLV, replied that tail coverage was not part of the negotiated contract. Chief Counsel Patterson stated that not every contract includes tail coverage, adding that very few do. He related that staff was working on a policy to determine the criteria by which it would be appropriate to award tail coverage.

Regent Sisolak said he had the same question for the following agenda item, noting a lack of consistency in some of the contracts. He observed the System could save quite a bit of money by not awarding tail coverage.

Dean West stated that the provision of tail coverage had not been a part of either of the employment contract negotiations.

Regent Geddes moved approval of the employment contract for UNLV. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

11. Approved-Employment Contract, Pediatric Dentistry, UNLV (Agenda Item 13) – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request for the employment salary above schedule for Dr. Jeanne Hibler, D.D.S., in the UNLV School of Dental Medicine, as the Director of Advanced Education in Pediatric Dentistry (Ref. G on file in the Board office). Current faculty salary budgets are sufficient to support this offer.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the employment contract for UNLV. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

12. Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV (Agenda Item 14) – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for tenure upon hire for Mr. Pablo F. Medina, effective August 1, 2008. This request was pursuant to Board policy which specifies that Board approval is necessary only in circumstances where the faculty member is not tenured at another institution (*Ref. H on file in the Board office*).

Dr. Dawn Newman, Vice Provost, Academic Resources-UNLV, indicated that Mr. Medina comes to UNLV from the New School in New York City. That particular institution provides only five-year contracts and therefore Dr. Medina was not tenured to NSHE’s definition of tenure. Dr. Medina is an international scholar in fiction and poetry and has received 18 awards over the last thirty years.

Regent Sisolak questioned the meaning of the reference that the department was “overwhelmingly” in favor of this appointment. He asked what this hire would do to the morale of the other faculty. Dr. Newman replied that upon a vote of the tenured faculty, there were twelve in favor and one opposed. The majority of the tenured faculty feels Dr. Medina strengthens the department and is thrilled to have him.

Regent Rosenberg asked if Dr. Medina had more than one five-year contract at his previous institution. Dr. Newman was unsure but noted he had served as chair of his department.

Regent Dondero moved approval of the tenure upon hire for UNLV. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

13. Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR (Agenda Item 15) – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for the tenure upon hire of Mr. Jerry Ceppos, Dean, Reynolds School of Journalism, University of Nevada, Reno. This request was pursuant to Board policy which specifies that Board approval is necessary only in circumstances where the faculty member is not tenured at another institution (*Ref. I on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the tenure upon hire for UNR. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

In response to Regent Sisolak’s question, Dr. Janet Vreeland, Interim Provost, UNR, indicated that upon a vote of the tenured faculty, only one was opposed to this hire.

Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Race/Ethnicity Identification (Agenda Item 16) – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols’ request for an addition to Board policy concerning the collection and reporting of student race and ethnicity data as required by the U.S. Department of Education (*Title 4, Chapter 21, Section 2*). No later than Fall 2010, the federal government is requiring higher education institutions to collect race and ethnicity data in a two-question format. The proposed NSHE policy will go into effect for Fall 2009 and will ensure comparable data on race and ethnicity is collected by all NSHE institutions (*Ref. J on file in the Board office*).

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Race/Ethnicity Identification (Agenda Item 16) – (Cont'd.)

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that the primary reason for instituting this revision a year prior to its actual requirement was to assist in the development of the data for the iNtegrate student services module. It makes more sense to establish the new software under the new ethnicity guidelines.

Regent Geddes moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning student race/ethnicity identification. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Knecht expressed his opposition in principle to the amount of data already collected and was not convinced this change was needed before it is absolutely required.

Regent Sisolak asked if a student answers yes to question 1, section 5, as to whether they are Hispanic/Latino, do they continue to answer question #2. Vice Chancellor Nichols explained that the category of Hispanic/Latino is not an exclusive category. A student could be Hispanic/Latino and also fall into other categories such as Caucasian. It is possible for two or three categories to be indicated when answering ethnicity questions.

The full text of the question, as stated under federal guidelines, will be provided to the students for the purposes of clarification.

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

15. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Non-Resident Summer Tuition Fee, William S. Boyd School of Law, UNLV (Agenda Item 18) – The Board approved President David B. Ashley's request to establish a non-resident per credit charge (equal to the current non-resident law fee per credit charge) for all non-resident students enrolled in the William S. Boyd School of Law during the summer sessions (Ref. L on file in the Board office).

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* revision concerning the establishment of a non-resident per credit charge for the William S. Boyd School of Law during summer sessions. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

The meeting recessed at 5:07 p.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2008, and reconvened at 8:01 a.m. on Friday, February 8, 2008, with all members present except Regents Anthony, Leavitt and Sisolak.

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

Mr. Taylor Gray, Student Body President-CSN, requested additional time for public comment from the students regarding the budget constraints. He stressed that CSN's 40,000 students were seeking Board leadership and urged Board members to take the students' message to the Governor and Legislature. Mr. Gray said he had not seen the

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

kind of leadership from the Board that the students can support. He hoped the entire Board would take this fight to the Legislature. He said that students were willing to march in the districts to help change the legislators' minds. He asked that any Board action relative to the budget shortfall be deferred to the April meeting to provide students time to review long-term planning and the long-term effects, unless the Board could guarantee that what is determined that day will be the plan in the following year.

Regent Alden stated although he has been critical, every Board member was unhappy with the mandated budget cuts. It was due to the Chair and Chancellor's efforts that the cuts were reduced from 8% to 4.5%. The Board of Regents is not the money-granting agency and can only do so much. The Regents rely upon their lobbying team to represent their interests in Carson City. The only way to change this is for the Governor to call a special session. It is up to the public to outcry.

Regents Leavitt and Sisolak entered the meeting.

Mr. Gray felt that his comments were misconstrued. He was asking for the Board to provide leadership. The CSN students answered the Chancellor's cry to rally and protest. They are asking for the Board to provide that same kind of leadership to which the students can respond.

Regent Schofield observed that Mr. Gray was asking for the Board's moral support.

Regent Crear empathized with and shared Mr. Gray's frustrations, stating that this was an unfortunate situation but it did not mean the students could not continue to fight. He encouraged the students not to rely upon the Board to tell them what to do and to continue their efforts.

Regent Sisolak assured Mr. Gray that the Board hears the students' concerns, adding that together a lot more could be accomplished.

Ms. Judy Stewart, Faculty Senate Chair-CSN, read a statement from the CSN Faculty Senate into the record. She noted that the state financial situation has worsened. The faculty senate is opposed to the budget reduction plan because: 1) It does not provide long-term solutions; 2) It proposes cuts without providing assurances for how budgetary planning and development will occur in the next biennium; 3) The depth of the cuts leave no backup plan and leave CSN in an under-funded position with little room for error and no flexibility; 4) CSN began this year with a budget cut of \$1 million and an operating deficit of \$1.3 million resulting in underfunded utility costs and costs of supporting our disabled students; 5) CSN serves the most ethnically and socio-economically diverse population and this cut will result in loss of access or loss of opportunity. Without equitable funding, the students feel they do not matter as much as the others. CSN's faculty senate is asking to 1) delay final action on CSN's budget reduction plan until more information is available so they are not locked into budget cuts they may be unable to maintain; 2) make bridging the funding gap the first priority for the next biennium. Ms. Stewart expressed her appreciation for the Board's efforts thus far.

