

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

Third Floor Rotunda  
Frank H. Rogers Science & Technology Building  
Desert Research Institute  
755 E. Flamingo Road, Las Vegas  
Thursday, October 2, 2008, 8:30 a.m.  
Friday, October 3, 2008, 8:00 a.m.

Members Present:

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

Others Present:

Chancellor James E. Rogers  
Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich  
Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, HSS, 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  
Interim President Carl Diekhans, GBC  
President Fred Maryanski, NSC  
President Maria C. Sheehan, 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. Jim Lowe, 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; Mr. Jeff Meyers, ASTM Board Chair, TMCC; and Mr. Andy Pozun, ASWN President, WNC.

Chair Wixom called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 2, 2008, with all members present except Regents Anthony, Crear, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple.

Reverend Jesse D. Scott from the Second Baptist Church offered the invocation.

Regent Alden led the pledge of allegiance.

1. Information Only – Introductions (Agenda Item #1) – Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich announced that the National Community College Hispanic Council named President Maria C. Sheehan as CEO of the Year.

Interim President Carl Diekhans announced that the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities recently reaffirmed GBC's accreditation for five years with no recommendations.

President Richards introduced Ms. Chris Engelstadt-McGary, representing the Engelstadt Family Foundation, Ms. Robbie Graham, Chair of the CSN Foundation, and Ms. Jacque Matthews, Executive Director and Chief Development Officer for the CSN Foundation.

NSC Provost Leslie DiMare introduced Mr. Gregory Robinson, NSC Faculty Senate Chair, Mr. Ryan Crowell, NSSA President and Ms. Amasala Alemu-Johnson, NSSA Budget and Finance Chair. She invited all attendees to NSC's grand opening ceremony of the new Liberal Arts building later that evening.

President Wells introduced Dr. Ken Kunkel, new Executive Director of Atmospheric Sciences, Dr. John Warwick, new Interim Vice President of Research and Dr. Mike Auerbach, Interim Vice President for Academic and Business Development.

2. Information Only – Chair's Report (Agenda Item #2) - Chair Michael B. Wixom invited Ms. Kathleen Boutin, Founder and Director of the Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth (*the Partnership*), to provide information about the organization and its services. As part of the Chair's report, he requested that the President of each hosting institution introduce one student and one faculty member to discuss a topic of the hosting President's choosing to help provide Board members with a focus on the reasons they serve as Board members.

Mr. Curtiss Robinson related that he searched out the services of the Partnership after becoming homeless as a sophomore in high school. The Partnership put him in touch with resources such as food, shelter and school supplies. Upon graduation from high school, the organization then provided tuition for a college education. He is currently nineteen and a sophomore at UNLV.

Chair Wixom asked how many youth are served by the Partnership. Ms. Boutin stated that last year the Partnership served over 3,000 unduplicated youth through their drop-in centers. The cashiers at the Terrible Herbst Gas Stations have also been trained to put youth in touch with the Partnership.

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

Regent Rosenberg asked how their organization is funded. Ms. Boutin stated that they now receive \$1.5 million mostly from government grants and the private sector, adding that Regents Sisolak and Alden and Chancellor Rogers are all private contributors.

Regent Crear asked if there was a way that the universities could work with the Partnership or if there was some form of collaboration already in place. Ms. Boutin replied that the Partnership is currently subsidizing eight students enrolled at CSN, NSC and UNLV. They recently received a very helpful scholarship grant from President Richards and would appreciate any assistance that the other institutions could provide. Regent Crear asked that the Partnership submit a proposal that UNLV could consider in an effort to be of assistance to these students.

Regent Alden stated that organizations such as this are a blessing to the community, adding that they literally save lives. For these students to perform as well as they do under the circumstances they are in, is a credit to themselves and the Partnership. He encouraged the Regents to visit the drop-in centers.

Regent Leavitt asked what specific services the Partnership provides. Ms. Boutin replied that their organization provides everything that parents should be providing. These children should be part of the child welfare system, but for 16 or 17 year olds, the resources are not always available. The drop-in centers provide a place to shower, to clean their laundry, to receive food or food vouchers and the use of computers. When a stable home cannot be found, the Partnership has access to a few condominiums that are available until their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday.

