

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

Elizabeth Sturm Library
Truckee Meadows Community College
7000 Dandini Boulevard, Reno
Thursday-Friday, June 12-13, 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

Members Absent: Mr. Bret Whipple

Others Present: Chancellor James E. Rogers
Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich
Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, UNHSS, Maurizio Trevisan
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
Chief Counsel Bart Patterson
Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen
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 Dr. Sondra Cosgrove, CSN; Dr. Dave Decker, DRI; Ms. Cindy Hyslop, GBC; Mr. Gregory Robinson, NSC; Mr. Brian Campbell, NSHE; Dr. Nasser Daneshvary, UNLV; Dr. Bill Follette, UNR; Mr. Stephen Bale, TMCC; and Mr. Richard Stewart, WNC. Student government leaders present included Mr. David Waterhouse, ASCSN President, CSN; Mr. Eron Sanchez, SGA President, GBC; Mr. Ryan Crowell, NSSA President, NSC; Mr. Adam Cronis, CSUN President, UNLV; Ms. Jessica Lucero, GPSA President, UNLV; Mr. Eli Reilly, ASUN President, UNR; Ms. Brithany Thompson, GSA President, UNR; Ms. Katy Oliver, ASTM Board Chairperson, TMCC; and Mr. Andy Pozun, ASWN President, WNC.

Vice Chair Howard Rosenberg called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m. on Thursday, June 12, 2008, with all members present except Regents Whipple and Wixom.

Regent Sisolak led the pledge of allegiance.

Ms. Lois Kane and Ms. Janice Gardipe, representatives of the Reno Sparks Indian Colony Language/Cultural Program, offered the invocation.

1. Information Only – Introductions (Agenda Item #1) – President Ashley introduced incoming CSUN President, Mr. Adam Cronis; CSUN Student Body Vice-President, Mr. Vik Sehdev; CSUN Student Affairs Director, Mr. Jason Meyer; CSUN College of Business Senator, Mr. David Rappaport; and GPSA Treasurer, Ms. Suzanne Becker, representing Ms. Jessica Lucero, incoming GPSA President.

President Glick introduced Dr. Mark Johnson, Provost and Executive Vice President, UNR, Dr. Olie Theinhaus, Dean, University of Nevada School of Medicine, effective July 1, 2008, and Dr. William Follette, incoming UNR Faculty Senate Chair.

President Wells introduced incoming DRI Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Dave Decker.

President Richards introduced incoming ASCSN Student Body President, Mr. David Waterhouse and incoming CSN Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Sondra Cosgrove. He then announced that Dr. Darren Divine is now the Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Interim President Sanford introduced new ASTM Board Chairperson, Ms. Katy Oliver, and incoming Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Steve Bale.

President Killpatrick introduced incoming Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Cindy Hyslop.

President Maryanski introduced incoming NSSA representatives Ms. Amasala Alemu-Johnson, Ms. Krystal Martinez and Mr. Anthony Filocamo. He then introduced incoming NSC Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Gregory Robinson.

President Lucey introduced incoming WNC Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Richard Stewart, and incoming ASWN President, Mr. Andy Pozun.

Regent Crear introduced his niece Ms. Kiera Temple, a student at Florida A&M University, majoring in public relations.

2. Information Only – Chair's Report (Agenda Item #2) - As part of the Chair's report, Chair 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.

2. Information Only – Chair’s Report (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont’d.)

Interim President Sanford introduced Dr. Julie Ellsworth. Dr. Ellsworth is a tenured faculty member in the Biology Department at TMCC and the state-wide Director of the iDea Network of Biomedical Research Excellence (INBRE) Biomedical Student Pipeline program. The Biomedical Pipeline program is working to increase the number of underrepresented students pursuing biomedical careers in Nevada.

Regent Dondero asked how many staff are employed through this program. Dr. Ellsworth indicated that there are five at TMCC including herself, four at CSN including an Assistant Director and one Advisor is located in Elko.

President Wells related that Dr. Ellsworth goes far beyond her duties at TMCC to reach out to Nevada’s children.

Interim President Sanford stated that TMCC is committed to keeping this program active.

Interim President Sanford then introduced Ms. Carmen Ortiz, a current student at TMCC and Communications Director for the ASTM Student Government.

1. Information Only – Introductions (Agenda Item #1) – (Cont’d.)

Regent Rosenberg congratulated Ms. Fini Dobyns on her new role as Executive Assistant to the President of TMCC.

The meeting recessed at 9:00 a.m. and reconvened at 12:50 p.m. on Thursday, June 12, 2008, with all members present except Regent Whipple.

1. Information Only – Introductions (Agenda Item #1) – (Cont’d.)

President Killpatrick introduced incoming SGA Study Body President, Mr. Eron Sanchez and recognized outgoing Student Body President Mr. Richie LaSpade.

3. Information Only – Chancellor’s Report (Agenda Item #3) - Chancellor James E. Rogers provided an update on his positive discussions with members of the Board of Regents regarding the development of a System-wide 10 year strategic plan. He also discussed the progress of the University of Nevada Health Sciences System (UNHSS) in regards to public and private partnerships, the enthusiastic support of current and prospective donors and the outcome of the recent fundraising event held on May 24, 2008.

Chancellor Rogers related that the event sponsored by the UNHSS in honor of Mr. Andre Agassi raised \$2.1 million in table purchases and other contributions. In addition to the \$2.1 million, the Lincy Foundation announced that it would match those funds raised. Senator Harry Reed has also announced that his foundation will be contributing \$1 million, bringing the total funds raised to over \$5 million. He related that the Lincy Foundation has indicated that they were looking forward to a long and great partnership between themselves and the NSHE, specifically with the UNHSS.

3. Information Only – Chancellor’s Report (Agenda Item #3) – (Cont’d.)

Chancellor Rogers stated that, in regards to a 10-year plan, the State and the System must begin to plan further ahead than the current biennia. The potential of this System is remarkable and he remains optimistic for its future and that of the Health Sciences System.

Chair Wixom complimented the Chancellor and the UNHSS staff for the success of the Agassi event.

Regent Crear related that the event in honor of Andre Agassi far exceeded his expectations and thanked the Chancellor and the UNHSS staff for their efforts in coordinating that event.

4. Approved – Election of Officers (Agenda Item #32) - In accordance with Regents’ Bylaws (Article IV, Section 2), an election of officers was held for FY 2008-09. The officers elected will serve from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

Chair Wixom stated that nominations for the Chair will be requested, followed by a roll call vote. If one nominee receives 7 or more votes, he or she will be elected Chair. The same process will be followed for the election of Vice Chair.

A. Chair – Regent Alden nominated Regent Wixom.

Regent Alden moved approval of the nomination of Regent Wixom as Chair for an additional term. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Knecht moved approval of unanimous consent. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

B. Vice Chair – Regent Knecht nominated Regent Rosenberg.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the nomination of Regent Rosenberg as Vice Chair for an additional term. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Alden moved approval of unanimous consent. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

5. Information Only – Public Comment (Agenda Item #4) – Ms. Terri Patraw, former Head Soccer Coach, UNR, stated that she was there to speak as a concerned citizen. She indicated that she e-mailed the members of the Board of Regents on October 18, 2007, and again on March 13, 2008, without response, to request their assistance with harassment at her home. She presented an envelope stating that it contained 64 examples of materials reflecting how Police Department personnel have used e-mail to circulate questionable material. She stated that the circulation of pornographic material on State time and with State owned equipment for personal interest is a clear violation of the Nevada State Ethics law. She indicated that a complete set of the exhibits had previously been presented to UNR attorneys in December 2007, again on May 22, 2008, and again last week. She felt the inactivity of the UNR attorneys makes them accessories to this. She urged the Board of Regents to request an audit of all e-mail transactions between the Police Department personnel and recommended the hiring of an independent outside information technology expert to secure any additional evidence. She stated that the failure of the UNR attorneys to report this evidence is a violation of public trust. Ms. Patraw also requested that the ban preventing her from being on campus be lifted, adding that she will be back at the campus either by the Regents authority or through a very expensive judicial process.

Chair Wixom asked Chief Counsel Patterson for guidance in light of related on-going litigation. Chief Counsel Patterson stated that he could not advise Ms. Patraw regarding the disclosure of information. However, the Board could receive whatever information is being provided during public comment without damaging the litigation.

Regent Leavitt asked Ms. Patraw if she was currently represented by legal counsel. Ms. Patraw stated that she was. Regent Leavitt then recommended that upon the Board's receipt of the information presented by Ms. Patraw, that copies be made and presented to her legal counsel. The Chair indicated Ms. Patraw could provide the materials to the Chair for handling.

Mr. Richie LaSpade, former Student Body President, GBC, stated that Dr. Killpatrick will be greatly missed, adding that he has kept an open door policy and his leadership and guidance have been exceptional.

6. Information Only – Farewell to Outgoing President (Agenda Item #19) - On behalf of the Board, Chair Michael B. Wixom and Vice Chair Howard Rosenberg presented outgoing GBC President Paul Killpatrick with a Certificate of Recognition and expressed the Board's gratitude for his service to the Nevada System of Higher Education.

President Killpatrick stated that it had been a pleasure to serve as the President of Great Basin College for the last six years.

7. Approved – Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – The Board approved the Consent Agenda, with the exceptions of item nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8, 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 April 3-4, 2008, the special Board of Regents’ meeting held May 1, 2008, a correction of a typographical error on page 223 of the minutes from the October 11-12, 2007, Board of Regents’ meeting, the TMCC President Search Committee meetings held February 22, 2008, February 28, 2008, and February 29, 2008, and the CSN President Search Committee meeting held December 10, 2007 (*Ref. C-1a, Ref. C-1b, Ref. C-1c, Ref. C-1d, Ref. C-1e, Ref. C-1f and Ref. C-1g on file in the Board office*).
- (2) Approved - Evaluation, Chancellor James E. Rogers – The Board approved Chair Wixom’s and Vice Chair Rosenberg’s request to indefinitely postpone the annual evaluation of the Chancellor.
- (3) Approved – Extension of Leave of Absence without Pay, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for a second year of Leave of Absence without Pay for Dr. Steven J. de Belle, National Science Foundation Directorship (*Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office*).
- (4) Approved – Appointment of Dr. Maurizio Trevisan to the Nevada Academy of Health – The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Maurizio Trevisan as the Board’s representative to the Nevada Academy of Health. Created by the 2007 Legislature, the Nevada Academy of Health reviews the overall state of medical care in Nevada and makes recommendations for improvement to the legislature (*Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office*).
- (9) Approved - Handbook Revision, Reorganization References, DRI – The Board approved DRI President Stephen G. Wells request for editorial changes to the *Handbook (Title 2, Chapters 6 and 8, Sections 6.16 and 8.5; Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 1; and Title 5, Chapter 2, Section 2.2)*, related to the reorganization references to two DRI governing documents. Final action is requested on this second reading of a Code change (*Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office*).
- (10) Approved - Handbook Revision, Bylaws Faculty Organization, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for a revision to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Bylaws (*Title 5, Chapter 6, Chapter 1, Sections 4.4.2 & 4.7*) requiring formation of a college bylaw committee for the review of unit bylaws (*Ref. C-10 on file in the Board office*).
- (11) Approved - Handbook Revision, Bylaws Annual Evaluation of Academic Faculty and Non-Academic Faculty, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for a revision to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Bylaws (*Title 5, Chapter 6, Chapter III, Section 8.3*) to encourage the incorporation of the sense of tenured faculty of the progress towards tenure of tenure-track faculty (*Ref. C-11 on file in the Board office*).