Regent Knecht asked if the faculty was in opposition to CSN's previous budget reduction plan, or the revised version to be considered that day. Ms. Stewart clarified that the faculty's opposition was for the revised version to be presented that day.

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

Mr. Steve Bale, Faculty Senate Chair-TMCC, recalled when he too was a struggling student and encouraged the Board not to place any additional financial burdens on the students. He initially felt the faculty could support the cuts, but he has been criticized since. The TMCC faculty have rejected his statement unanimously and also rejected the deferral of merit, feeling that it was not fair to have made the decision while faculty and students were not in session. He said that merit is not a bonus, it is earned. He related that faculty spend long hours, days, weeks, months, and years to qualify for merit and rely upon it to supplement department funds. He said that deferring merit and reducing the budgets placed faculty in a no-win situation.

Regent Crear asked if merit pay was an entitlement or incentive based on certain factors. He related that in private industry, employees share in good and bad times. If times are tough, how can more be provided with less. He truly applauds the hard work and dedication of faculty. If the System simply does not have the funds, how can salaries be increased.

Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that at UNR, UNLV and NSC the merit distribution is a much more performance based method than at the other institutions. The methodology at the community college level is more similar to the traditional state employee in that it is based on the salary schedules previously approved by the Board (*approximately 2.5%*). Faculty or staff have to be judged as not performing to standards in order to be ineligible.

Regent Sisolak was under the impression that there were only so many steps before the salary range maxed out. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the Board adjusted the steps to provide for more upward movement. Once a faculty member reaches the top, they can be considered for merit but it is a different process.

Regent Crear asked if merit is an entitlement or is it based on performance throughout the year and does it consider economic shortfalls of the institution. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that merit is never an entitlement. However, the conditions under which merit is given is more clearly spelled out for the community colleges. Merit is totally dependent upon the discretion of the Legislature to provide the funding. In Nevada, the Legislature has always been supportive of merit. When considering budget reductions, it is always better to delay merit for six months instead of returning the entire budgeted amount.

Regent Schofield observed that he could not support the current inconsistent methods for determining merit.

16. Approved-Budget Reduction Plans – Reversion of iNtegrate Funds (Agenda Item 7) – The Board approved the budget reduction plans including the adjustments submitted by the Presidents as well as the change proposed by Interim President Richards. At its special meeting January 7, 2008, the Board heard and approved budget reduction plans from the respective institutions. The Board also approved reverting the \$10 million allocation for the iNtegrate project to the state. While the Board recognized the necessity for flexibility in the implementation of these plans as part of the approval of the campus budget reduction plans, the Board directed that there be a discussion at the February 7-8, 2008, meeting regarding the impact on the respective campus plans of the decision on the

16. Approved-Budget Reduction Plans – Reversion of iNtegrate Funds (Agenda Item 7) – (Cont'd.)

iNtegrate reversion. The Presidents presented addenda to their respective plans to outline the impact as requested by the Board. Based on this discussion, the Board approved modification of the earlier plan approval (*Ref. A on file in the Board office*).

Interim President Richards stated that CSN proposed to use their proportionate share of the iNtegrate funds to reduce the previously proposed student surcharge from \$4.50 to \$2.75 per credit. Additional funds were applied to backfill other key student success areas. He suggested minor adjustments to CSN's original plan which he felt were more helpful to the institution and provided more flexibility in meeting the institution's specific needs. He asked the Board to preserve that flexibility. With deep respect to the faculty and students he noted there were two separate issues: 1) the immediate problem of the 4.5% budget reduction. He echoed the sentiments of the CSN faculty in thanking the Board and the System for their efforts in keeping the required reduction percentage as low as possible and 2) the funding gap. He stood by the proposed changes, noting the addendum to the plan was more sensitive and helpful to the students while helping to address the 4.5% reduction.

Regent Geddes asked if there would be any funds in the deferred HECC account that could be used elsewhere. Ms. Patty Charlton Dayar replied the HECC fund is being used to offset their 4.5% reduction. They also have a critical need for HVAC system repairs in one of their main classroom buildings over the summer. If the repairs are not done, the building will be unavailable in the fall. In the next week, they will be going out to bid for this project and if there is any gap, the funds will come from capital improvement which will completely deplete that source.

Regent Sisolak asked about savings from temperature control mandates. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that a bill was passed providing for energy audits of state buildings. Relatively new buildings were exempted since they are built with greener standards. The NSHE supported that bill and has begun the process of energy audits which should eventually pay off. Application can be made to access a very small pool of funds, but it will not solve the problem. Regent Sisolak asked if there is a specific degree setting that would result in significant savings. Regent Geddes related that the variables between individual building (*age, design and construction materials*) would make it very difficult to standardize. The campuses are doing a very good job but need funds to upgrade some of the older, less efficient systems. Ms. Charlton Dayar related that within the last year, CSN has been conducting engineering studies to identify efficiency issues.

Regent Rosenberg stated that there simply is not enough money. The Presidents have to make difficult decisions and they should not be second guessed. He pleaded with the Board members to provide the Presidents with maximum flexibility, adding that the Presidents have thought about these plans long and hard and with full consultation with faculty and students. Regents Leavitt, Knecht and Geddes agreed with Regent Rosenberg's comments.

16. Approved-Budget Reduction Plans – Reversion of iNtegrate Funds (Agenda Item 7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Geddes moved approval of the budget reduction plans including the changes provided by the Presidents and the recent change proposed by CSN Interim President Richards. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Whipple left the meeting.

Regent Geddes clarified that the action entailed reallocating \$10 million in iNtegrate funds to the campuses to help cover the budget reduction plans approved at the Board's special meeting on January 7, 2008.

In response to Regent Sisolak's question, Chair Wixom clarified the Board was approving the budget reduction plans approved at the January special meeting, including the adjustments provided by the Presidents and the recent adjustments provided by Interim President Richards.

In response to Regent Alden's question, Chair Wixom clarified that the Presidents have full flexibility in determining the expenditure of funds.

Regent Geddes applauded UNR Student Body President Sarah Ragsdale and the student government for their determination to make The Knowledge Center a priority and accelerate its opening by accepting a student fee. He felt it was a good decision on their part.

Regent Knecht commended the students, student leaders and faculty for an outstanding effort in presenting their concerns to the Board. He acknowledged they might not all agree on everything, but assured them he had heard and considered their concerns. He also commended the Presidents for doing a fine job and encouraged them to continue to do so.

CSN Faculty Senate Chair Judy Stewart clarified that the faculty's main concern was the impact to the base budget.

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

Regent Knecht recalled that the Board had previously determined not to revert \$8.7 million allocated to the UNHSS capital projects. Subsequently, the State Public Works Board deducted \$7.2 million from the NSHE, which was not included in the System's 4.5% budget reduction. Regent Knecht stated that Building B will be ready in such time that the System could spend the \$2.72 million allocated for furniture, fixtures and equipment (*FF&E*) and be open by Fall 2009. He reported that Chancellor Rogers had asked the Governor whether the \$2.72 million for *FF&E* for Building B could be restored. He proposed the Board publicly support that effort with a letter to the Governor.