Regent Leavitt asked if the Partnership focused mostly on unduplicated services. Ms. Boutin stated that by focusing on getting them off the streets these youth will become successful adults. Their organization is heavily focused on prevention and intervention. Chair Wixom thanked Ms. Boutin and Mr. Robinson for their presentation.

President Wells introduced Dr. Michael H. Young. Dr. Young is an associate research professor and is currently serving as Interim Executive Director of the Division of Hydrologic Sciences (*DHS*) at the DRI. In this capacity, he administers one of the largest groups in the United States focusing on hydrologic research. With almost 80 scientists, support staff and students, DHS completes more than \$12 million in research annually.

Dr. Young is also graduate faculty in the Hydrologic Sciences Program at UNR and is an associate graduate faculty in the Department of Geosciences at UNLV. Dr. Young has worked at DRI since 2000.

Dr. Young received his Ph.D. in Soil and Water Science (*specializing in soil physics and hydrology*) from the University of Arizona, Tucson in 1995 and has held research faculty positions at University of Arizona and Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. While in Arizona, he was named Research Specialist of the Year in the College of Agriculture. He has authored or co-authored more than 40 peer-reviewed journal articles, several book chapters, more than 100 presentations at scholarly meetings and many other technical reports. Dr. Young currently serves on the editorial boards of the

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

Vadose Zone Journal and the Soil Sciences Society of America Journal, and numerous other committees in scholarly organizations. He funds and advises several students through his University of Nevada appointments.

His research interests and experience have focused on the movement of water and solutes in the vadose zone, arid land ecohydrology, soil water recharge in disturbed and undisturbed soils, and determining hydraulic and transport properties of soils. Dr. Young teaches Vadose Zone Hydrology and a seminar course on Ecohydrology at UNLV.

He is currently the lead investigator on a state-wide project entitled “Scaling Environmental Processes in Heterogeneous Arid Soils” (*SEPHAS*), an NSF EPSCoR-funded project that includes the construction and operation of large weighing lysimeters, a nationally unique facility, at Boulder City ([www.sephas.dri.edu](http://www.sephas.dri.edu)). This statewide project includes more than 60 persons from NSHE institutions across the State of Nevada, including many at UNLV and UNR. The project has funded fellowships and assistantships for numerous students, 4 post-doctoral researchers and funding for new faculty. The SEPHAS project includes more than 10 research projects, in addition to the creation of the lysimeter facility. Dr. Young provided a presentation on the Underground Weighing Lysimeter Facility in Boulder City (*full presentation on file in the Board office*).

Regent Whipple entered the meeting.

President Wells then introduced Dr. Jen Fisher. Dr. Fisher received a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil/Environmental Engineering at Duke University in 1998. She worked as an environmental engineer at the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C., in the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxic Substances until 2000.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Dr. Fisher attended the University of Georgia for graduate school, and conducted her doctoral research on the microbial ecology and arsenic biogeochemistry of Mono Lake, CA. She received her Ph.D. in December of 2007 and came to DRI in 2008 as a postdoctoral scholar. She currently works for Duane Moser’s Environmental Microbiology Group in the Division of Earth and Ecosystem Sciences. Dr. Fisher provided a presentation on Microbial Transformation of Toxics in the Environment (*full presentation on file in the Board office*).

Chair Wixom asked how many researchers were involved in the Walker Basin Project. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich responded that there are currently approximately 200 faculty, staff and students involved in that project. Regent Crear felt that it was vitally important for that information to be disseminated to the public so that they realize there is a strong correlation between the research conducted within the System and their day-to-day lives.

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

Chair Wixom announced that agenda item #6 (*Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget*) would be heard at a time certain of 8:00 am, Friday, October 3, 2008.

The meeting recessed at 9:05 a.m. and reconvened at 1:18 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 2008, with all members present except Regent Alden.

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

Chair Wixom reviewed the various actions taken by the Board of Regents and System Administration in light of the budget situation. He thanked Mr. Scott Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents, for his assistance in streamlining Board operations. All Board of Regents’ meeting agendas and reference materials are now provided electronically on a CD, as well as posted to the NSHE website. This has resulted in a substantial savings by the Board office in excess of \$6,000 per meeting or over \$36,000 per calendar year. Since campus and foundation reports are also now submitted to the Board office electronically, there has been additional savings to each of the campuses in terms of paper and duplication costs.