7. Approved – Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont'd.)
- (12) Approved - Handbook Revision, Bylaws Promotion or Appointment to Academic Rank for Academic Faculty, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request for a revision to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Bylaws (*Title 5, Chapter 6, Chapter III, Sections 16.4 & 16.5*) to provide guidelines for the use of external referee letters during promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty and promotion for tenured faculty (*Ref. C-12 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with exceptions of item nos. 5 (*Gift-John L. Harvey Baseball Field, WNC*), 6 (*Gift-Land for the Douglas Campus, WNC*), 7 (*New Endowment, TMCC*) and 8 (*New Endowment, UNR*). Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS APPROVED SEPARATELY:

7. Approved – Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont'd.)
- (5) Approved – Gift – John L. Harvey Baseball Field, WNC – The Board approved WNC President Carol A. Lucey's request to accept the gift of the John L. Harvey Baseball Field by the WNC Foundation to the Board of Regents (*Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Knecht requested that this item be approved separately to properly acknowledge the Whittemore family for this gift. President Lucey expressed her gratitude to the Whittemore family for their development of the baseball field.

Regent Knecht moved approval of WNC's request to accept the gift of the John L. Harvey Baseball Field. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

- (6) Approved – Gift – Land for the Douglas Campus, WNC – The Board approved WNC President Carol A. Lucey's request to accept the gift of .7888 acres of land from the WNC Foundation for the Douglas Campus to the Board of Regents (*Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office*).
- (7) Approved – New Endowment, TMCC –The Board approved TMCC Interim President Delores A Sanford's request to accept a \$6,000.00 donation from Laurie Quintel to establish a new endowment account in memory of Barbara Quintel. The new endowment account will benefit TMCC students in Education. The donors have expressly requested for this endowment account to be invested and managed by the NSHE endowment pool (*Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office*).

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS APPROVED SEPARATELY:

7. Approved – Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont’d.)
- (8) Approved – New Endowment, UNR – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed’s requests to accept an unrestricted donation from the Lucy Nieder Trust in the amount of \$1.1 million to establish a new endowment account in memory of the donor Ms. Lucy Nieder to award scholarships to students in the Arts Department who will meet the scholarship criterion (*Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Sisolak requested that each contributor be recognized for their generosity. Mr. Wasserman stated that the Board office had extended an invitation to all contributors to attend. However, they were unable to attend, adding that a letter of the Board’s gratitude will be sent to each.

Regent Alden moved approval of consent agenda items nos. 6 (*Gift-Land for the Douglas Campus, WNC*), 7 (*New Endowment, TMCC*) and 8 (*New Endowment, UNR*). Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

8. Approved - 2009-2011 Biennial Budget Operating Request (Agenda Item #6) – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich’s request to approve the 2009-2011 budget requests for operating and one-shots for the 2009 Legislative Session. This represented the second reading of the biennial operating budget; the matter was previously heard in April 2008. The Board intends to take final action in approving the biennial operating and one-shot budget at its August 2008 meeting (*Ref. A on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the 2009-2011 Biennial Budget Operating Request. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Chair Wixom related that there is a severe budget shortfall facing the System and the State which will be discussed at length later in the meeting. At his request, the System has prepared the budget without consideration for further reductions so that there is a standard for what the System feels it needs to operate.

Chief Counsel Patterson asked for clarification for what will be requested at the August Board meeting. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the budget to be presented in August will only be a more extensive reformatting of what was presented to the Board at this meeting. Chief Counsel Patterson clarified that the motion is for approval of the tentative budget, which will be finalized at the August Board meeting.

Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

9. Approved - 2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Request (Agenda Item #7) – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich’s request for final approval of the prioritized biennial budget request for the 2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The presentation included an overview of the capital budgeting process and timelines and the establishment of System priorities. This was the second and final hearing by the full Board on the 2009 CIP. The matter was previously heard on March 26, 2008, by the Budget and Finance Committee and on May 1, 2008, by the full Board (*Ref. B on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the 2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Request. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the handout provided at this meeting reflected the minor changes made by the State Public Works Board. Chair Wixom asked if the information had already been received by the Board. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich clarified that the handout was simply a color version of information that the Board had already received and simply highlights the minor changes (*handout on file in the Board office*).

Regent Geddes stated that campus safety, infrastructure and life safety issues should be the System’s highest priority and expressed his disappointment that this is not reflected on the list of projects. He was aware that Vice Chancellor Reed and Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich have found additional funds to address some of these issues but he felt it was important for the Board to also show their support.

Regent Sisolak indicated that President Ashley brought to his attention that these are not necessarily life safety issues. President Ashley stated that many of the projects have life safety implications but are more closely related to remodeling. For example, in the case of sprinklers for UNLV’s education building, President Ashley related that the building was constructed prior to the requirement for sprinklers but they would like to bring the building up to current codes. The assessment has been that it may not necessarily be a life safety issue, but rather an improvement that would make the building safer.

Regent Sisolak related that the Investment Committee had discussed the other pool of funds and asked if the safety issues were to be addressed using those funds, would it result in a zero sum gain. Vice Chancellor Reed indicated that, to the best of their understanding, it would not result in a zero sum gain, adding that he will keep the Board apprised of any developments.

Regent Knecht stated that it was important not to fall victim to the tyranny of words, explaining that just because a label such as “health and safety” is put on an item, that label automatically elevates it to the first priority. The Board’s responsibility is in trying to balance a wide variety of factors and he was very comfortable with the list as presented.

9. Approved - 2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Request (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom asked in terms of that pool of funds being discussed in the Investment Committee, will those funds be available for the types of safety related projects that Regent Geddes expressed concern about. Vice Chancellor Reed stated that was correct, adding there is a narrow range of areas that could possibly be moved to a different consideration in order to be addressed more quickly to meet safety and ADA guidelines. He indicated that the staff will continue their discussions with the State Public Works Board and he will report back to the Board. Chair Wixom asked that Vice Chancellor Reed report back to the Investment Committee, adding that he did not want Regent Geddes' point to be overlooked.

Regent Sisolak asked President Lucey to further explain project no. 25. President Lucey explained that particular project had been one component of a larger project that has been broken down into several smaller projects.

Mr. Dan Neverett, Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services, WNC, related that all of WNC's projects are related to ADA compliance issues. For example, in one of their elevators, the buttons are at a height that cannot easily be accessed by individuals in wheelchairs. There is also a concern for the use of an unpaved hill that is currently being used as a loading dock, under which runs a gas line.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related other than a relatively modest allocation for HECC/SHECC funds, there is no means in the State of Nevada for dealing with depreciation of capital investments. This is not unique to the NSHE. However, due to the sheer size of the System's physical plant, there is no vehicle in the System's funding process for maintenance. Buildings are constructed but there is no pool from which to fund maintenance except from the HECC/SHECC funds, which are grossly inadequate. He stated that Regent Geddes brings up a legitimate point, adding that the System has typically taken the position that it is unlikely to receive a fund for depreciation out of the legislature.

Regent Sisolak asked if the situation with the gas line at WNC has been evaluated. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that WNC has been working diligently with their facilities administrator to correct these inadequacies. Regent Sisolak requested to know who determined that the gas line was acceptable.

Regent Knecht presumed that an underground natural gas pipeline would be the responsibility of Southwest Gas. He asked President Lucey if the item on the CIP budget would move the gas line or substitute the location of the loading dock. Mr. Neverett stated that one of WNC's CIP requests is to construct a loading dock that will replace the use of the current area. Regent Knecht asked how deep the current gas line was buried. Mr. Neverett estimated that it was approximately 18" but felt he was not able to answer that question with certainty.

9. Approved - 2009 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Request (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht stated that if a loading dock is built, the gas line will remain where it is and Southwest Gas will still be responsible for owning, operating and maintaining it. Mr. Neverett stated that was correct. Regent Knecht asked if WNC's use of the area above the gas line is in violation of any federal or state safety regulations. Mr. Neverett replied that he would research that answer and report back. Regent Knecht felt that even if a permanent loading dock is constructed elsewhere on the campus, the gas line will remain underground in its current location. He is not convinced just because there is an implication of a safety label that it should be reprioritized.

Regent Anthony stated that there is a difference between an immediate safety issue and something that can be planned for. He expressed his trust in the institutions to find the necessary funds to immediately resolve safety issues. He is not in a position to determine if a gas line is an immediate safety issue or to reprioritize any of the other items.

Regent Geddes agreed with Regent Anthony, adding that his general concern is that the Board does not place a high enough priority on campus retrofits for air conditioning, sprinklers and ADA compliance. The campuses may not consider it as high a priority because the Board has not communicated the need to take these items into consideration during the planning process. He wants to make sure the System is valuing the assets that it currently has as much as what it anticipates to build in the future.

Regent Dondero indicated that the Investment Committee could consider setting aside a pool of funds to be used for these types of projects.

Vice Chancellor Reed stated that at its August meeting, the Investment Committee will discuss the need to find deferred maintenance funds. There are some estimates that the deferred maintenance backlog is \$500 million. To begin to study and then seek funding requires thoughtful activity. Chair Wixom requested that Vice Chancellor Reed apply the deferred maintenance formula to determine how far below industry standards the System currently is in deferred maintenance expenditures and provide that information to the Board.

Chief Counsel Patterson requested that WNC conduct a risk assessment of the use of the area over the gas line and, if a risk is determined, that the situation be corrected. Regent Sisolak asked if a risk assessment had been done. President Lucey stated that she would consult with their safety officer and report back to the Board. Chair Wixom requested that report be in the form of a memo and directed to all of the Regents.

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

10. Information Only – Report on Potential Budget Reductions (Agenda Item #8) -The Board received an update on the current position of state revenues and the potential impact on the NSHE budget, including the potential for additional budget cuts to the 2007-2009 biennial budget and/or reductions in the current legislatively approved levels mandated for the submission of the Executive Budget for the 2009-2011 biennium. Based on the information received, discussion included strategies to be pursued in relation to such reductions. (*Ref. C on file in the Board office*).

Chair Wixom related that he had attended a meeting that morning with the Governor and other legislators regarding the budgetary issues. At that meeting, the Governor had requested that they all look at the issues and return to the table with all possible solutions. The Board's discussion at this meeting will include the challenges facing the System, the timing and type of decisions that need to be made and what options are available at the Board and institutional level.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the Chancellor and presidents are attempting to create a process to deal with the budget situation as prudently as possible while maintaining the NSHE that the Regents are working to build and perpetuate. A multi-tiered approach has been developed, the first part of which was the approval of the budget that the institutions have been working on for the last seven months. He applauded the presidents for presenting a very reasonable and restrained budget. Knowing that there will be issues regarding revenues, the second step is in knowing that the System has very competent presidents to deal with those issues on the campus level. He felt the Chancellor has done the right thing in staking out a position. The presidents have been looking at all the possibilities including potential buyouts that may reduce long-term faculty loads. The System will have to carefully consider whether notices of non-renewal need to be issued to allow for appropriate notice before July 2009. The Chancellor has cautioned the presidents against sending out blanket notices of non-renewal. He added that the Board has made it very clear that it is the only body that approves the System's budget and revisions to that budget.

Regent Knecht left the meeting.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich proposed to the Board that they consider a number of principles from which to operate by in that if there are plans to be made in response to fiscal necessity, it be done at the local level of the campus. During the last round of reductions, the concept of town hall meetings was very effective. Although time consuming, those types of meetings allow an open forum for the many people that care about the institutions and emphasizes the need for planning to be open and transparent and to include all of the stakeholders. As this process goes forward, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the presidents understand that the Board has a broader responsibility and may want to weigh in on discussions regarding System-wide priorities.

Regent Knecht entered the meeting.

10. Information Only – Report on Potential Budget Reductions (Agenda Item #8) – (Cont'd)

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that options for discussion include notices of non-renewal and the timing of those notices, deferral of merit, hiring freezes, and the concept of capping enrollment, fees, faculty workload, furloughs, lay-offs and financial exigency. He related that in regards to the last item, the presidents would encourage that as an absolute last resort. He stated that the Regents will want to keep in mind the reputation and credibility of the institutions that the presidents have cultivated and the impact that simply discussing these options will have. Discussions may also include the possibility of having COLA unfunded, distribution of fees and limiting hours of operation. He related that Nevada is not the easiest state in which to recruit to and those faculty members with the most options will pick up on the negative vibrations the earliest. Discussions have included the impact of these decisions on workforce development programs. There could also be discussion of differential tuition and campus closures. He stated that no one looked forward to those discussions, adding that they are not here to dismantle the System but rather to serve and protect the students of higher education in the State of Nevada.