16. Approved-Budget Reduction Plans – Reversion of iNtegrate Funds (Agenda Item 7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht moved approval of composing a letter to the Governor reflecting the Board's support for the Chancellor's request with regard to the Health Sciences System. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of order, questioning whether this was considered part of the agenda item. Chief Counsel Patterson stated that the agenda item was intended to address the Board's prior action with regard to budget plans. Part of the Board's prior action included decisions regarding the System budget, which included a reversion of the iNtegrate funds and a rejection of reverting the funds related to health sciences.

Regent Whipple left the meeting.

Chair Wixom noted it could also be included as part of the Health Sciences System Committee report. Regent Sisolak related that Ms. Marcia Turner, Vice Chancellor, UNHSS, had discussed with the Committee about approaching the IFC with the request. He was merely concerned that the Board take action in the proper manner. Chair Wixom said he was willing to write a letter indicating full Board support. He offered to undertake the Health Sciences System Committee report to facilitate the motion. Regent Sisolak withdrew his point of order indicating he had no objections.

Regent Knecht proposed a friendly amendment to send the letter to the IFC and the Governor. Regent Rosenberg accepted the friendly amendment.

Regent Sisolak clarified that the Board is merely formalizing Ms. Turner's offer to request permission to redirect the money.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reported that he, Ms. Turner and Chancellor Rogers had discussed this matter, noting that Chancellor Rogers, Executive Vice Chancellor Trevisan and Ms. Turner were fully supportive of this measure. He felt the Chancellor would appreciate the Board's formal support.

Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

17. Approved-Tuition Bracket Study (Agenda Item 11) – The Board approved the Tuition and Fees Committee recommendation that the Board of Regents request a study of a possible tuition bracket within NSHE in an effort to encourage a culture of completion. The Committee acknowledged that this is a departure from the Board's current tuition and fee structure, and therefore, recommended that the fiscal feasibility of this proposal be thoroughly studied. It was recommended that the study include, but not be limited to, a review of tuition platforms utilized in other states, non-financial impacts including the potential impact on student behavior, a process to allow for broad student input and other similar elements. Results of the study will be brought back for the Board's consideration at a later date (Ref. E on file in the Board office).

17. Approved-Tuition Bracket Study (Agenda Item 11) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg clarified that approval was being sought for a study to be conducted.

Regent Dondero asked whether students would be involved. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied student involvement would be an absolute necessity.

Regent Sisolak expressed his opposition to spending money on a study at this point. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that she had no way to quantify the costs of a study but they are prepared to proceed if the Board so desires.

Regent Geddes observed that the Board is concerned about completion rates and a study may provide information that can be taken to the Legislature.

Chair Wixom asked if it was possible to narrow the focus of a study to reduce overall incremental and opportunity costs. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that they could begin with four-year institutions. Chair Wixom suggest that they do that, adding it was his understanding that the overall cost per student decreases if the time spent obtaining the degree also decreases from five or six years to four years. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that was correct, adding that the longer it takes a student to finish the more likely they are to take additional courses and incur higher costs.

Chair Wixom observed that it is unfair to the students to require they complete their degrees in a specific time if there are not adequate course offerings or adequate guidance counseling (*on-line or in person*). He asked that the study address course availability and resources and guidance necessary for students.

Regent Dondero asked if there was a time frame for this study to come back to the Board. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that they would need at least until the August meeting, if not October, adding that they will do their best to turn it around quickly.

Regent Crear noted that it may not be fair for the System to force students to complete their education in a specific amount of time, adding that every student's schedule is different.

Regent Sisolak noted that the number of credits continue to increase, requiring additional semesters, and asked that the study perhaps address that also.

President Lucey noted that at the community colleges, many students are not full-time. She encouraged the study to include community college as it may potentially have implications for retention rates.

Regent Knecht suggested not limiting the scope of the study, but rather that administration take the sense of the Board to be mindful of opportunity costs in studying a full scope of ramifications.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

Chair Wixom asked what the impact of study creep would be if their report extended to the community colleges. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that would not be a significant issue as they already have much of the information available for all seven institutions.

17. Approved-Tuition Bracket Study (Agenda Item 11) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher moved approval of requesting a study of a possible tuition bracket within NSHE. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Sisolak voted no. Regents Anthony, Crear and Whipple were absent.

Regent Crear entered the meeting.

18. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Management of Host Expenditures/Table Purchases (Agenda Item 17) – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich's request for a revision to the Board's current policies and procedures (*Procedures and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 5, Section 1*) regarding the use of host funds for table purchases. The proposed revision was requested by the NSHE Presidents and retains the current limit on table purchases of \$30,000, and provides for a waiver of the limit under certain circumstances (*Ref. K on file in the Board office*).

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that due to the heavy pressure that is placed on them to attend events, the Presidents are in favor of having a Board-imposed limit. The waiver under certain circumstances will allow an option for those Presidents that are unable to attend a certain event because they have already reached the annual maximum. In addition, the Presidents were not keen on hosting events at one another's institutions. The changes in the proposed policy include: 1) a between-institution ban on hosting tables remains. However, each institution will grant a gratis number of seats for their sister institutions and 2) the \$30,000 limit is still in effect with exceptions provided with written good cause to the Chancellor. These recommended changes were approved by the Council of Presidents.

Regent Sisolak clarified that the only change is that the presidents are able to go to the Chancellor for a waiver. He asked what happened to the request for an increase to the limit. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the policy proposed that day would not increase the current Board policy limit of \$30,000. Regent Sisolak asked why the institutions do not request Foundation funds for these events. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the policy applies to Foundations as well as to the institutions. Regent Sisolak noted that most of the large foundations have members that work for large corporations and asked if the Presidents typically receive invitations to those events anyway. The Presidents indicated that many times they do receive invitations from Foundation members. President Ashley added that the funding for these purchases comes from non-state money. There are times when having an institutional presence at certain events (*e.g., Latin Chamber of Commerce*) is important.

Regent Sisolak recalled some entity being criticized for which events they chose to attend. President Ashley indicated that they try to be fair and apply similar purchasing policies to all organizations. Chancellor Rogers said he has not received any complaints in this regard.

Regent Crear felt it was important to have a presence at these types of events; especially by the Presidents. He was unsure if \$30,000 would be enough. Chancellor Rogers said the institutions can request that the limit be waived.

18. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Management of Host Expenditures/Table Purchases (Agenda Item 17) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* revision concerning host expenditures and table purchases. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

19. Approved-Regents' Awards – The Board approved the 2008 Distinguished Nevadan and Regent Scholar recipients:

A. Distinguished Nevadans - Policy: *Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 14 (Ref. M on file in the Board office):*

- Dr. Joseph N. Crowley, Reno, *Nominated by Regent Geddes.*

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the nomination of Dr. Joseph N. Crowley for Distinguished Nevadan. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

- Mr. Michael Gaughan, Las Vegas, *Nominated by Regent Alden.*

Regent Knecht moved approval of the nomination of Mr. Michael Gaughan for Distinguished Nevadan. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

- Mr. Lynn C. Hettrick, Gardnerville, *Nominated by Regent Knecht.*

Regent Geddes moved approval of the nomination of Mr. Lynn C. Hettrick for Distinguished Nevadan. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

- Mrs. Cathy Ray, Las Vegas, *Nominated by Regent Wixom.*

Regent Alden moved approval of the nomination of Mrs. Cathy Ray for Distinguished Nevadan. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

- Mr. Edward Dewayne Smith, Las Vegas, *Nominated by Regent Schofield.*

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the nomination of Mr. Edward Dewayne Smith for Distinguished Nevadan. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

19. Approved-Regents' Awards – (Cont'd.)

- Mr. Bruce L. Woodbury, Las Vegas, *Nominated by Regent Dondero.*

Chair Wixom observed that Mr. Bruce L. Woodbury is currently serving as an elected public official. Pursuant to the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual (Chapter 8, Section 1)*, the Board waived its limitation of bestowing the award of Distinguished Nevadan upon a current elected public official.