The Board has begun webcasting its meetings whenever possible. A plan is in progress to secure the necessary equipment to allow the webcast of all Board meetings and to capture additional savings in reduced travel expenses for the campuses and System Administration.

In the past, food and beverages were provided to all Board meeting attendees in an effort to be as efficient as possible by condensing the work into two days and keeping everyone at the meeting location during working meals. The Board has undertaken many steps to minimize the cost of providing food and beverages to meeting participants, including limiting this service to the provision of a modest lunch and beverages for only those personnel who are required to be present during all portions of the two-day meeting and who do not have an opportunity to leave the meeting at any time (*i.e., the Regents, Presidents, Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Board Counsel, Faculty Senate Chairs and Student Body Presidents*). With a conscious effort toward maximizing efficiency, the second day of this Board meeting is scheduled to be completed before noon, and will save the System the cost of providing a working lunch. These changes resulted in a savings of \$7,420 at the August Board meeting, a savings of \$6,992 at the October Board meeting, and will yield an ongoing similar savings at each future meeting of the Board, yielding an estimated savings of \$42,000 per year. In terms of agenda production and meal costs, the Board has been able to save a total of approximately \$75,000 per year.

As Chair, the only institutional representation that he requires at Board meetings, in addition to the President, is one additional staff member during the Committee meetings that are simultaneously held on the first day of the Board meeting. The only other campus representatives should be those determined by the President to be necessary for the purposes of a presentation to be made before a committee or the Board.

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

All special Board meetings will be held by videoconference thereby further reducing travel expenses for the campuses and System Administration.

Chair Wixom also related that during this Board meeting, the Board will be reviewing the current committee structure in an effort to reduce both the number of committees and frequency of committee meetings.

All future communication to and from the Board office will be done electronically, reducing paper, duplication and mailing costs. Beginning this month, the bimonthly publication of the *Regents’ Review* (approximate annual printing cost of \$18,000) will be distributed in electronic format only. While a recipient can still choose to print the newsletter, moving to an electronic version will save the System \$1,800 in printing and distribution costs per issue, for an annual savings of \$10,800.

All Board of Regents’ *Handbook* updates, made necessary by revisions approved at each Board meeting, are now provided to the campuses electronically on a CD (as well as on the NSHE website). This will result in a savings of \$720 annually from the reduced paper and mailing costs.

Chair Wixom also related that, just as the campuses have had to obtain cost savings through personnel action, both System Administration and the Board office have taken similar action including the reassignment, transferring and noticing of staff, and, absent exigent circumstances and specific approval, the continued freezing of vacant positions in System Administration and the Board office. Chair Wixom related that through these combined efforts, the Board will realize approximately \$100,000 in savings annually.

3. Information Only – Chancellor’s Report (Agenda Item #3) - Chancellor James E. Rogers discussed the Nevada System of Higher Education's progress with legislators in providing them the specifics on the damage to be suffered by the institutions if the budget cuts become a reality.

Chancellor Rogers related that he has considered how to expand the scope of the memorandums so that the topics covered do not repeat. The memorandum distributed on October 1, 2008, included letters from ten legislators. Next week’s memorandum will include letters from an additional 13 legislators. Through meetings with individual legislators, he and Mr. Josh Griffin, NSHE lobbyist, have not been trying to pitch the System’s position to the exclusion of all others. Specifically in regards to NSHE’s alliance with K-12, the System realizes that a reduction in their budget would only increase the funds needed by higher education to provide remedial education.

Chancellor Rogers related that next week’s memorandum will include letters from legislators that will support higher education as well as the need for healthcare and the infrastructure of the state. They believe that the state needs to look at the overall culture and financing of its departments. Historically, Nevada only plans for the short term and that needs to change. At the end of his last conversation with Mr. Josh Hicks, the Governor’s Chief of Staff, he was optimistic that further meetings would occur to discuss potential specific solutions. Chair Wixom and Executive Vice Chancellor

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

Klaich have also agreed to join those meetings. In the meantime, he intends to continue preparing the memorandums.