Chair Wixom asked if notices of non-renewal are to be issued, when those notices have to be given. Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen replied that the most recent amendment to Board policy requires that notice of non-renewal relate to the date of hire instead of a physical year. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich added that for all but the most recent hires, the notice period is approximately one year, adding that tenured faculty enjoys additional rights and protections.

Chair Wixom asked if notices of non-renewal could be rescinded. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that if the notice was issued in response to a fiscal situation that did not materialize, it could absolutely be rescinded.

Chair Wixom asked what other timing considerations the Board needed to operate under in light of the budgetary process. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the most significant timing restraint is in issuing the potential notices of non-renewal. He also indicated that any buyouts to bring down long term payrolls need to be effected prior to July 1, 2008. Anything else that the presidents, Chancellor and Board are discussing will certainly want to be deliberate.

Chair Wixom stated that one concern was that we do not know the specific numbers for the 2009-2011 biennium. That being the case, what action would the Board need to take to empower the presidents to prepare for that eventuality. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the most important thing the Board could do is to support the Chancellor with his efforts to maintain the budget at appropriate levels. The Board has done that through its approval of the CIP and Operating Budgets. He added that the presidents are already doing what they can to prepare their campuses.

10. Information Only – Report on Potential Budget Reductions (Agenda Item #8) – (Cont'd)

Regent Alden stated that to be a Regent is to be a trustee of higher education, to set policy and tuition fees, to hire and fire the chancellor and set the budget. The budget is set in the best interest to pursue excellence in higher education. The Board is not the money maker, the legislature or the Governor. The Regents' job is to set a budget that enhances higher education, not destroys it. The Governor, the Legislature or Board did not create the shortfall. The economy of this country and the State did. It is not the Regents' job to criticize but to establish a fair and reasonable budget to be presented to the Governor and then let the Chancellor and presidents do their jobs.

Regent Rosenberg asked that due to the devastating impact that fiscal exigency or issuing notices of non-renewal would have on the System and the State, he requested that those be the last options to be considered.

Regent Sisolak asked for the status of the Letter of Intent in regards to the recent fee increases. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the Letter of Intent has not been modified at this point, adding that incident to the preparation of the budget this fall, staff will attempt to build in those changes. The conversations that the Chancellor and presidents have had on the Letter of Intent indicates strong support for a more bifurcated approach whereby there is a portion of fees that support inflation and are divided in the fashion set forth in the Letter of Intent.

Regent Sisolak asked for a one page explanation of the recent fee increases and surcharges and a breakdown of how incremental surcharges would impact the System and institutions. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that they would provide a report on the mandatory and optional fees in tabular form that will show what is raised by various fee increases.

Regent Sisolak asked if the CSN issue of funding had been addressed. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the CSN issue was included as an enhancement in the budget passed by the Board earlier that morning. He related that after the last Board meeting, he met with the Vice Chancellor of Finance and the CSN staff and they worked through the history and what they felt was the necessary enhancement. They felt that there is a real financial issue that needs to continue to be addressed every year until it is resolved. Regent Sisolak asked if that was part of the Chancellor's 10-year plan. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that he hoped it happened much sooner than 10 years, adding that CSN is an institution that is stretched to the breaking point.

Regent Geddes requested that the concept of shared services be considered, specifically in regard to BCN and BCS or other opportunities where campuses can work together to share costs and services. Secondly, he would like to make sure that teaching remains the core purpose, and that classrooms and research laboratories are given the first priority. He also felt that it was important for the students and faculty to know that the administration is not exempt from these decisions.

10. Information Only – Report on Potential Budget Reductions (Agenda Item #8) – (Cont'd)

Chancellor Rogers indicated that every issue that needs to be resolved is out on the table for negotiation. The situation is very complicated and that it would be premature to draw up a game plan without having an idea what the game is going to be.

Regent Knecht joined Regent Geddes in asking the institutions to emphasize what they can do for shared services and space with each other as well as potentially sharing space with other public entities. He related that eight or nine months ago, this Board took a position advocating a global set of principles. He felt that the Governor had also been thinking along those same lines. Speaking in terms of global solutions, he felt that Lt. Governor Brian Krolicki had a very good idea to securitize the tobacco funds and felt that the Board should support that initiative. He agreed with the Chancellor and others that the situation is very much in flux. The Governor's request for further reductions (14.12%) is not a final decision, but a number to be addressed for planning purposes. He felt discussion of specific percentages would create a destructive effect on morale and planning. He felt it is very important to cooperate fully with the Governor, Legislature and other state officers and respond in a timely manner but it would be premature to adopt a list of budget reduction this day. However, he felt it would be useful to support Lt. Governor Krolicki's securitization proposal. Finally, he felt that the Board needs to address the overall direction and range of options including everything from a certain percentage reduction to strategic realignments. He felt it would be useful to focus on to what extent across the board type cuts need to occur and how to protect areas of strengths and focus potential reductions on areas of weakness. No one takes pleasure in discussing budget reduction but at some point it will have to be faced and they will need a strategic plan and guiding principles.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

Chancellor Rogers stated that it is very important for the System to seek different types and sources of funding. Once the System starts to develop those relationships, it will bring a whole new equation to the System never seen before.

Chair Wixom sensed that the presidents understand the reality of the situation and what the System faces. However, the timing is very difficult because it involves a very complex budget process not only for the System, but throughout the State. He requested that the Board allow him and the Chancellor, along with System staff, to return to the Governor and begin speaking about solutions including Lt. Governor Krolicki's proposal with the understanding that the Millennium Scholarship needs to be protected.

Regent Crear entered the meeting.

Regent Gallagher requested further explanation of Lt. Governor Krolicki's proposal. Chair Wixom explained that, in essence, the proposal is to take the income stream from projected tobacco revenue in the future and secure it now through bonding that would be non-recourse to the State and would be for the present value of the money. The advantage is that it transfers the risk that those funds will not be there in the future and places it with the bond holder. The State is currently estimating that it will receive

10. Information Only – Report on Potential Budget Reductions (Agenda Item #8) – (Cont'd)

\$600-700 million now. The question then becomes what should be done with those funds. The Millennium Scholarship could be protected through that process, including setting aside a certain amount to create a trust fund.

Regent Knecht related that a proposal for securitization was rejected when the tobacco settlement initially came through. At that time, the State would have received more funds as the expected revenue stream was much greater than it is now. Lt. Governor Krolicki's staff has estimated that the net would now be \$600-\$700. In terms of the Millennium Scholarship, because the settlement was not securitized and the scholarship was not tied to that stream initially, the higher number of Millennium Scholarship recipients combined with the lower revenues has caused the State to provide general funding to supplement the tobacco revenues. Importantly, saying that general fund revenues will be used for the Millennium Scholarship would not, in principle, be a new concept. If this stream of revenue of securitized now and general fund revenues are used to support the scholarship in the future, it would reflect a change in the amount of general fund revenues, not a change in the principle and the source. He felt Chair Wixom was correct in saying that there was a laying off of the risk of variability to those who are in the business of carrying those kinds of risk.

Regent Leavitt stated that in essence, by securitizing the tobacco funds now, they are gambling that cigarette sales will continue to decrease. With that being said, in the last year the Chair and the Chancellor have done an effective job of reaching out to the Governor and he continues to support them in their efforts.

Regent Crear expressed his frustration that the Board and System has to go through these issues. He stated that although this is not the Governor's fault, the responsibility does lie with him to show some leadership and take a stand, adding that diplomacy and raw data does not seem to work. He felt that more drastic measures were called for in dealing with the Governor. He does not feel the Governor has looked for other sources of income, adding that only so much can be cut before alternative revenue streams must be developed. He felt the Board needs to be much more forceful and adamant and take a stand. For many people, this Board is the end of the spectrum for that. He also looked to the faculty, staff and students to also be more forceful, adding that he would join the students and staff if a demonstration was organized.

Regent Knecht stated that, with due respect, the Governor has shown good leadership. In particular, the Governor has expressed an openness to increase revenues by considering Lt. Governor Krolicki's plan and keeping his pledge to not increase taxes. He related that the average family and business are experiencing lower revenues and higher expenses and it would be a shame to increase taxes at this point. He stated that this situation is not fun, it makes it very difficult for the Regents to do a good job of promoting higher education, but it does not mean that stones should be cast at the Governor.

Chair Wixom stated that he and the Chancellor will proceed in discussions with the Governor to try and pull some solutions together for the State and higher education.

11. Approved – Bank Financing for the Center for Molecular Medicine, UNR (Agenda Item #9)
– (Ref. BF-6 / Ref. INV-7 on file in the Board office)

- 11.1 The Board approved the Budget & Finance Committee’s recommendation to approve UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for (1) a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education, on behalf of the University of Nevada School of Medicine (UNSOM), to secure a 30-year fixed rate, tax-exempt revenue bond in an amount to net \$60 million and (2) a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education, on behalf of the UNSOM, to secure a not-to-exceed \$4.2 million, 10-year variable rate, taxable commercial loan, to finance and construct the new Center for Molecular Medicine.
- 11.2 The Board approved the Investment Committee’s recommendation to approve UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request to enter into a long term lease agreement between the UNSOM and the Nevada Cancer Institute and a long term lease between the UNSOM and the Whittemore-Peterson Institute for Neuro-Immune Disease.

Regent Sisolak stated that these issues were vetted thoroughly through both the Investment and Budget and Finance Committees. Regent Sisolak acknowledged Mr. Harvey Whittemore’s explanation of indirect cost recovery provided to the Committee, noting that his explanation clarified why this was so beneficial. He stated the Board would benefit from his explanation.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of (1) a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education to secure a 30-year fixed rate, tax-exempt revenue bond in the amount to net \$60 million, (2) a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education to secure a not to exceed \$4.2 million, 10-year variable rate, taxable commercial loan, to finance and construct the new Center for Molecular Medicine, (3) the request to enter into a long term lease agreements between the UNSOM and the Nevada Cancer Institute and (4) the request to enter into a long term lease agreement between the UNSOM and the Whittemore-Peterson Institute for Neuro-Immune Disease with an amendment to include a provision concerning hazardous material not exceeding legal limits similar to the provision found in the lease with the Nevada Cancer Institute. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

7. Approved – Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked to return to the consent agenda and asked that the Board acknowledge the presence of Mrs. Whittemore for their family's generosity in developing the baseball field for WNC.

The meeting recessed at 3:05 p.m. and reconvened at 3:22 p.m. on Thursday, June 12, 2008, with all members present except Regent Whipple.

12. Information Only– Institutional Mission Statements (Agenda Item #26) – The Board received an update from each of the Presidents on how the institution's current mission, as demonstrated by its strategic plan and its recent decisions, is congruent with the Regents' Master Plan. Based on this report, the Board discussed the alignment of strategic planning with mission statements and the possible need to re-evaluate mission statements (*Ref. P on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chancellor Nichols reminded the Board that the Master Plan was approved in 2002. She referred to page 2 of 13 of the reference material, stating: "Without clear mission parameters the strain of explosive growth will compel haphazard and inefficient use of finite resources. With them, reasonable criteria are possible to help the System meet the challenges of the next decade more effectively and efficiently." The document goes on to define community colleges, state colleges, universities and the research institute. The document also provides a definition for high tech centers and institutes of technology, which the System has never implemented separately but which are incorporated within the community colleges.

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that in Nevada there is the choice to have a collaborative or a competitive model. Many states have an open competitive model and are basically free to do what the market will bear. In this document, the Board made the decision that the NSHE would have a collaborative model due to its small size and to focus the institutions and missions to work together to make the best use of resources. The discussion was brought back to life by Chancellor Rogers' memo regarding a 10-year plan. The reference material includes the most recently Board approved mission statement for each institution. She related that these mission statements vary widely, and in general, there is no commonality among them nor do they significantly depart from the Boards' Master Plan. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that in talking with the presidents and vice presidents, none are particularly happy with their statements and feel that they could be approved.