Regent Alden moved approval of waiving the Board limitation. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Geddes and Leavitt voted no. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

Regent Sisolak disclosed that Mr. Woodbury is the partner of Regents Sisolak's lawyer, adding that he did not feel it would impact his vote.

Regent Geddes explained he would be voting no because he was opposed to waiving Board policy, but had nothing against Mr. Woodbury personally.

Chancellor Rogers expressed his support for the nomination.

Regent Leavitt expressed his support for Regent Geddes' reasoning for not waiving Board policy.

Regent Schofield disclosed that Mr. Woodbury had married into his family and testified to the caliber of Mr. Woodbury's integrity.

Regent Alden related that Mr. Woodbury is a very responsive county commissioner.

Regent Sisolak requested clarification from Regents Geddes and Leavitt regarding their opposition to waiving Board policy. Regents Geddes and Leavitt clarified they had no objections to Mr. Woodbury and held him in high regard. However, in general, they were opposed to suspending the policy for sitting politicians.

Regent Crear concurred with Regents Geddes and Leavitt, recalling past examples when schools have been named for elected officials only to be followed by a negative occurrence. He said it was no reflection of Commissioner Woodbury, but it was difficult for him to move forward with this nomination.

Regent Knecht said he considered the waiver thoughtfully and exercised discretion in judgment. He respected and understood those Regents who felt the policy should not be waived. Regent Knecht said he knew Mr. Woodbury's reputation sufficiently to make an exception.

19. Approved-Regents' Awards – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the nomination of Mr. Bruce L. Woodbury for Distinguished Nevadan. Regent Gallagher seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Geddes, Leavitt and Crear abstained. Regents Knecht, Rosenberg, Schofield, Sisolak, Wixom, Alden, Dondero and Gallagher voted yes. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

B. Regents' Scholars – Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15 (Ref. N on file in the Board office):

- Ms. Aurora Guzman-Luna, CSN.
- Mr. Jim Flanders, GBC.
- Ms. Christine Pesqueira, NSC.
- Ms. Windi Goodman, TMCC.
- Ms. Emily Powers, UNLV Undergraduate.
- Ms. Lorraine Benuto, UNLV Graduate.
- Ms. Jessica Ford, UNR Undergraduate.
- Ms. Rashi Tiwari, UNR Graduate.
- Ms. Nichole Peterson, WNC.

Regent Sisolak explained he would abstain from voting because he opposed issuing a monetary award at this time.

Regent Crear moved approval of the 2008 Regents' Scholar nominations as presented. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Sisolak abstained. Regents Anthony and Whipple were absent.

Chair Wixom stated that nominations for Honorary Degrees were normally considered at this meeting. However, to accommodate the campuses, Honorary Degrees will be considered at the April 2008 meeting.

20. Information Only-Update on Native American Students - In response to a request by the Board, Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols reviewed data on capture, retention and graduation rates of Native American students. In light of this data, campus representatives discussed the factors that contribute to student success for Native American students and potential initiatives planned for the future (Ref. O on file in the Board office).

Vice Chancellor Nichols introduced Dr. Rebecca Mills, Vice President of Student Services, UNLV. She noted that Dr. Mills will be stepping down from her position at the end of this academic year and will be missed very much.

Dr. Mills reported that on every campus, there are a number of activities to enhance access for and retention of Native American students including: support services, financial aid, assistance with transition, TRIO program, student organizations, and faculty, staff and community member outreach programs. In regards to access, the Native American population has experienced tremendous growth in the last 100 years and

20. Information Only-Update on Native American Students – (Cont'd.)

1/3 of that population is currently under the age of 18. The majority of their population live on reservations, which are rural and more geographically isolated. Between 1996 and 2002, their college enrollment doubled but they continue to have the lowest educational attainment rates than any other racial/ethnic population. Approximately 28% have not graduated high school, compared to the national average of 15%. Approximately 42% pursue any form of higher education, of which 13% attain a bachelor's degree compared to the national average of 28%. The characteristics of this population may require alternative planning when compared to other student populations.

Native American students tend to be older (*35 years or older*), which puts them at higher risk of not completing their degree. Students that do make it to the tribal colleges, still have family incomes that are 27% below the national poverty threshold. More than 1/2 of Native American students are enrolled in two-year institutions. Because they are older, they need more support for factors such as child-care, flexibility in scheduling and access to public transportation.

It is important that NSHE institutions consider establishing transfer articulation agreements and focus recruitment programs with the tribal colleges and universities and establishing transition programs of support as Native American students move from community colleges to universities and/or state colleges. Native American students should participate and be well represented in early intervention programs such as Head Start, Gear Up and TRIO and Upward Bound. Outreach programs to local Native American students in K-12 and the broader Native American community needs to be improved to encourage these students to attend school. It is also important to improve need-based financial aid for these students and to help them find other community support programs that are already effective.

Within NSHE, there are a variety of partnerships with state and local organizations as well as wonderful faculty and student groups working to create scholarships to enhance Native American access. In northern Nevada, the American Indian Higher Education Collaborative is working across institutions to increase enrollment and retention. They have broadened their effectiveness by connecting with entities such as the Nevada Indian Commission, Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, the Washoe Tribe and all four northern NSHE institutions. UNLV and CSN have agreed to create a similar program in southern Nevada. UNR created a position for a Native American Outreach and Retention Coordinator in their Center for Student Cultural Diversity. That position is co-funded with the tribes in northern Nevada and is experiencing success. Southern institutions will also be looking at that approach. UNLV has plans to work on a multi-cultural center to bridge diversity, student affairs and academic affairs and services and to look at areas of service for underrepresented students.

At each of the NSHE institutions, there are a small number of Native American faculty and staff and each one gives tremendously of their time and fiscal resources to support the Native American students on their campus. They provide a very important formal and informal mentorship that makes a difference to the students. It is important that the System make additional efforts to ensure that Native American students are connected to existing programs and make special efforts to remove the barriers because in many ways they are different than other underrepresented populations.

20. Information Only-Update on Native American Students – (Cont'd.)

Regent Dondero noted that Native Americans may be interested in seeking hospitality classes as they are becoming more and more involved in gaming and hospitality. Dr. Mills agreed that was a great employment opportunity and efforts in that area need to be increased.

Regent Gallagher indicated that in her personal experience, she noticed that there is an issue with other members of the Native American community that have not succeeded in higher education in accepting and supporting individuals that have been successful in higher education. She was unsure how that could be overcome. Dr. Mills agreed that was one of the most painful aspects for those that are working with these students. This is an issue that is shared by many first-generation students.