Chancellor Rogers invited input on the memorandums and related that he recently received a joint letter from the Faculty Senates. The Student Body Presidents have also formed an alliance among themselves to communicate their concerns to the students, Governor and Legislature. Most importantly, the legislators with whom he has spoken do not think the NSHE will suffer the proposed 16% budget cuts. They believe there may be some other remedies that would also not require the Governor to abandon his position.

Regent Crear expressed his support for the Chancellor’s memorandums, adding that he also distributes them throughout his office so that others will know what is happening within the State and within higher education. He encouraged the Chancellor to continue with his efforts. Regent Gallagher added that Chancellor Rogers’ memorandums have been helpful in that they are factual.

Regent Sisolak echoed the sentiments of Regents Crear and Gallagher, adding that the memorandums have impacted students and the citizens of this state in ways that others have not. He appreciated how the discussion has been brought to a crescendo that will hopefully be reflected in the Legislature. He felt that the students could not have a stronger advocate than Chancellor Rogers.

Regent Schofield added that Chancellor Rogers’ letters are very effective, adding that the System was fortunate to have him as an advocate.

Regent Crear also thanked Mr. John Kuhlman, Public Information Officer, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich and Mr. Griffin for their assistance in preparing and distributing the memorandums.

4. Information Only – Public Comment (Agenda Item #4) - Regent Sisolak related that Mr. Robinson had been very touched by the reception he received from the Regents and those present. He emphasized that Mr. Robinson is able to attend UNLV partly due to the generosity of James and Beverly Rogers and commended them for their involvement.

Chair Wixom stated that one of the objectives of having presentations such as that from the Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth was to send a reminder that the System has a real impact on the futures of real people.

Regent Sisolak related that he also recently spoke with Mr. Owen Nitz who was largely responsible for the \$8 million recently donated to CSN. Mr. Nitz had expressed his genuine appreciation for the sincerity of Ms. Jacque Mathews, Director of the CSN Foundation, and the six students who had visited his office to deliver a plant and a thank you note.

5. Approved – Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) - The Board approved the Consent Agenda, with the exceptions of (2) (*New Endowment, TMCC*) and (3) (*New Endowments, CSN*) which were approved separately (*Consent Agenda on file in the Board office*).

5. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont’d.)
- (1) Approved – Minutes (Consent Agenda Item (1) – The Board approved the minutes from the regular Board of Regents’ meeting held August 7-8, 2008, the special Board meeting held August 21, 2008, the TMCC President Search Committee held February 27, 2008, the NSC Periodic President Evaluation Committee held February 28-29, 2008, the WNC Periodic President Evaluation Committee held April 22-23, 2008, and the CSN President Search Committee held April 24, 2008 *(Ref. C-1a, Ref. C-1b, Ref. C-1c, Ref. C-1d, Ref. C-1e and Ref. C-1f on file in the Board office).*

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items (2) *(New Endowment, TMCC)* and (3) *(New Endowments, CSN)*.  
Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.  
Regent Anthony was absent.

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS APPROVED SEPARATELY:**

5. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont’d.)
- (2) Approved – New Endowment, TMCC (Consent Agenda Item (2) - Consistent with the Board of Regents’ policy, Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 9.C.2b, TMCC President Maria C. Sheehan requested the Board’s approval to accept a \$5,000 donation from Dee H. Gamal-Eldin and various donors to establish the new Seeds for Peace and Understanding Endowment Account in honor of Atef Gamal-Eldin. The new Endowment account will benefit the TMCC Distinguished Lecturer Series, other projects, cultural events and professional development to foster cultural exchange. The donors have expressly requested for this Endowment account to be invested in and managed by the NSHE Endowment pool *(Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Gallagher moved approval of Consent Agenda item (2) *(New Endowment, TMCC)*. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regent Anthony was absent.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