In pointing out how important these statements are, Vice Chancellor Nichols referred to page 12 of 13 (*UNR Mission Statement*), where it states that UNR will emphasize undergraduate, graduate and professional programs that will meet the needs of the citizens of Nevada. She emphasized the role that mission statements play in how the Board judges the approval of new education programs and if it is an appropriate activity for the institutions to engage in.

Chair Wixom asked how often the mission statements are revisited, if they are part of the planning process or if they serve any function.

12. Information Only– Institutional Mission Statements (*Agenda Item #26*) – (*Cont'd.*)

President Lucey stated that they discovered WNC is using a mission statement that is far briefer than the version last approved by the Board. She stated that the current WNC mission statement will be presented to the Board for their approval at the August meeting.

Regent Leavitt asked if the mission statement drives the strategic plan or vice versa. Chair Wixom replied that was the crux of the concern.

President Maryanski stated that NSC has a short version that states “Educate the next generation of professionals for the State of Nevada.” However, in many cases they have had to refer to the longer version approved by the Board. He indicated that it is important for the mission statement to be driven by the master plan and not the other way around.

President Killpatrick stated that GBC recently underwent a successful 5-year accreditation visit that prompted a review of their mission plan. It has been shortened to state “To provide superior student-centered postsecondary education in central and northeastern Nevada. He indicated that their institution looks at the mission as driving the strategic plan.

Interim President Sanford stated that TMCC’s Council for Strategic Planning meets periodically to review their operational goals, including measuring themselves against their mission. The mission statement that was created in 2006 will be reviewed with their new president.

President Richards stated that CSN’s mission statement was last approved in 2000. They have appealed to the staff to review that statement and as it is brought up-to-date, it will drive a revision of their strategic plan.

President Wells stated that their mission statement was created during DRI’s strategic planning process which began in 2002. He related that their most recent modification was made in 2006 and approved by the Board at that time, noting that they have shortened it as much as possible. He felt it was very important to follow their mission statement as it drives their strategic plan.

President Glick stated that UNR’s current Board-approved mission statement is much too long to be useful, adding that their new provost will be refining a new mission statement. He felt that a mission statement should tell what they do, don’t do and what differentiates them.

President Ashley stated that UNLV’s current mission statement was out of date, adding that a presentation of their new strategic plan will be made later in the meeting.

12. Information Only– Institutional Mission Statements (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht asked when the next review of the Master Plan is scheduled. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that a review is conducted at the Board's request. The last full cycle was in 2001-2002 with a brief update in 2005. She felt it would be logical to revisit this every three to four years. Regent Knecht indicated his aversion to master plans although he understands and supports the need for strategic plans. During the next cycle, he felt the System should expressly pursue a strategic planning cycle and hoped that is what the institutions were also doing. He emphasized that a master plan tends to be fixed and goal oriented, while a strategic plan tends to be more responsive to the market and other opportunities.

Regent Leavitt asked, although the institutions are different from each other, if going forward there needs to be a standard format that ensures relative uniformity. He emphasized that this would apply to the format only, not the language. He felt the first principle of a mission statement should be that it has to tell us something or it is not useful at all.

Chair Wixom asked which institutions were planning a review their mission statements in the next few months. In answer to his question, the presidents of WNC, GBC, DRI, and UNR all indicated they would be conducting a review within the next six months. UNLV would be presenting their new strategic plan that day. Chair Wixom requested input from the Board for whether the mission statements drive strategic planning or performance reviews and who is accountable for them.

Regent Rosenberg felt that a good point of departure for this process would be for each institution to ask what differentiates it from the other institutions.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that Regent Rosenberg's comment raises the concept of not just institutional mission statements but how they relate to each other, adding that the Council of Presidents has already started that discussion which fits well with the types of efficiencies that Regent Geddes spoke of earlier.

Chair Wixom suggested that the institutions revisit their mission statements with their stakeholders and report back to the Board via the Council of Presidents and to evaluate their mission statements in light of the System's mission statement.

Regent Anthony agreed, feeling that a mission statement is the guiding light of the institution. An incorrect mission statement filters down through the organization. Every institution needs to have a brief mission statement they believe in and that every employee understands.

Regent Knecht asked that if there is a chance that the System will be evaluating its Master Plan in the next year or so, how the institutional mission statements will interface with that plan. He was not sure that the institutions should be made to wait. He also felt that perhaps the Board Development Committee should be involved.

12. Information Only– Institutional Mission Statements (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom stated his initial thought was to direct the institutions to first get back to their respective stakeholders and then return via the Council of Presidents to create or affirm their present mission statements in the next three to six months. Then the Board should set as an objective that by June of 2009 all mission statements are to be re-evaluated and a blanket mission statement for the System should be crafted to reflect the institutional mission statements. He also felt that it would be appropriate to use the mission statements not only for strategic planning but also for accountability.

Regent Schofield related that he personally agrees with the concept of personal mission statements and felt it was the right thing for the institutions and System to do.

Regent Leavitt, as Chair of the Board Development Committee, felt that this is particularly relevant within NSHE as it starts a search for a new Chancellor in the next year or two.

President Maryanski asked Chair Wixom to elaborate on the term stakeholders. Chair Wixom stated that would include students, faculty, community and so forth. President Maryanski related that the presidents will be presenting their academic plans to the Student and Academic Affairs Committee in October and expressed concern for the timing between presenting how they are implementing their missions versus reevaluating their missions entirely.

Chair Wixom felt it was appropriate to determine what the institutional and system-wide missions are and if they are driving the strategic plans. He requested input from the presidents.

Interim President Sanford indicated this request would be timely as their new president will be joining them shortly prompting a review of their strategic plan and mission statement.

President Richards agreed, adding that CSN would review their strategic process to look at entrenchment as well as growth scenarios.

President Wells stated it would not be a small undertaking and needs to be done properly when school is back in session and within an appropriate timeframe. Chair Wixom asked if he is suggesting that six months is too short a timeframe. President Wells was not sure and would need to consult with his staff.

President Glick expressed his concern that they not turn planning into a cottage industry. He would guess the process would take six months to a year.

Chair Wixom requested that within the next six months, the institutions present their mission statements to the Board Development Committee with the final objective of the Board being that the mission statements be fully coordinated within one year.

13. Approved – Faculty Hires Above Salary Schedule, School of Medicine, UNR (Agenda Item Nos. 10, 11 and 12) – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for the hire of Alexander Feliz, M.D., for the position of Assistant Professor, Pediatric Surgery, at a salary of \$400,000, which exceeds the established maximum salary of \$341,089 (*Ref. D on file in the Board office*); Murray Flaster, M.D., Ph.D., for the position of Associate Professor, Neurology, Internal Medicine Las Vegas, at a salary of \$325,000, which exceeds the established maximum salary of \$219,452 (*Ref. E on file in the Board office*); and Joseph Fayad, M.D., for the position of Associate Professor, Gastroenterology, Internal Medicine Las Vegas, at a salary of \$400,000, which exceeds the established maximum salary of \$219,452 (*Ref. F on file in the Board office*).

Regent Knecht moved approval of the faculty hire above salary schedule for Alexander Feliz, M.D.
Regent Leavitt seconded.

Regent Crear asked how clinical revenue works and how it helps to increase the number of students that graduate from medical school.

Dr. John McDonald, Dean, University of Nevada School of Medicine (*UNSOM*), explained that each physician will be a full-time employee of the UNSOM. They are not employed by the University Medical Center (*UMC*), nor will they be engaged in independent private practices. The UNSOM’s obligation to UMC is to provide clinical services, adding that they have worked with UMC to arrive at an equitable distribution of support until clinical revenues are adequate to cover the salaries for the first year.

Regent Crear asked if the physicians see patients at UMC in addition to providing instruction at the UNSOM. Dean McDonald stated that was correct. Regent Crear asked from whom the patient receives the bill. Dean McDonald stated that as a generality, the patient receives a bill for professional services rendered by the surgeon and a bill for facility fees from the hospital. Regent Crear asked if that professional fee is then returned to the UNSOM. Dean McDonald stated that was correct adding that in the south, billing is done through the school of medicine and no monies are accrued by the individual physician.

President Glick asked Dean McDonald to elaborate on the revenue above what it takes the UNSOM to pay the physicians’ salaries. Dean McDonald replied that the revenue received above the physicians’ salaries is used by the UNSOM to grow and increase faculty and educational services. He related that revenue from the clinical practice is approaching 50% of the UNSOM budget.

President Glick asked how many hours of community service the UNSOM physicians provide to the state of Nevada. Dean McDonald said it was many, many hours of uncompensated care.

13. Approved – Faculty Hires Above Salary Schedule, School of Medicine, UNR (Agenda Item Nos. 10, 11 and 12) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Crear asked if malpractice insurance is provided for the physicians. Dean McDonald stated that was a separate component of the medical school budget and is not provided for all physicians. Once per year, the loss rates, the number of physicians provided coverage and the specialties involved are reviewed and bid out to insurance carriers. He stated that none of the physicians on this agenda are being provided tail coverage.

Regent Sisolak expressed his concern that the salary schedule is continually exceeded, adding that if the schedule is out of date then it needs to be reviewed.

Dean McDonald related that the annual salary for an Assistant Professor of Pediatrics would be in the low \$100,000, range, adding that this particular physician is a Pediatric Surgeon that has been trained in general surgery, pediatric surgery and has an MPH and is trained in critical care/pediatric surgery.

Regent Sisolak asked how he would know what the current market rate is for these physicians. Dean McDonald related that Dr. William Zamboni, UNSOM Chair of Surgery-Las Vegas, has been working for four or five years to recruit a pediatric surgeon to southern Nevada. The marketplace is defined by their ability to recruit and in Nevada there are very few pediatric surgeons. The starting annual salary for a pediatric surgeon, just out of training, is \$450,000. The benchmarks used are from the American Association of Medical Colleges and are up-to-date. However, what the benchmarks do not reflect is the total compensation and what it costs to recruit a similar physician to southern Nevada that compares to other specialists practicing in the community.

President Glick related that it is a very individualized market and if the UNSOM does not hire at the top, it is not getting the people it needs for the medical school.

Regent Sisolak stated that he always hears about market demands but yet the salaries are under the national average. From a business point of view, if the scale is \$219,000, why should Dr. Fayad be paid \$400,000. Dean McDonald explained that for gastroenterologists, the starting salary figures are grossly inaccurate. Ever since the screening guidelines for regular colonoscopies over the age of sixty were published, the market for gastroenterologists has increased dramatically.

Regent Sisolak asked why this physician would accept a position for half the salary. Dean McDonald related that some individuals have instructional motivation and want to be part of something larger than themselves.

Regent Sisolak asked, in regards to an annual salary, what would happen if the physician became disabled. Dean McDonald stated that the UNSOM's obligation to pay a physician's salary is directly related to the physician's ability to complete their task.

13. Approved – Faculty Hires Above Salary Schedule, School of Medicine, UNR (Agenda Item Nos. 10, 11 and 12) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Alden stated that this is a public system with a perception that it is paying this money with public tax dollars even though the medical school is really self supporting. He felt that these types of requests should not even be on the agenda, adding that there should be a policy that if a program is self-supporting and does not impinge on state funds, it should not be brought to the Board. He does not feel that the Board should be asked to vote on the use of non-state funds.

Regent Dondero asked if the hiring of these physicians will create referrals from other hospitals in the community to UMC. Dean McDonald related that UMC serves a very important role in seeing patients without insurance. Their new hospitalist service has been praised by the culinary union because of its ability to cut costs and significantly improve outcomes for its patients. These physicians will create opportunities to increase services and patient numbers. Regent Dondero asked if teaching will also bring in additional money. Dr. McDonald explained that teaching does not generate revenue but the residents and fellows are an integral part of providing healthcare.