President Killpatrick related that GBC has established an outreach center that includes Native Americans in Elko's Cowboy Poetry events. This allows an opportunity to display and sell Native American crafts during the event. He has seen the same situation as that related by Regent Gallagher on their campus. In response, GBC has organized study halls for American Indian students to develop a cohort to help support each other and to help the campus keep a finger on the pulse of what is going on in their lives. He meets with them once a month himself. Their culture tends not to communicate with their instructors when there are problems at home, rather they tend to just disappear. They also have a Native American archive to capture and preserve their oral histories.

Chair Wixom asked that the College of Hotel Management explore ways to reach out and develop relationships with tribes across the country. He suggested that they explore relationships with successful Native Americans such as the former Governor of Idaho.

President Glick said the suggestions focus on the cultural issues which make it especially difficult for Native American students to graduate. In his experience two things that have made a difference were: 1) financial aid and 2) visiting the reservations to develop relationships with the tribes, families and institutions to determine what is necessary to help the students to be successful.

Regent Gallagher related that at one time the leader of the Navajo Nation wanted the Board to categorize Navajo Indians as resident students. At the time, some members of the Board were concerned that would create a large influx of students. She did not feel that would happen and questioned how many Navajo students the System has ever had.

Regent Rosenberg related that there is a need to educate faculty and staff to be sensitive to the cultural differences.

Chair Wixom asked that UNR and UNLV provide the requested information to Vice Chancellor Nichols for discussion at a future meeting. He does not want this issue to fall by the wayside as this is a service area that is not being adequately reached.

The meeting recessed at 10:20 a.m. and reconvened at 10:29 a.m. with all members present except Regents Alden, Anthony and Whipple.

21. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 25) – Chair Thalia M. Dondero reported the Investment Committee met December 7, 2007, and February 1, 2008. At the Committee’s December 7th meeting, the Committee considered a request from President Glick to approve a lease agreement between the NSHE Board of Regents and the Davidson Academy of Nevada. At the Committee’s February 1st meeting, Cambridge Associates presented a preliminary report on investment returns for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds for the quarter ending December 31, 2008. UNHSS Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer Marcia Turner presented an update regarding the development of an ENA between the NSHE and the city of Las Vegas with regard to Union Park, Parcel 2A (*Committee report on file in the Board office*).

Regent Dondero requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 27, and December 7, 2007, Committee meetings (*Ref. INV-1a; Ref. INV-1b on file in the Board office*).
- Asset Allocation and Investment Returns – The Committee recommended approval of the recommendation by Cambridge to rebalance the asset allocation of the operating pool by a \$30 million reduction in the cash account and an additional allocation to the following investment vehicles:
 - ✓ \$6.3 million to Vanguard 500 – U.S. Equity.
 - ✓ \$2.4 million to Vanguard Pacific – Global ex-U.S. Equity.
 - ✓ \$13 million to Fund of Funds Absolute Return Funds.
 - ✓ \$3.9 million to PIMCO Total Return – Long term bonds.
 - ✓ \$4.3 million to Common Fund Real Return – TIPS (*Treasury Inflation Protective Securities*).
- NSHE Endowment Fund – The Committee recommended approval of an additional 1½% management fee on endowed funds calculated in the same manner as the 4½% spending authority. The Committee approved for UNR and UNLV to charge their own endowed accounts by the 1½% management fee for foundation development support, subject to the agreement policy between NSHE and the institutions/foundations that will be brought forward at a later date (*Ref. INV-3 on file in the Board office*).
- Villa Ristorante Lease Agreement, UNR – The Committee recommended approval of the lease agreement with Villa Ristorante to operate a retail food operation in the Joe Crowley Student Union (*Ref. INV-4 on file in the Board office*).
- Desert Lane Purchase Agreement, UNLV – The Committee recommended approval of the purchase of a .17 acre parcel of land located at 930 Desert Lane, Las Vegas, to accommodate future growth at UNLV’s Shadow Lane Campus that will include development activities for the University of Nevada Health Sciences System (*UNHSS*) (*Ref. INV-5 on file in the Board office*).
- City of Las Vegas Development Agreement, CSN – The Committee recommended approval of a development agreement and design standards with the city of Las Vegas providing a location adjacent to Durango and Elkhorn for development of the Northwest Campus (*Ref. INV-6 on file in the Board office*).
- S Bar S Irrigation System Repairs, UNR – The Committee recommended approval of the use of partial proceeds from the Mill & McCarran land sale for S Bar S irrigation system repairs (*Ref. INV-8 on file in the Board office*).

21. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 25) – (Cont'd.)

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

Regent Sisolak urged that steps be taken to ensure the other System institutions share in the cost of developing UNHSS cooperatives. Executive Vice Chancellor Trevisan indicated those conversations were beginning to occur so that resources, costs and governance would be shared by all of the institutions involved.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that UNLV Vice President Bomotti would monitor the situation.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony and Whipple were absent.

22. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 21) - Chair Ron Knecht reported the Audit Committee met February 7, 2008, and received follow-up responses for eleven internal audit reports that were presented to the Committee at the June and August 2007 meetings. The Committee received reports from the UNLV Alumni Association and UNLV Football Foundation regarding their plans for an external audit for the year ending June 30, 2008. Chief Counsel Bart Patterson and Assistant Vice Chancellor Sandi Cardinal researched Nevada Revised Statutes, Board of Regents policies on foundation financial reporting and other accounting standards and reported on foundation audit options. The Committee directed Chief Counsel Patterson and Assistant Vice Chancellor Cardinal to report options and criteria for foundation audit waivers at the next meeting (*Committee report on file in the Board office*).

Regent Knecht requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 29, 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*):
 - ✓ School of Dental Medicine, UNLV (*Ref. A-2 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Security Administration, NSC (*Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office*).
- Audit Exception Report – The Committee recommended approval of the Audit Exception Report for the six months ending December 31, 2007 (*Ref. A-15 on file in the Board office*).
- Foundation Audit Requirements – The Committee recommended approval of recommendations concerning external audit requirements for the various NSHE foundations.
- External Audit Contract – The Committee recommended approval of the third contract amendment for external auditors Moss Adams regarding the upcoming changes in audit standards.

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

23. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 22) - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Budget & Finance Committee met February 7, 2008, and heard the following reports (*Committee report on file in the Board office*):

- Calendar year 2007 self-supporting summer school and calendar year budgets, budget-to-actual comparisons, for each NSHE university and college.
- NSHE student enrollment plans were reviewed in anticipation of future 2009-11 operating and capital budget deliberations of the Committee.
- The 2009-11 biennial budget building process and timeline for Board of Regents' action, including possible budgetary enhancement requests for the System and institutions, was discussed (*Ref. BF-7 on file in the Board office*).
- The Committee deferred action on a proposed *Handbook* revision (*Title 4, Chapter 17, Sections 18 and 19*), concerning student fees and special course fees to the next meeting (*Ref. BF-4 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 29, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. BF-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Mid-Year Fiscal Year 2007-08 Self-Supporting Budgets & 2008 Summer School/Calendar Year Budgets – The Committee recommended approval of the NSHE mid-year self-supporting budgets for fiscal year 2007-08 and the self-supporting budgets and the summer school and calendar year self-supporting budgets for calendar year 2008 (*Ref. BF-2 on file in the Board office*).

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

24. Approved-Cultural Diversity & Security Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 23) – Board Vice Chair Howard Rosenberg reported the Cultural Diversity & Security Committee met February 7, 2008. Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presented the *2006-07 NSHE Diversity Report*, which highlights diversity-related data and trends of faculty, staff and students. The Committee discussed ways through which System efforts can positively impact and improve diversity, including the possible creation of a task force to explore, identify and recommend best practices for improvement. The Committee also received a report from Mr. Larry James, Chief of Police, University of Central Arkansas, regarding the recently completed external evaluation of TMCC's police department. Board policy provides that an external review occur at least every five years to assure effective and appropriate operations. Community college Presidents presented their institutional plans to improve campus safety. Institutional plans incorporated the recommendations of the September 2007 report by the National Association of Attorneys General Task Force on School and Campus Safety as suggested by Nevada Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto. Each campus has paid close attention to both general safety and crisis situations nationally to monitor and utilize best practices. (*Committee report on file in the Board office*).

Regent Rosenberg requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 29, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. CDS-1 on file in the Board office*).

24. Approved-Cultural Diversity & Security Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 23) – (Cont’d.)

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

25. Approved-Student & Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 24) – Chair Jack Lund Schofield reported the Student & Academic Affairs Committee met February 7, 2008, and discussed the 2006-07 NSHE Financial Aid Report, which highlights aspects of student financial aid programs across the System. Total financial aid awarded was \$292.4 million, including \$58.2 million in grants, \$11.3 million in grants-in-aid, \$51.5 million in scholarships, \$135.2 million in loans and \$36.2 million in on-campus student employment. The Committee discussed Nevada’s inability to provide sufficient need-based financial aid and considered various methods to increase need-based aid, including informing the Legislature of NSHE’s unmet need of \$92.2 million. (Committee report on file in the Board office).

Regent Schofield requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 29, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. SAA-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Academic Master Plan, CSN – The Committee recommended approval of CSN’s Academic Master Plan (*SAA-4 on file in the Board office*).
- Handbook Revision, Teacher Training Programs – The Committee recommended approval of a revision to Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 13*) to allow NSHE institutions to offer professional development K-12 teacher education programs funded by federal, state and school district entities at a reduced per-credit fee if an agreement is in place (*Ref. SAA-5 on file in the Board office*).
- Regents’ Awards – The Committee recommended approval of the following individuals nominated for the 2008 Regents’ awards with an additional recommendation that the Board consider suspending the \$5,000 stipend that accompanies the award for the 2008 award cycle (*Ref. SAA-3 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Nevada Regents’ Academic Advisor Award
 - Dr. N.J. Pettit, CSN (*Community College Award*)
 - Ms. Lorena Beck, UNR (*Undergraduate Award*)
 - Dr. Richard Tracy, UNR (*Graduate Award*)
 - ✓ Nevada Regents’ Creative Activity Award
 - Mr. Thomas Warrington, UNLV
 - ✓ Nevada Regents’ Teaching Award
 - Ms. Gail Ferrell, TMCC (*Community College Faculty*)
 - Dr. John Farley, UNLV (*University, State College & DRI Faculty*)

Regent Schofield moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report with a condition for the Board to consider the suspension of the monetary award for the Regents’ Awards separately. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony and Whipple were absent.

25. Approved-Student & Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations (Agenda Item 24) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak objected to awarding the financial stipend during the current difficult economic conditions. He expressed a great deal of respect for the faculty and staff receiving these awards, but felt the cash portion should be suspended temporarily until such time that resources were not so tightly constricted. He felt the System could not afford the \$30,000 expenditure and recommended that plaques or certificates be issued.

Regent Knecht expressed his support for the monetary award, noting that it was a relatively small percentage of the overall System budget shortfall and that withholding the award would not make a significant difference.

Regent Geddes asked which account would be used and whether the funds were available. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the awards are split amongst all the campuses. The cost to UNR, UNLV, NSC and DRI is \$5,000 each, while the cost to each community college is \$1,875. The Board contributes a portion of the community college Advisor awards in the amount of \$625. It is a relatively small contribution per campus. She suggested the Board check with the institution Presidents to see if the monetary awards would now be problematic.

Chair Wixom suggested transferring the unused portions of the Regents' host accounts. Regent Rosenberg agreed. Regent Sisolak said he would rather transfer his to student fees. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that those are discretionary funds which can be allocated for whatever purpose the Board or individual Regent desires. However, because this is an end of the fiscal year expense, it would be a retroactive action. Vice Chancellor Nichols established that the awards are bestowed at the institutions' commencement ceremonies. The System would need to reimburse the campuses on a pro-rated basis. Chair Wixom advised the Board that the conversation had strayed from the agenda topic. He related that Regents can allocate their unused host accounts for whatever purpose they choose.

Regent Sisolak expressed his admiration for the award recipients but felt the monetary stipends totaled a significant amount of money. He acknowledged that this action would not solve the Systems' problem, but would show that the students and public are not alone.

Regent Rosenberg felt it was a mistake not to recognize those faculty that go above and beyond, noting that the faculty had already sacrificed half of their merit increases.

Ms. Judy Stewart, Faculty Senate Chair-CSN, stated on behalf of the Faculty Senate Chairs, that since the awards had been made without any indication of withholding the monetary stipend, that the stipend be withheld from future awards and not those bestowed this year. She noted that these awards are given in recognition of excellence.

Chair Wixom requested assistance in crafting the motion to properly reflect the Board's discussion. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that since the Committee made no specific recommendation regarding the stipend, the Board could vote upon a motion to suspend awarding the monetary stipends. Should the motion to suspend fail, Board policy for awarding the stipends would prevail.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of suspending the monetary stipend. Motion failed for lack of second.

26. Approved-Research & Economic Development Committee Recommendations - Chair Jason Geddes reported the Research & Economic Development Committee met January 31, 2008. Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich provided the Committee with an update of the Walker Basin Project. A major focus of the project is increasing communication between researchers and stakeholders, specifically to better inform stakeholders of all research projects and how the sum of the research is impacting the project as a whole. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich will bring back to the Committee a summary representation of stakeholder concerns regarding the project's impact on the Walker Basin, a financial accounting of the congressional appropriation and when ready, a communications pamphlet for the public.

Dr. Mark Brenner, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School-UNR, presented a report of the Association of American Universities (AAU) on faculty conflict of interest. The report put forth a commonly accepted definition of conflict of interest and provided best practices for minimizing potential conflicts. Best practices included utilizing internal committees; educating faculty and administration; using simple disclosure forms; disclosure of all equity interests; and disclosure of interests in publications, presentations and proposals. Following Dr. Brenner's presentation, representatives from UNR, UNLV and DRI presented overviews of institutional policies related to conflict of interest. Each of the three research institutions has its own policies and practices for handling real or perceived conflicts of interest. Each addresses the concerns and recommendations of the AAU report. All three institutions now require annual conflict of interest disclosure and additional disclosure when a new situation arises.

Regent Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 26, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. RED-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Nevada Regents' Researcher Award – The Committee recommended approval of Dr. Thomas Cargill, Professor of Economics-UNR, as the recipient of the 2008 Nevada Regents' Researcher Award (*Ref. RED-2 on file in the Board office*).