Chancellor Rogers related that a few years ago, a San Francisco newspaper printed a list of people employed by the state of California with incomes over \$1 million annually. There were approximately 20 names on that list and every one of them was a doctor. If the System wants a medical school it has to pay to be competitive.

Regent Crear agreed that in order to provide quality education, the System has to employ quality professors. He would like to see how that addresses some of the other concerns such as increasing the number of residents. He added that everything the System does should work toward the goal of improving the quality of its students.

Dean McDonald agreed completely. This Board has endorsed the UNSOM's plan to grow its faculty, residencies and student body. Every hire that is made is with that goal in mind.

Regent Dondero asked if the residents work at UMC or private hospitals. Dean McDonald stated that as the UNSOM's anchor hospital, the residents are based at UMC with the exception of pediatrics which is based at Sunrise Hospital.

Chair Wixom offered a friendly amendment to include in the request for approval of the hire above salary, agenda item nos. 10 (*Alexander Feliz, M.D.*), 11 (*Murray Flaster, M.D., Ph.D.*), and 12 (*Joseph Fayad, M.D.*). Regents Knecht and Leavitt accepted the friendly amendment.

Upon a roll call vote Regents Dondero, Gallagher, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Rosenberg and Wixom voted yes. Regents Sisolak and Alden voted no. Motion carried. Regents Schofield and Whipple were absent.

14. Approved, Employee Contract, Assistant Football Coach, UNLV (Agenda Item #13) – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for a two-year employment agreement for Andre Patterson to assume the title of Assistant Football Coach. The contract is effective March 8, 2008, and extends through March 7, 2010 (*Ref. G on file in the Board office*).

Regent Geddes noted the length of the contract and asked why that was necessary for the position of assistant coach.

Mr. Richard Linstrom, General Counsel, UNLV, stated that it is his assessment that the Systems’ and UNLV’s best interests are protected by a more sophisticated contract. This is their standard form of contract for all coaches and from which modifications are made based on negotiations.

Regent Sisolak asked why this was being presented to the Board for approval three and a half months after the date of hire. Mr. Hamrick stated that the Board of Regents’ agenda timeline dictated the delay in presenting this contract.

Regent Sisolak noted that the contract was signed on March 8th. In response to Regent Sisolak, Mr. Wasserman indicated that the deadline for submitting agenda items for the April meeting was March 4th. Regent Sisolak expressed concern for the delay, noting that the Board may vote no. Mr. Linstrom related that since the president’s authority spans only the fiscal year, and does not include multiple years, without Board approval the contract would expire at the end of this fiscal year. Mr. Hamrick added that during the negotiation process, it is made very clear to the candidate that the contract is pending Board approval.

Regent Sisolak noted that the contract indicates that during the duration of employment, the employer will provide the employee with a number of UNLV athletic tickets, as specified by the ticket policy. He asked why the number of tickets was not specified in the contract. Mr. Hamrick stated that the policy specifies how many tickets each position is entitled to and is amended as necessary. All assistant coaches receive four tickets for football and basketball games. He added that it is very important for their athletic department staff and their families to attend athletic events for morale and the opportunity to mingle with supporters and season ticket holders.

Regent Rosenberg asked if there was a process by which time-sensitive issues could be placed on the Board agenda after the deadline has passed. Chair Wixom stated that there is a provision in place that will allow for late submissions.

Regent Knecht noted that there is a provision in the ticket policy that allows reevaluation of the number of tickets distributed based on market conditions. When tickets are scarce and valuable, the number can be adjusted down.

Regent Geddes asked if tickets are also provided for other sports such as baseball or softball. Mr. Hamrick stated that they are.

14. Approved, Employee Contract, Assistant Football Coach, UNLV (Agenda Item #13) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Leavitt moved approval of the employee contract for UNLV. Regent Crear seconded.

Regent Leavitt stated that he did not feel that the Regents should be telling the Athletic departments and university presidents what they should do with their tickets.

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that later on the agenda, the Regents will be addressing proposed changes to the coach and assistant coach contract policy to allow the Chancellor to approve contracts within a specific salary range and contract length.

Regent Crear stated that these contracts seem to burden the Board meetings. If this will allow the universities to win more football games and recruit more players and build the program, then he concurs. He did feel that leaving the number of tickets vague in the contract should be questioned.

Mr. Hamrick stated that this particular individual has experience coaching in the NFL. In order to bring him to UNLV, it required the negotiation of a two year contract. This coach also adds diversity to their coaching staff. To haggle over whether his wife and children can receive complimentary tickets to attend a football game puts the university at a tremendous disadvantage.

Regent Sisolak stated that the tickets are not the UNLV Athletic Department's tickets. They are the System's tickets and the taxpayers' tickets and they should be used to generate revenue whenever possible. The System has a policy that faculty receives tuition waiver for their children. He asked if the assistant football coaches receive that. Mr. Hamrick stated that they did.

Regent Sisolak questioned that if the assistant football coaches receive the ticket and the tuition break, why all employees could not also receive both, adding that he just wanted to ensure that it is fair to everyone.

Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regent Schofield and Whipple were absent.

Chair Wixom asked if there was no fiscal impact because the salary is already within their budget. President Ashley confirmed that there would be no fiscal impact.

15. Approved, Employee Contract, Head Women's Basketball Coach, UNLV (Agenda Item #14) – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request for a five year contract for Women's Head Basketball Coach, Kathy Olivier. The contract is effective April 22, 2008, through April 21, 2013 (Ref. H on file in the Board office).

Regent Dondero moved approval of the employee contract for UNLV. Regent Knecht seconded.

15. Approved, Employee Contract, Head Women's Basketball Coach, UNLV (Agenda Item #14) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Geddes asked why there is a sudden escalation in salary between years three and four. Mr. Hamrick related that it was the desire of the coach to have a larger salary on the back end instead of the front end. This also worked out to the university's best interest in keeping the coach here if she is successful.

Regent Sisolak asked if UCLA was aware of this negotiation and if the process would subject the System to potential litigation. Mr. Hamrick indicated that he had a discussion with an administrator at UCLA and was assured that this coach's departure from their institution was above board. Mr. Linstrom added that the salary structure actually provided some insulation against potential litigation

Regent Sisolak asked why this contract allows for one vehicle whereas the previous coach received two. Mr. Hamrick stated that was what was negotiated.

Regent Sisolak asked if the previous coach was bought out from her contract and how that process occurred. Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen stated that usually when a buyout occurs, the individual is no longer an employee of the System and that a lump sum payment is typically made and the relationship is terminated. Mr. Linstrom stated that the settlement agreement would be made available for Regents' review but he would prefer not to discuss it in a public meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked if the buyout funds were from non-state funds. Mr. Linstrom indicated that was correct.

Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regents Schofield and Whipple were absent.

16. Approved – Employment Contract, Vice President of Development, DRI (Agenda Item #15)
– The Board approved DRI President Stephen G. Wells request of a three year employment contract for Russel A. Kost, III, as Vice President for Development at the Desert Research Institute, effective July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2011, at a starting annual salary of \$175,000 (*Ref. I on file in the Board office*).

President Wells related that Mr. Kost had previously spent 23 years at UNLV.

Regent Alden stated that he will be abstaining from the vote on principle but that should not be interpreted to mean he does not support the individual.

Regent Anthony moved approval of the employee contract for DRI. Regent Knecht seconded.
Motion carried. Regent Alden abstained. Regents Schofield and Whipple were absent.

17. Withdrawn – Personnel Session, President Carol A. Lucey and Presidential Contract, WNC (Agenda Item Nos. 17 and 18) – Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that this agenda item had been scheduled for a time certain of June 13, 2008, at 8:00 a.m. However, due to the necessary absence of a number of Regents from tomorrow's meeting, this item has been deferred until the August meeting to allow for all of the Regents to be present for this important matter.

Regent Crear asked if an increase is approved at the August meeting would it be retroactive to July 1st. Chair Wixom stated that it would. However, there have been no increases for presidential contracts.

Regent Knecht asked if the contract extension being discussed begins on July 1, 2009. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the policy of the Board allows for the evaluation of the president the year before the final year of the contract. The contract being extended currently runs from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009. He added that when presidential contracts are extended, that is the time to consider an increase. However, increases are not being considered this year.

18. Information – Commencement Schedules (Agenda Item #30) - The Board discussed the process in which the institutions schedule commencement ceremonies (*Title IV, Chapter 1, Section 7*). Based on this discussion, the Board provided direction to the institutional presidents and the Chancellor regarding the method of scheduling commencements (*Ref. S on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chair Rosenberg related that this year there were three commencement ceremonies scheduled on the same day. He asked the Presidents to please communicate with each other and eliminate any conflicts so that the Regents can attend as many ceremonies as possible.

Chair Wixom asked if there are any known conflicts with the ceremonies that have been scheduled to-date. Mr. Wasserman replied that thus far, no conflicts exist but not all of the institutions have submitted their schedule.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated that this is a policy consideration in that the schedules should be reviewed by the Chancellor's office and should not be finalized before that office has the opportunity to respond.

Chair Wixom stated that the general tenor of this discussion is that the commencement schedules need to allow as many Regents as possible to be in attendance.

19. Approved – Board Meeting Dates – Calendar Year 2009 (Agenda Item #31) - The Board approved the following meeting dates and venues for the Board of Regents' meetings to be held in calendar year 2009.

- February 5-6, 2009, CSN – West Charleston
- April 2-3, 2009, WNC
- June 18-19, 2009, DRI – Las Vegas
- August 13-14, 2009, UNR
- October 8-9, 2009, GBC
- December 3-4, 2009, UNLV

Chair Wixom stated that a request was received to hold the June 18-19, 2009, meeting at DRI-Las Vegas and the October 8-9, 2009, meeting at GBC. Presidents Killpatrick and Wells have agreed to the change.

Chair Wixom also clarified that the February 5-6, 2009, meeting will be held at CSN's West Charleston campus.

Regent Alden moved approval of the 2009 Board meeting dates and venues as presented. Regent Knecht seconded.

Regent Alden expressed his opinion that the Board should only meet four times per year for one day only (*April, July, October and January*), adding that would save the System nearly \$1 million per year.

Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regents Schofield and Whipple were absent.

20. Approved – Appointment, Interim President, GBC (Agenda Item #20) – The Board approved the recommendation of Board Chair Michael B. Wixom and Chancellor James E. Rogers for appointment of Mr. Carl Diekhans as Interim President of GBC while a search is conducted for a permanent replacement, including the following employment terms and conditions (*handout on file in the Board office*).

- Base Salary: \$165,000 base salary, effective July 1, 2008.
- Car Allowance: \$8,000 per fiscal year, prorated for partial years of service.
- Housing Allowance: \$12,000 per fiscal year, prorated for partial years of service.
- Host Account: \$5,000 per fiscal year, prorated for partial years of service.
- Contract Period: Contract will begin July 1, 2008, and continue until a new president is hired.
- Benefits: Standard benefit package given to all NSHE employees.

Regent Alden moved approval of the appointment of Mr. Carl Diekhans as Interim President of GBC. Regent Knecht seconded.

20. Approved – Appointment, Interim President, GBC (Agenda Item #20) – (Cont'd.)

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the negotiated salary was based on Mr. Diekhans last salary at GBC, including merit increases and the standard stipends that have been coming to the Board. He added that this contract is comparable to those of the TMCC and CSN interim presidents.

Regent Crear asked if the contract includes any restrictions that the interim president cannot be considered for the permanent president position. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that was not included in this contract.

Regent Geddes asked if there has been any discussion for how often the interim president must visit the outlying campuses. Chancellor Rogers and President Killpatrick indicated that was typically left as a local decision.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that Dr. Killpatrick had appointed Mr. Diekhans as the Vice President of the Pahrump campus for the last few months. Regent Sisolak asked if the provision requiring a residence within fifty miles of the GBC campus was fair, asking if Mr. Diekhans will be reimbursed for his expenses when driving between the campuses. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated that Mr. Diekhans would receive reimbursement of travel expenses when travelling to the Pahrump campus. President Killpatrick agreed that that would be adequate. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich added that there is also the provision for reimbursement for his wife's travel expenses when she is expected to travel with him to an event in which he appears in his official capacity as Interim President.