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

Chair Wixom requested a report to the full Board regarding the significant research conducted on the Walker River project. Regent Knecht related that he had also requested such a report at the next committee meeting.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich said a broader spectrum of reporting would be provided at the next Committee meeting, noting it was a sensitive issue with differing opinions.

Regent Gallagher agreed that it was important for the full Board to know more about this project.

Regent Geddes noted that while the Board was leading the research portion, the project also encompasses heated debate regarding the water acquisition issue.

26. Approved-Research & Economic Development Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak stated he could not support the motion due to the monetary stipend provided for the Researcher award.

Regent Gallagher said there were some misconceptions about the role the System is taking on this project.

Regent Knecht noted that the Researcher award was less than 1/100 of 1% of the total System budget and somewhat non-material in nature.

Motion carried. Regent Sisolak voted no. Regents Alden, Anthony and Whipple were absent.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

27. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations - Chair James Dean Leavitt reported the Board Development Committee met January 31, 2008. The Committee (Committee report on file in the Board office):

- Reviewed and discussed the conflict of interest policies and the relevant Nevada Revised Statutes. It was expressed that a full review of these policies would be beneficial at the full Board meeting in April or June.
- Chief Counsel Patterson related that a conflict of interest disclosure form and policy are being considered by the Research & Economic Development Committee for System Administration staff.
- Discussed various options, other than the Distinguished Nevadan award, that are available to the Regents to bestow recognition and honor upon deserving members of the community. While the Board on occasion considers for approval official resolutions of the Board to recognize certain accomplishments, the Committee focused on alternatives to allow individual Regents to recognize contributions of constituents to the State of Nevada and System of Higher Education. The most viable option available to Regents was determined to be a Regent's certificate of appreciation or proclamation that could be initiated by an individual Regent without necessitating approval by the full Board. The certificate could be placed in a jacket for the cost of \$3.00, framed at a cost of \$20.00 or placed on a plaque for the cost of \$40.00. The cost of the recognition will be charged to the initiating Regent's host account.
- Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents Wasserman presented the current Board orientation practices for the Committee's review and discussion. Ideas for future implementation included:
 - ✓ Newly elected Regents will be contacted to schedule a personal visit with Mr. Wasserman for an initial introduction to NSHE.
 - ✓ The Board of Regents' *Handbook* and *Orientation Manual* will be provided immediately to the newly elected Regents for the purpose of advanced reading.
 - ✓ The Board office will contact the local officials in each district to perform the oath of office on the first Tuesday following the first Monday of January. A ceremonial swearing in will also be held at the January or February Board meeting.

Regents Whipple and Crear entered the meeting.

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

- ✓ Expansion of the Board Orientation beyond one meeting, including the expansion of the discussion of conflict of interest rules and other ethical considerations.
- ✓ A separate orientation will be scheduled with the Vice Chancellor of Finance regarding the budget and formula funding issues.
- ✓ A three-to-four day group orientation will be scheduled to allow the newly elected Regents to visit each institution and meet with its President and its faculty senate, student government and foundation leadership.
- ✓ Consideration is being made to pair a newly elected Regent with a veteran member of the Board for the purpose of an informal mentorship program.

Regent Leavitt requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 3, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. BD-1 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Leavitt moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Knecht observed that Regents could also personally pay for the suggested recognitions.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent

28. Approved-Health Sciences System Committee Recommendations - Chair Dorothy S. Gallagher reported the Health Sciences System Committee met October 25, 2007, and covered the following items (*Committee report on file in the Board office*):

- Introductory remarks by the Committee Chairperson.
- Introduction of the new Executive Vice Chancellor for the University of Nevada Health Sciences System (*UNHSS*).
- Discussion regarding the role and mission of the Committee, the Board's Bylaws governing the Committee and other related administrative issues concerning the operations of the Committee. The Committee asked to continue this discussion in greater detail during the next Committee meeting. The Committee also requested clarity on the role of the Executive Vice Chancellor.
- Update on recent activities to develop a baseline inventory and assessment of the nature and scope of existing health science programs throughout the eight NSHE institutions. The Committee requested additional details be provided at the next Committee meeting.
- Discussion regarding the development of logo designs for the UNHSS. Committee members requested that additional discussion occur regarding the concepts for logo design and the formal name of the UNHSS at the next meeting.
- Update on the status of the development of capital improvements projects for the UNHSS, including an update on legislative support, fundraising efforts, architectural design progress and interaction with the city of Las Vegas.
- Update on the activities of the UNHSS Foundation, including fundraising efforts and administrative issues.

28. Approved-Health Sciences System Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

The Health Sciences System Committee met January 30, 2008, and covered the following items:

- The Committee discussed the role and mission of the Committee and decided to defer the discussion to a future date.
- The Committee heard an update from Dr. Maurizio Trevisan regarding his initial assessment of the UNHSS and the health science programs throughout the NSHE institutions and opportunities for enhanced partnerships with internal and external stakeholders.
- Ms. Marcia Turner provided an update on the status of the development of capital improvement projects for the UNHSS and the impact of recent budget cuts and deferrals on these projects; discussions with the city of Las Vegas regarding the potential development of a building at Union Park; and discussions with the Lou Ruvo Brain Institute regarding transfer of their building to the System. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the Board to seek the Interim Finance Committee's (IFC) approval for a change in scope of the three UNHSS CIP projects on the Reno campus.
- Chair Gallagher and Dr. Maurizio Trevisan announced a gift of \$500,000 from the Bruce Layne family. Mr. Brian Campbell provided an update on the UNHSS Foundation activities.

Regent Gallagher requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 25, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. HSS-1 on file in the Board office*), which included the Committee's request for approval of the minutes from the March 22, 2007, Committee meeting.
- UNHSS Facilities Planning – The Committee recommended approval to seek IFC approval for a change in scope of the UNHSS CIP projects on the Reno campus (*Ref. HSS-5 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Sisolak commended Mr. Bruce Layne and the HSS staff on the recent gift. Dr. Trevisan indicated this was the beginning of future success, adding that Mr. Brian Campbell was also instrumental in securing the donation.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

Regent Gallagher stated that the success of the HSS rests upon the cooperation of the eight institutions and requires a buy-in from the Regents, Presidents and everyone concerned with health science education. She cautioned that internal negativity will not help. She was pleased with Dr. Trevisan's enthusiasm, feeling they were off to a good start. She emphasized that everyone needs to believe in the project.