Motion carried. Regents Schofield and Whipple were absent.

21. Approved – Student Registration Fee Distribution, 2009-2011 (Agenda Item #22) – The Board approved the NSHE Presidents internal distribution of the student registration fee increases based on the recommendations received from the Council of Presidents. A portion of the student registration fee revenues collected by the institutions is used to support the State operating budget for higher education. The remainder of the registration fees collected are retained by each institution to provide for student access (need-based financial aid), as well as other institutional and student-related needs, including General Improvement, Capital Improvement, and Student Government/Programs (Ref. L on file in the Board office).

President Lucey prefaced this discussion with a request that the Regents grant the presidents the greatest possible flexibility. She then introduced Ms. Patricia Charlton Dayar, Vice President of Finance, CSN and Mr. Dan Neverett, Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services, WNC.

21. Approved – Student Registration Fee Distribution, 2009-2011 (Agenda Item #22) – (Cont'd.)

Ms. Charlton Dyer stated that a significant portion of the fee increases have been allocated to general improvement to ensure flexibility to meet the overall students' needs in light of the current budget situation. All of the campuses rely on those funds significantly to meet a wide range of services including tutorial support, writing center support, child care, public service support, student access and study programs.

Regent Alden moved approval of the 2009-2011 Student Registration Fee Distribution. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Mr. Neverett added that in 2007, in order to meet the Letter of Intent, all of the community colleges had to reassess their fee allocations, adding that most reallocated funds from their general and capital improvement funds. This will help to restore some of what was taken from those two funds.

Motion carried. Regents Schofield and Whipple were absent.

22. Information Only – Frazier Hall and Pioneer Wall and Plaza, UNLV (Agenda Item #28) -
UNLV President David B. Ashley provided an update on UNLV's Frazier Hall. Part of the University's plan is to establish a landscape/gathering place for the campus to create a major gateway into the campus which will also allow UNLV to celebrate significant contributions made to the campus by key individuals in the history of the University. The construction of the plaza will require the demolition of Frazier Hall with the exception of one existing wall, including the building cornerstone, which will be incorporated into the plaza area (*Ref. R on file in the Board office*).

President Ashley related that there was a discussion approximately one year ago for the plan for the area around Maude Frazier Hall. They promised at that time that they would consult with various constituent groups. Their focus today is on the entry park to the UNLV campus off of Harmon Avenue and how UNLV could honor the individuals that founded UNLV and recognize their contributions.

Mr. Gerry Bomotti, Senior Vice President of Finance and Business, UNLV, provided a conceptual presentation (*full presentation on file in the Board office*) and emphasized that this is not the final construction drawing but only current planning concepts. Their anticipated schedule is for partial demolition to occur between the fall of 2008 and the spring of 2009 because most of their voice and data communication is wired through a small portion of that building. They have been working with Tam Alumni who has a potential donor to develop a park-like setting. The portion of Frazier Hall that remains will house their voice and data equipment. The idea is to develop a major focal area that is consistent with the Midtown UNLV master plan.

22. Information Only – Frazier Hall and Pioneer Wall and Plaza, UNLV (Agenda Item #28) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom asked if this plan is contingent on the Midtown UNLV project or can this project be completed independently. Mr. Bomotti indicated that it is consistent but independent, adding that if Midtown UNLV does not go forward, this plan is still consistent with the overall campus plan.

Regent Alden requested that Harmon Avenue be renamed Maude Frazier Way.

Regent Dondero asked if it would be possible to consider the placement of a bronze statue of Maude Frazier in honor of the significant role she played for UNLV. Mr. Bomotti indicated that there has been some discussion for creating a 100% to 150%-scale facial cast in bronze of Maude Frazier, Donald Moyer and Jim Dickinson. He showed an artist's conception of what the wall may potentially look like, adding that the wall is approximately 20-feet long by 10-feet high.

Mr. Bomotti discussed the planning history, key attributes and recent outreach and summary response to the UNLV East Harmon Gateway. He related that the university has been in contact with various campus and community groups regarding this project including the Midtown Leadership Council, the CSUN and the UNLV Foundation Executive Committee. President Ashley related that the CSUN passed a resolution regarding this project at their April 20, 2008, meeting. However, the graduate students have only met as a summer group.

Regent Alden indicated that he and Regent Dondero will be asking the Clark County Commission to rename Harman Avenue to Maude Frazier Way.

Regent Rosenberg related that there is a good example of a bronze plaque of Joe Crowley on the new UNR student union building and suggested that style be considered for this project.

Regent Sisolak asked if there has been an adjustment in the timeline of the MidTown UNLV project. Mr. Bomotti felt that the economic downturn has had some effect. However, Mr. Mike Saltmann is still moving forward on his planning of major facilities.

23. Information Only – New Business (Agenda Item #40) - Regent Sisolak related that he has received many questions regarding the pre-paid tuition program and asked if advertisement for the program has stopped due to the tuition increases. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that last year there was a very short enrollment period in order to see what the Regents would do with relation to an increase in tuition. Conversations are currently under way for the next enrollment period which is anticipated to be longer and include more advertising. Special Counsel Nielsen warned that these questions are beyond the parameters of new business. Chair Wixom asked that this be addressed as a separate agenda item at the August meeting.

The meeting recessed at 5:37 p.m. on Thursday, June 12, 2008, and reconvened at 8:07 a.m. on Friday, June 13, 2008, with all members present except Regents Alden, Anthony, Dondero, Sisolak and Whipple.

24. Information Only - 2007-08 NSHE Performance Indicators and Master Plan Goals
(Agenda Item #16) – The Board heard Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presentation of the 2007-08 NSHE Performance Indicators which are based on the system-wide Master Plan approved in April 2002. In addition, she discussed potential specific, measurable Master Plan Goals that the Board may consider *(Ref. J on file in the Board office)*.

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that through the years, the System has added data to provide a sense of how well it is achieving the goals established in the Master Plan. For the first time this year, they are reporting the data by institution. The System now has the capacity to provide the information by campus.

Vice Chancellor Nichols provided a brief highlight for some of the indicators found in the report:

- Indicator #1 – Access for All. The college continuation rate for Nevada has dropped and there is the potential for the fall 2007 data to reflect a further decline. There is currently a 53% college going rate, and of that 38% attended college in Nevada in the fall of 2006. That returns us to the 1996 data that 15% of college attendees are going out of state. When the Millennium Scholarship was first offered, we saw more students staying in state. However, as the value has gone down and the requirements have increased, there is a return to the pattern that more students are going out of state.
- Indicator #3 – Persistence. There are better persistence rates. The data is starting to reflect the actions that the institutions have taken in this area.
- Indicator #6 – Distance Education. – The greatest growth in any sector of the System is in distance education. The Board had set as a goal that all students would take some on-line courses to ensure continued education after obtaining a degree.
- Indicator #7 – Participation Rates. The head count per every 100 Nevada residents enrolled in higher education continues to go down. The population growth exceeds the System's growth in enrollment and graduation.
- Indicator #8 – Transfers – There continues to be progress made in the successful transfer of students from the community colleges to the state college or universities. All institutions are working very hard in that area.

Regent Anthony entered the meeting.

24. Information Only - 2007-08 NSHE Performance Indicators and Master Plan Goals
(*Agenda Item #16*) – (Cont'd.)

- Indicator #12 – Workforce Needs of Nevada – The number of enrollments in the nursing program and the number of graduates from nursing programs rose phenomenally. However, in the area of teaching, enrollments have declined although the need for teachers has not. The System may need to consider the necessity for more emphasis on finding ways to increase the number of teachers that the System is educating. This indicator also contains a summary of the degrees and certificates by field awarded by institution which can be compared to the data on work force needs.

Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that pages 12-13 of the reference material included sample goals for the Board to consider. It occurred to her that every year she presents these indicators but there is no yardstick or benchmark to determine if improvement is being made or if it is being made fast enough. As the Board looks toward reviewing mission statements and master plans, it may want to relate them to very specific and measurable goals.

Regent Geddes asked how the growing need for nurses compares with the population growth. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that staff would need to conduct an analysis and report back to the Board.

Regent Geddes noted that, in regard to Indicator #2, there is a significant drop in remedial education at UNLV. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that occurred when the Board and the Legislature indicated that state funding would no longer be available for remedial courses. UNLV signed an agreement with CSN to offer the remedial courses to students in need. However, there was not as large a rise at CSN for those classes as they would have expected and are unsure what happened to those students.

Regent Knecht observed that by the rise in UNR's remedial education numbers, it appears to not have a similar arrangement with the northern community colleges. Vice Chancellor Nichols confirmed that UNR continues to offer remedial courses and that the number of courses offered continues to increase. Regent Knecht asked if UNR and TMCC and WNC could also come to some agreement. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that would be possible. However, UNLV has discovered that it may not be able to utilize its contract with CSN as it had originally envisioned due to NCAA regulations for their athletic students. President Ashley related that the student athletes must participate in regular courses.

Regent Knecht observed that UNLV's remedial offerings dropped from 37% to 8% in the first year and he could not believe that a large part of that was comprised solely of student athletes. President Ashley stated the drop was due to the agreement UNLV made with CSN that they would no longer teach or receive credit for remedial courses, adding that it really reflects a drop in FTE.

Vice Chancellor Nichols added that although UNR shows their number of courses offered, those courses are self supporting and do not count towards their FTE.

24. Information Only - 2007-08 NSHE Performance Indicators and Master Plan Goals
(*Agenda Item #16*) – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Knecht asked, in regard to Indicator #1, if grade inflation data should be considered before a conclusion is made that rising scholarship standards is the cause for the decrease in college continuation rates. He noted that in 2006, the percentage of students continuing to NSHE institutions, versus continuing to postsecondary overall, had not changed greatly over the previous 10 years. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that it is partly due to the complexity of many factors. She stated that Millennium Scholars have better choices to go to out of state schools. One of the goals set for the Millennium Scholarship was to keep those students in state. The report is pointing out that the difference between those staying in state and going out of state has once again increased. She indicated they do not know the factors for why that is happening, adding that they have been conducting focus groups in Las Vegas with students that have not continued to college to try and make some determinations. Regent Knecht felt that it was important as they go forward with strategic planning to use quantitative targets.

Chair Wixom stated that he very much wanted the performance indicators to be part of the overall strategic plan that is driven by the mission statement. From a global perspective, it should be part of the System's mission to enhance all of the indicators.

Regent Leavitt stated that these quantitative numbers relate back to assessment and accountability. In the midst of the current budget constraints, there is more of an emphasis to show these numbers to the legislature. He is also mindful that when quantitative goals are focused on, sometimes qualitative data is missed. Unless we can reduce some of these indicators to quantitative numbers it is difficult to tell our story to the legislature.

Chair Wixom stated that as the institutions evaluate their mission and strategic plan, he hoped they would focus on the performance indicators.

4. Approved – Election of Officers (*Agenda Item #32*) (*Cont'd.*)

Chair Wixom asked for a point of personal privilege and expressed his appreciation to the Board and System for their support in his first term as Chair. The State should be very proud of how it is served by higher education. He thanked Vice Chair Rosenberg for a marvelous job and his extraordinary support.

25. Information Only – Fall 2007 University Admission Impact Report (*Agenda Item #21*) –
The Board heard Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols' presentation of the annual report on the impact of the increased university admission standards that became effective fall 2006. This is a follow-up report to the first report presented at the August 2007 meeting and includes data for fall 2007. The full impact of all the changes in admission criteria cannot be evaluated until fall 2008 data are available (*Ref. K on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that there has been some discussion to combine this report with the diversity report in 2009. Currently, this document considers three separate categories of university enrollment: the students that apply, the students that are admitted and the students that actually enroll.

25. Information Only – Fall 2007 University Admission Impact Report (Agenda Item #21) – (Cont'd.)

Vice Chancellor Nichols reminded the Board that in the fall of 2006, for university admission only, the GPA requirement was increased from 2.5 to 2.75 in 13 required academic courses. Admission based on test scores was later added. Then in the fall of 2007, the Board increased the number of students that could be admitted under special criteria for regular admission (*combination of test scores, GPA, special talents and so forth*). She clarified that this report only takes incoming freshmen into account, adding that consideration of the total student body would paint a much different picture.

Vice Chancellor Nichols reported that the first table (*page 3 of 6*) reflects the enrollment of first-time full-time degree seeking freshman at the universities and colleges for the fall of 2005, 2006 and 2007. The theory behind raising the number of special admissions was to create the best pathway to success for all students. They expected any decrease in enrollments at the universities to show up as an increase at the other institutions. However, when looking at the UNLV's data for 2005-2006, enrollment dropped by 423 students but enrollment at CSN also decreased. There appeared to be other unknown factors in addition to the admissions standards causing the decline. The overall change in southern Nevada from the fall of 2005 to the fall of 2007 was a negative percentage. When considering the northern institutions during the same time period, there is almost a balance that reflects that the agreement between the northern university and community colleges for the admissions review process appears to be working. However, she reminded the Board that last year UNLV changed its admission review process to more closely match that of UNR's and they anticipate a positive result from that change.

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that when considering the percent admitted from those that applied, the number of admissions did decrease at UNLV. At UNR, there really was not a change between the percent that applied and those that were admitted.

Regent Knecht asked Vice Chancellor Nichols to what extent she felt the patterns are driven by Nevada's long history of rapid immigration and the difference in that slice of the population. He also felt that Nevada has a larger percentage of the population that does not need higher education to make a good living. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that she is amazed by the volume of immigration and out-migration in southern Nevada in particular and felt that makes a significant difference.

Regent Crear asked for a copy of the letter of denial that UNR and UNLV have begun to send to students when addressing special admissions. Vice Chancellor Nichols ensured that the Regents will receive a copy of that letter.

Regent Crear observed that the System wants to create world class institutions but it does not have a branding campaign to bring students in. He is personally not surprised by the numbers reflected in the report. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that they are beginning to receive the information from the focus groups that the universities are not thought of as well as they feel they deserve. Regent Crear felt it was imperative to determine what their message is and get it out to the target public. Chair Wixom stated that Regent Crear's input is very important given his professional background.

25. Information Only – Fall 2007 University Admission Impact Report (Agenda Item #21) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom noted that past economic downturns have resulted in higher than normal enrollments and asked if that trend is being seen or if it was too early to tell. President Glick stated that is typically truer at urban universities and community colleges although UNR's admissions data currently shows an increase of over 500 students. However, he was not yet ready to predict what their final enrollment will be.

President Ashley stated that UNLV's applications are up but their capture rate is still unknown. The underrepresented student categories are up. He related that in his experience, the current economic climate in Nevada has not had as much of an effect as it has in other locations. UNLV Provost Smatresk stated that the lack of federal assistance is also hurting the applications. However, they continue to receive applications, adding that the number of freshman and transfer applications is up as are student registrations. He noted that the change in the student admissions process has been reduced from two months to ten to fourteen days. UNLV is also conducting registration events which were not done in the past.

All four community college presidents indicated that preliminary enrollment data appear to reflect an increase.

Chair Wixom stated that when admissions standards were addressed in the fall of 2005-2006, both university presidents stated there would not be a material adverse affect as a result of those admission standards. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that has generally held true except in the category of black students, which decreased. She referred to page 5 of 6, stating that in the fall of 2005 there were 269 black students enrolled at UNLV. In the fall of 2006 that number fell to 209 and then in the fall of 2007 it fell further to 200. She felt the new admissions standards would result in an increase to those numbers. She noted that at UNR, the black student population went way up.

Chair Wixom asked UNLV Provost Smatresk to elaborate on UNLV's black student enrollment. UNLV Provost Smatresk stated that indications are that enrollment for every demographic will increase, adding that clearly the additional criteria has been incredibly helpful in allowing them to maintain diversity.

Chair Wixom stated that there are two competing concerns, one is student success and the second is student diversity. As a Board, their objective for instituting the additional standards was to address the second of those concerns. He asked if that was enough or if more needs to be done to serve that particular population. Provost Smatresk stated that it is critical to establish success programs for students after they are admitted so that the students accepted will have a good chance at being successful. President Ashley related that at the August meeting, he will return to the Board with more specific numbers on how the additional special admissions criteria has affected their enrollments and diversity.

25. Information Only – Fall 2007 University Admission Impact Report (Agenda Item #21) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Geddes asked if the students currently applying are affected by the changes made two years ago in the Clark County graduation requirements for math. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that the Gateway (*Washoe County*) or 21st Century (*Clark County*) curriculum will not affect students until 2010 in Washoe County and 2011 in Clark County. Those curriculums will require four years of math although the universities require only three years but at a higher level. She indicated that there is a later agenda item that addresses advanced diplomas, adding that they are trying to take advantage of all pathways that could lead to student success.

Regent Anthony asked if data is gathered on the soldiers returning from Iraq to assist them in returning to higher education. He is aware of federal assistance but asked if there are state programs available. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that Nevada has one of the most, if not the most generous policy in the country regarding veteran tuition and fees. The System does track those numbers and its policies have been extremely successful, adding that those particular students have proven to be very serious. The students that enroll under the GI bill are also tracked but that program is not as generous. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that Representative Shelley Berkley is currently supporting a bill at the federal level that is much more generous. If that bill passes, the System will build those changes into its admission policies. To the best of her knowledge, every campus has veterans' affairs staff to assist soldiers through the process.

President Ashley related that a national firm involved in standardized test preparation has approach Chancellor Rogers to consider UNLV as a collaborator on a major initiative for the military involving test preparation and the entire spectrum of what it means to go to college including support services and mentoring. He is not sure what the current discussion is with the System office but it is possible that they could be involved.

26. Information Only - Handbook Revision, Coach and Assistant Coach Employment Contracts (Agenda Item #23) – The Board reviewed changes to the policy on the approval of coaches' contracts by the Chancellor under certain limited conditions. This was the first reading of a change to the NSHE Code (*Title 2, Section 4.2*) (*Ref. M on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that the requested revision was reviewed by the athletic directors at a salary of \$100,000 or less per contract year not to include the perks or performance bonuses if the bonuses do not exceed \$25,000 (*total of two years or \$200,000*). However, the Board may find that there are very few contracts being presented that are that low. She indicated that this is the first reading of the requested revision and the Board may want the second reading to include a larger number.

Chair Wixom stated that a motion for approval would be premature at this point and requested that the Board wait until the next reading.

Regent Crear asked if the proposed amount is based on actual data. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that the athletic directors had indicated the proposed amount would cover the majority of the assistant coaches.

Chair Wixom thanked Interim President Sanford and the TMCC staff for hosting the Board of Regents meeting.

27. Approved – Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Naming of Campus Buildings (Agenda Item #24) – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed’s request for revisions to the existing provisions of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Chapter 1, Section 2 (*in part*) concerning the naming of buildings (*Ref. N on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chancellor Reed related that the purpose of this policy revision, in relations to buildings that are to be demolished, is to make sure that appropriate recognition to major contributors is provided in or adjacent to newly constructed or renovated building or in another appropriate manner on the campus. The proposed revision has been vetted through the campuses and has been compared to other similar policies at other institutions.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision concerning naming of campus buildings. Regent Geddes seconded.

Chair Wixom expressed concern for the naming of buildings over time. Vice Chancellor Reed indicated that “useful life” language has been included in the proposed policy revision and it would be appropriate for the Board to address that issue at this time.

Regent Crear observed that the life of a building could exceed 25 to 30 years and asked how that impacts the System’s ability to generate revenue. Chair Wixom asked if there is flexibility in the proposed policy to address that issue on a case by case basis. Vice Chancellor Reed felt that there was, adding that the policy language allows for a conversation with the family, Board and other stakeholders.

Regent Crear stated that the development staff from each campus needs to be involved with this. Vice Chancellor Reed related that the proposed policy language had been reviewed with the institutional development staff, in particular at UNLV.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the proposed revision does not include any restrictions that once a name is on a building it stays there forever. That will remain an option for the institutions to discuss during the negotiation process with the donor. Regent Crear felt it was important that the individuals or families giving the gift need to understand that there may be a timeframe involved.

Chair Wixom asked that the message be conveyed very clearly to the donors, adding that perhaps a cover letter to the development staff raising these points could be included with the policy.

Regent Geddes asked that paragraph (e) of the proposed policy language be corrected to reflect the accurate policy sections. Vice Chancellor Reed stated that will be corrected to reflect the newly numbered sections.

27. Approved – Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Naming of Campus Buildings (Agenda Item #24) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom proposed a friendly amendment to correct the newly numbered sections within the revised policy language. Regents Gallagher and Geddes accepted the friendly amendment.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Dondero, Rosenberg, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

28. Approved – Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Student Health Service and Health Insurance Rates (Agenda Item #25) – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed's request to revise Student Health Service and Health Insurance Rates. In accordance with Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 18*), student fees require Board approval. This agenda item addressed 2008-09 student health service fees and student health insurance rates. These revised student fees will be codified in the *NSHE Procedures and Guidelines Manual*, and will be effective in the fall, 2008 semester (*Ref. O on file in the Board office*).

Regent Leavitt moved approval of the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision* concerning student health service and health insurance rates. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Dondero, Rosenberg, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

29. Withdrawn – UNLV Institutional Strategic Plan (Agenda Item #27) – This item was withdrawn and will be rescheduled for the August Board meeting.

President Ashley related that there had been an article in the previous day's publication of the Las Vegas Review Journal regarding the impact that further budget reductions would have upon UNLV's ability to pursue its mission. He stated that the question posed to him was how UNLV could continue its mission in light of the level of budget reductions, what his sense of the situation was. His response was that the budget impacts would hamper their ability but they would persist. He reaffirmed that UNLV is striving for excellence and will not have outside influences prevent them from their goals. However, he wanted there to be no question that the level of budget cuts being discussed would be dramatic and have an incredibly adverse impact on the institutions.

30. Information Only – Board of Regents Self-Assessment (Agenda Item #29) - Board Development Committee Chair James Dean Leavitt and Mr. Wasserman led the Board of Regents in a preliminary discussion of undertaking a Board self-assessment and related workshop. The Board Development Committee will give further consideration to the issue and make specific recommendations to the Board at a future meeting of the Board.

30. Information Only – Board of Regents Self-Assessment (Agenda Item #29) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Wasserman related that a Board self-assessment study should assist the Board in evaluating its performance, identify strengths and weaknesses, clarify responsibilities, increase effectiveness and accountability, improve communication and identify goals and objectives for the coming year. He stated that a Board assessment is an evaluation of the Board's performance, not an evaluation of performance of individuals on the Board. In reaffirming UNR's accreditation last year, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) recommended that the Board of Regents engage in an evaluation of its performance and operations. The Commission then noted this was an area that the university did not meet its accreditation standard and required a resolution to this issue within a two year period. While it is a recommendation, the Commission has made it clear that the university must correct this, adding that the only way for the university to correct this is for the Board to conduct a self-assessment.

Mr. Wasserman reported that both ACCT and AGB offer formal self-assessment programs. Both organizations would start with a survey questionnaire self-assessment and then the Board would review the results and develop plans for improving performance at a workshop or at a full Board meeting. At the next Board Development Committee meeting, the Committee Chair will invite ACCT and AGB to present their proposals, after which the committee will make a recommendation to the Board on how to proceed.