29. Approved-Technology Committee Recommendations - Chair Bret Whipple reported the Technology Committee met January 29, 2008, and heard discussion on the following matters (*Committee report on file in the Board office*):
- A discussion was held among Committee members and staff to update all on the status and to discuss the potential future direction of the iNtegrate project. Discussions included updates and potential future directions of: 1) the work of the student services group; 2) vendor negotiations; 3) the search for a project director; 4) financial modeling, including a discussion of the C+ implementation scenario and pilot campuses; 5) campus readiness assessments; and other matters concerning recent work on the project.
 - To avoid any confusion, Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klaich stated that, even with the reversion of \$10 million appropriated by the Legislature, the iNtegrate project is proceeding forward. Over the next 18 months, the System needs to move aggressively on implementation of the project in order to present the strongest case for appropriation to the next session of the Legislature.
 - Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich announced to the Committee that after reviewing the finalist candidates for the position of iNtegrate Project Executive Director he determined to conclude the search without a hire. He indicated that he did not find the leadership within the finalists to take this project forward. He reiterated that the leadership the project director will provide is more important than ever to lead this project once a vendor is selected. In aiding the search, discussion included increasing the salary to \$175,000 per year, soliciting the aid of a professional recruiting agency and utilizing internal as well as personal contacts.
 - Chief Counsel Patterson stated that vendor contracts are being structured so that NSHE funds will be sufficient to provide funding for the current biennium based on the pilot campus model. Chief Counsel Patterson stated that much progress has been made in the negotiations. However, he expressed concern that the “price hold” agreements with the vendors will expire on March 31, 2008. He recommended to the Committee a contract negotiation cut off date of February 26, 2008.
 - Consultant Charlie Moran stated that during negotiations the vendors have affirmed that the C+ implementation model of two pilot campuses will reduce the overall cost of the project. Regent Crear queried whether the pilot campuses have been identified. Mr. Moran stated that UNLV and TMCC are candidates with campus teams working closely together. The pilot campuses would be completed with 18-24 months; and 3-6 months before the pilot campuses are completed, the second wave implementation of the remaining campuses would commence.
 - With respect to a readiness assessment, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that while the pilot campuses are being brought online, a lot of work needs to be undertaken by the non-pilot institutions in cleaning data, finalizing common data definitions and conducting general readiness assessments of their personnel and other systems to implement the new iNtegrate system.
 - Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols updated the Committee on the superb job the Student Services Module group has done in paring down to the bare essentials the functions needed in the vendors’ software so as to keep costs low and still get the best product. One recommendation made was to potentially transition away from using DARS, depending on the vendor chosen.

29. Approved-Technology Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

- Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich declared that staff will present an analysis of all components of the iNtegrate project: software, hardware, contracts, etc., in a complete package for Committee review first and finally to the Board of Regents. Staff close to the project will be available to the Regents for questioning and vendors will be able to address the Board in an open, fair and deliberative process.

Regent Whipple requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the November 20, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. TC-1 on file in the Board office*).
- The Committee recommended approval of allowing staff two weeks to explore other options for finding a candidate for the project director position and, if a hire is not made within that time, reopening the search with a salary of \$175,000 and the possibility of a multi-year contract and also to explore the option of using a professional recruiter.
- The Committee recommended approval that master vendor contract negotiations be completed by February 26, 2008.

Regent Schofield left the meeting.

Regent Whipple moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Gallagher seconded.

Chief Counsel Patterson related that staff requires Board feedback for how this will transpire, noting that although it may be difficult to demonstrate the product in a meeting, the vendors will be available to provide explanation. He noted that the master contracts are not solely for the student services module, adding that in the future there was no need to renegotiate to obtain the human resources or financial modules, which would result in a cost savings. Chief Counsel Patterson said the contracts are quite complex, including thousands of pages of associated documents stipulating vendor obligations. He said that staff was attempting to negotiate the best product and price possible and recommended that an executive summary of those contracts be provided to the Board.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Chief Counsel Patterson offered to provide Board members with special briefings if they felt it was necessary, adding that he was uncomfortable with including contracts in the public record as part of the agenda packet.

Chair Wixom established that contracts would be available in Chief Counsel Patterson's office for Regents to review.

In answer to Regent Whipple's questions, Chair Wixom replied that he estimated allowing approximately three hours for contract evaluations to occur in April. Regent Leavitt was concerned that might not be sufficient, noting that the cost of a special meeting paled in comparison to making a wrong decision on this matter.

In response to Regent Gallagher's question, Chief Counsel Patterson replied there were three vendors being considered for implementation and two vendors for licensing.

29. Approved-Technology Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

Regent Whipple wondered if the vendors had been contacted regarding how much time they will require. Chief Counsel Patterson replied there was some concern by the vendors as to what is expected. He said it would be very difficult to demonstrate for the Board and that vendors would appreciate time to field questions about their product and how it will be used.

Regent Whipple suggested hearing responses from the vendors present. Chair Wixom expressed concern for having not provided public notice to the vendors appropriately. Chief Counsel Patterson suggested asking the vendors to estimate the amount of time necessary and then make a decision as to the length of the meeting.

Regent Gallagher asked whether executive summaries would be made available prior to the meeting. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that they would.

Vice Chancellor Nichols reminded the Board they would be receiving recommendations from the subcommittees formed to provide such input for the Regents. She said they would spend a great deal of time reviewing the products and providing recommendations for the Board.

Regent Whipple expressed a preference for the Regents making a determination after hearing the strengths and weaknesses of the different products, feeling that the ultimate decision should be made by the Board. He noted the Board could not do so without all of the information. He was unsure if it was appropriate for the subcommittees to recommend a particular vendor.

Chair Wixom suggested a separate conference to determine the final arrangements for presentation preferring not to do so as part of a regular Board meeting. Regent Whipple encouraged him to allow at least three hours for presentations.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

30. Approved-CSN President Search Committee Recommendations - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the ad hoc CSN President Search Committee met December 10, 2007, and heard discussion on the following matters (*Committee report on file in the Board office*):

- Search consultant Marti Cizek led a discussion on the president search process including applications, nominations and a proposed timeline for the search.
- The committees also discussed the position profile statement and position announcement and worked collaboratively to develop a final draft of both documents for consideration and approval by the Board of Regents.
- The committees reviewed a list of publications in which the position announcement will be placed.
- The committees set Thursday, April 17, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. and Thursday, April 24, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. as the next two scheduled meeting dates. Brief interviews of semi-finalist candidates will be conducted on April 17, while full interviews of finalist candidates will occur on April 24, 2008.

30. Approved-CSN President Search Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The committees recommended approval of the minutes from the October 22, 2007, Committee meeting (*Ref. CSN-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Position Announcement – The committees recommended approval of the position announcement for the President of the College of Southern Nevada.
- Position Profile - The committees recommended approval of the position profile for the CSN President.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report.
Regent Rosenberg seconded.

In response to Regent Gallagher's question, Mr. Wasserman indicated that the consultant would be bringing five candidates to be considered for the pool of finalists.

Regent Dondero asked whether candidates were aware of the System's financial condition. Regent Sisolak replied that the consultant has spoken to most of the candidates, adding that many had questioned the System's financial condition.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

28. Approved-Health Sciences System Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

Executive Vice Chancellor Trevisan acknowledged the efforts of Dr. Jim Lenhart with the UNHSS. Chair Wixom requested that letters of appreciation be addressed to the staff that worked to bring the Layne family's gift to HSS.

31. Information Only-New Business – Chair Wixom stated that any Regent with available host funds can apply them to student fees or faculty awards and encouraged them to do so. Chair Wixom expressed his appreciation to everyone for their efforts in dealing with the challenging economic circumstances.

The meeting adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

Prepared by: Fini S. Dobyms
Assistant Secretary of the Board of Regents
and
Jessica Morris
Administrative Assistant IV

Submitted for approval by: Scott G. Wasserman
Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents

Approved by the Board of Regents at the April 3-4, 2008, meeting