Regent Leavitt provided the following points for what a self-assessment should lead to:

- An agreement on Board rolls and Board member responsibilities;
- A better understanding of what the Board members expect amongst themselves;
- Improved communication with the Chancellor's office, presidents and other Board members; and
- Identification of strategies to improve Board effectiveness.

Regent Leavitt noted that approximately six months ago he could not get this past committee and is grateful for the NWCCU's mandate. He added that when he was elected to the Board of Regents, it was near the end of a relatively contentious time for the Board. He is pleased with the spirit and atmosphere the current Board members provide.

Regent Schofield related that six years ago this Board had the reputation of being very dysfunctional. He felt that working as a team the Board could make NSHE one of the finest Systems in the world.

Regent Knecht stated that it is often the test of a group of people that have come upon hard times to either rise or sink. Over the last year, the Board has faced hard times but through the leadership of the Chair, Vice Chair and staff, the System has risen to the occasion.

Chair Wixom observed this is a very important issue for the accreditation process but also for the Board to project forward and become more proactive.

31. Approved – Audit Committee (Agenda Item #33) – Chair Knecht reported the Audit Committee met on June 12, 2008, and received follow-up responses for three internal audit reports that were presented to the Committee in October 2007 and February 2008.

The Committee received reports on Athletic Ticket Accountability from UNLV and UNR. The institutions were asked to provide a detailed report at the August Audit Committee meeting of the complimentary tickets provided to employees and as trade-outs for 2003 through 2008.

Regent Knecht requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the April 3, 2008, Committee meeting. (*Ref. A-1 on file in the Board office*)
- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended for approval the internal audit reports: (*Ref. Audit Summary on file in the Board office*)
 - ✓ Payroll Department, UNLV (*Ref. A-2 on file in the Board office*)
 - ✓ Facilities Maintenance, UNLV (*Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office*)
 - ✓ Marjorie Barrick Museum of Natural History, UNLV (*Ref. A-4 on file in the Board office*)
 - ✓ Human Resources, WNC (*Ref. A-5 on file in the Board office*)
 - ✓ Human Resources, BCN (*Ref. A-6 on file in the Board office*)
 - ✓ Property Acquisition Accounts, UNV (*Ref. A-7 on file in the Board office*)
- Handbook Revision, Foundation Audit Waiver Guidelines – the Committee recommended for approval a *Handbook* revision addressing guidelines/options for the Committee to consider when granting audit waivers in accordance with the Board of Regents *Handbook*, Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 9.B.1 revised to allow audit waivers for smaller institution foundations every other year. (*Ref. A-11 on file in the Board office*)

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

32. Approved – Budget & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #34) – Regent Geddes reported the Budget & Finance Committee met on June 12, 2008, and heard the following reports:

- Budget transfers of state appropriated funds between function for the third quarter of fiscal year 2007-2008.
- All Funds revenues and expenses of the NSHE for the third quarter of fiscal year 2007-2008.
- NSHE Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets and the status of state appropriations for the third quarter of fiscal year 2007-2008.

32. Approved – Budget & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #34) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – the Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 26, 2008, and April 3, 2008, Committee meetings. (*Ref. BF-1a and Ref BF-1b on file in the Board office*)
- Handbook Revision, Student Fees – the Committee recommended approval of a revision to the Board's policy on student fees (*Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 18*). (*Ref. BF-5 on file in the Board office*).
- Joe Crowley Student Union, Operating Expenses – the Committee recommended approval to expend \$390,000 of UNR Student Union Capital Improvement Fees to balance the first year operating results at the Joe Crowley Student Union. (*Ref. BF-7 on file in the Board office*)

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

33. Approved – Cultural Diversity & Security Committee (Agenda Item #35) - Chair Anthony reported the Cultural Diversity & Security Committee met on June 12, 2008, and received an update on the recent work of the Inclusive Education Task Force. Consisting of NSHE, school district, and community leaders, the Task Force examines inclusive education practices and their utilization, particularly in NSHE teacher education programs. The update included a report on the recently completed survey gauging teacher, faculty, and administrator perceptions related to inclusive education. The survey will inform a Fall workshop facilitated by West Ed to improve and increase the utilization of an inclusive education process in Nevada.

Chair Anthony requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – the Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the April 3, 2008, Committee meeting (*Ref. CDS-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Handbook Revision, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Council – the Committee recommended approval of a revision to Board policy establishing the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Council (*Title 4, Chapter 8, New Section 5*). (*Ref. CDS-2 on file in the Board office*).
- Handbook Revision, Hate Crimes Policy – the Committee recommended approval of a revision to Board policy requiring all institutions to adopt specific policies and procedures regarding hate crimes (*Title 4, Chapter 1, New Section 30*) (*Ref. CDS-3 on file in the Board office*).

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

34. Approved – Student & Academic Affairs Committee (Agenda Item #36) - Chair Schofield reported the Student & Academic Affairs Committee met on June 12, 2008, and requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:
- Minutes – the Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the April 3, 2008, Committee meeting (*Ref. SAA-1 on file in the Board office*).
 - Elimination of the following programs:
 - ✓ UNLV - Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences (*Ref. SAA-2 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ UNLV - Bachelor of Science in Fitness Management (*Ref. SAA-3 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ TMCC - Associate of Applied Science, Apprenticeship Program, Gaming Dealer Apprentice (*Ref. SAA-4 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ With respect to the elimination of programs, the Committee discussed the matter of low or no enrollments in academic programs and requested that a report be brought back on the issue.
 - Transfer of “D” Grade Policy – the Committee recommended approval of a revision to Board policy defining the “D” Grade (*Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 13.4e*) (*Ref. SAA-5 on file in the Board office*).
 - University Admissions – the Committee recommended approval of a revision to Board policy granting automatic admission to NSHE universities to Nevada high school graduates who receive a Nevada Advanced High School Diploma effective Fall 2009 (*Title 4, Chapter 16, Section 3*) (*Ref. SAA-7 on file in the Board office*).
 - Renaming of Nevada Student Access Aid Program – the Committee recommended approval of a renaming this program to the Regents’ Higher Education Opportunity Award to promote positive perceptions and opportunities provided by the program. (*Ref. SAA-6 on file in the Board office*).

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

In light of these recommendations, the Committee discussed outreach and public relations efforts and the need for Systemwide improvements. The Committee requested that staff update Regents on the public relations and outreach improvements to better market the opportunities and pathways to participate in higher education.

Regent Geddes asked if the two programs being eliminated were to offset the two PhD programs at UNLV. President Ashley indicated that it was and explained that internally, UNLV’s strategy is if a Dean comes forward with a request for a new program, they must specify which other program will be eliminated.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Dondero, Rosenberg, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

35. Approved – Health Sciences System Committee (Agenda Item #37) - Chair Gallagher reported the Health Sciences System Committee met on June 5, 2008, and heard an overview by the Chair regarding her recent meetings with health sciences faculty in southern Nevada, and her tours of the CSN Nursing building, the UNLV Dental School and other facilities at the Shadow Lane Campus. An update was provided regarding the UNHSS fundraising event, and other fundraising efforts, which totaled approximately \$5 million. An informational presentation was given regarding the development of the Academic Clinical, Training and Research Center building on the Shadow Lane Campus, which is part of the 2007 CIP projects. The building will provide space for the UNLV School of Nursing and UNSOM, and stakeholders from both institutions have worked very hard and very well together to ensure that the plans are as efficient and effective as possible. An informational presentation was also given regarding the progress of planning efforts to develop a building on a parcel of land to be donated by the City of Las Vegas in the downtown Union Park area. This presentation included an overview of the general terms of agreement with a developer partner and outlined the basic structure of the development plan. An overview was provided on the potential shared parking opportunities with the World Market Center, in the Union Park and Shadow Lane areas. Staff requested permission to enter into negotiations with representatives from the World Market Center to further explore these opportunities.

Chair Gallagher requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 27, 2008, Committee meeting (*Ref. HSS-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Parking Agreement, World Market Center – the Committee recommended approval to give staff direction to enter into negotiations with the World Market Center representatives regarding shared parking opportunities (*Ref. HSS-6 on file in the Board office*).

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

36. Approved – Investment Committee (Agenda Item #39) – Regent Geddes reported the Investment Committee met on June 6, 2008, and heard the following reports:

- CSN President Mike Richards presented a status report on the city of Las Vegas Fire Station/Classroom building project. The Committee recommended that the campus obtain further information regarding the access from the back of the proposed building to reduce emergency response time.
- NSHE Vice Chancellor Mike Reed provided background information to the Committee concerning the Space Utilization Report. Further detail will be brought back to the Committee regarding short term course utilization.
- NSC President Fred Maryanski presented a brief update on Mater Plan efforts and the creation of a new tax increment area of the NSC campus.

36. Approved – Investment Committee (Agenda Item #39) – (Cont'd.)

- NSHE Vice Chancellor Mike Reed presented information concerning a proposal received from the State Public Works Board to facilitate state funding for life-safety/ADA capital projects. Further information will be brought back to the Committee regarding this proposal.

Regent Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 28, 2008, Committee meeting. (*Ref. INV-1 on file in the Board office*)
- GMO Performance Update – the Committee recommended approval to remain with Grantham, Mayo, Van Otterloo & Company until the August meeting, at which time Cambridge Associates will return with alternative investment scenarios.
- Asset Allocation and Investment Returns – the Committee recommended approval for the performance report presented by Cambridge Associates and for their \$5 million rebalancing recommendation for the Endowment pool.
- Sprint Spectrum L.P., Retail Lease Agreement, UNLV – the Committee recommended approval for UNLV to enter into a long-term lease agreement with Sprint Spectrum L.P. for the lease of retail space in the new UNLV Student Union (*Ref. INV-6 on file in the Board office*).
- NSHE Endowment Fund, CSN – the Committee recommended approval for CSN to assess a 1.5% management fee from the campus endowment accounts held in the NSHE Endowment Pool. (*Ref. INV-4 on file in the Board office*)
- Nell J. Redfield Auditorium, Davidson Mathematics and Science Center, UNR – the Committee recommended approval for UNR to:
 - ✓ Construct a proposed new auditorium as part of the Davidson Mathematics and Science Center CIP project.
 - ✓ Submit the proposed auditorium to the Interim Finance Committee for approval of a change in scope for the Davidson Mathematics and Science Center project.
 - ✓ Name the Nell J. Redfield Auditorium in recognition of the Nell J. Redfield Foundation.
 (*Ref. INV-8 on file in the Board office.*)

The Committee also recommended that a copy of the Committee minutes be submitted with the Interim Finance request.

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

37. Approved – Research & Economic Development Committee (Agenda Item #38) - Chair Geddes reported the Research & Economic Development Committee met on June 5, 2008, and heard an update on the Walker Basin. The Committee also reviewed the established criteria of the Nevada Regents' Researcher Award and requested that staff bring back for consideration methods by which Regents can honor promising junior faculty members who achieve excellence in research but have not established a lengthy scholarly record. Representatives from UNR, UNLV and DRI presented a report of the financial support provided to students involved in research programs. Awarded to thousands of undergraduate and graduate students, financial support is provided through federal, state, private and institutional means in the form of assistantships, scholarships, stipends, fellowships and research grants.

Chair Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 27, 2008, Committee meeting. (Ref. RED-2 on file in the Board office)
- Compensated Outside Professional Services – the Committee recommended for approval the clarification of the application of provisions concerning conflict of interest found in the Compensated Outside Professional Services policy to personal, family and business relationships (Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 8 and Title 4, Chapter 11, Section 11). (Ref. RED-4 on file in the Board office). The Committee revised the proposed language that was included in the meeting agenda and Board packet. The revisions (copies were attached to the Chair's Report) include changing all instances of the word "employee" to "faculty member" and, beginning on the second line of subsections 6, revising the phrase "in which known benefits accrue" to "in which the faculty member knows that benefits accrue..."

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

26. Information Only – New Business (Agenda Item #40) – (Cont'.d)
None.

The meeting adjourned at 9:53 a.m.

Prepared by: 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 August 7-8, 2008, meeting