- (3) Approved – New Endowments, CSN (Consent Agenda Item (3) - CSN President Michael Richards requests Board approval to accept seven new endowments to benefit the students of the College of Southern Nevada *(Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office).*
- From Dale Michael Barnhurst, a minimum \$10,000 donation to establish the Jan Marie Barnhurst Memorial Scholarship endowment for need based students pursuing Associate of Science or Bachelor of Science in Dental Hygiene degrees. Recipients need to be enrolled in a minimum of 12 credits per semester, maintain a 3.0 grade point average and do not receive any other grants or scholarships.
  - From Nevada Power Company, the CSN Gala 2008 donors and the family, friends and colleagues of Dr. Larry Tomlinson, a minimum of \$13,678 to endow a scholarship to benefit Nevada resident students pursuing an Associate of Arts degree with a preference in the School of Education and Behavioral and Social Sciences. Recipients need to be enrolled full-time and maintain a 2.8 grade point average.



**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS APPROVED SEPARATELY:**

5. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont’d.)
- (3) Approved – New Endowments, CSN (Consent Agenda Item (3) – (Cont’d.)
- From Nevada Power Company and CSN Gala 2008 donors, a minimum of \$10,000 to establish the Dr. James and Marie McMillan Scholarship endowment to benefit Nevada resident students pursuing an Associate of Science or Associate of Applied Science degrees with a preference in the School of Health Sciences. Recipients need to be enrolled full-time and maintain a 2.8 grade point average.
  - From Nevada Power Company and CSN Gala 2008 donors, a minimum of \$10,000 to establish the Paula Francis Scholarship endowment to benefit Nevada resident students pursuing an Associate in Arts degree with a preference in the School of Arts & Letters. Recipients need to be enrolled full-time and maintain a 2.8 grade point average.
  - From Nevada Power Company and CSN Gala 2008 donors, a minimum of \$10,000 to establish the Nevada Cancer Institute Scholarship endowment to benefit Nevada resident students pursuing an Associate of Science or Associate of Applied Science degree with a preference in the School of Health Sciences. Recipients need to be enrolled full-time and maintain a 2.8 grade point average.
  - From Nevada Power Company and CSN Gala 2008 donors, a minimum of \$10,000 to establish the Donald “Pat” Shalmy Scholarship endowment to benefit Nevada resident students pursuing an Associate of Applied Science degree with a preference in the School of Business, Hospitality and Public Service programs. Recipients need to be enrolled full-time and maintain a 2.8 grade point average.
  - From Nevada Power Company and CSN Gala 2008 donors, a minimum of \$10,000 to establish the Julie Murray Scholarship endowment to benefit Nevada resident students pursuing an Associate of Science or Associate of Applied Science degrees with a preference in the School of Health Sciences. Recipients need to be enrolled full-time and maintain a 2.8 grade point average.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of Consent Agenda item (3) (*New Endowments, CSN*). Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

6. Approved – Continuation of PERS Retirees, UNLV (Agenda Item #12) – The Board of Regents’ approved the request of UNLV President David B. Ashley for recertification of the following positions within the UNLV College of Education for which a critical labor shortage continues.
- Dr. Jerry Hughes, Associate Faculty-in-Residence, Sport Administration (*Ref. D on file in the Board office*);
  - Mr. Michael Robison, Associate Professor-in-Residence, Educational Leadership (*Ref. E on file in the Board office*);
  - Ms. Pamela Salazar, Assistant Dean/Associate Professor-in-Residence, Educational Leadership (*Ref. F on file in the Board office*).

6. Approved – Continuation of PERS Retirees, UNLV (Agenda Item #12) – (Cont'd.)

Dr. Christopher M. Brown II, Dean of the College of Education, UNLV, related that current policy requires reaffirmation by the Board every two years for those individuals retired from state employment, that are filling a critical work shortage for the state. The three employees being presented are the only three of such status within the College of Education. Dean Brown related that UNLV has the only physical education program offering baccalaureate degrees for licensure for teachers in the state of Nevada. Dr. Hughes is a key person in the Physical Education program. Mr. Robison and Ms. Salazar are part of the Educational Administration program and are the only two trained, experienced and formerly licensed superintendents in that program.

Regent Anthony entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked if new searches are being conducted every two years. He had a fundamental concern that this is an exception that has been expanded over the years and was a bad precedent to have set. Dean Brown stated that although he understands the concerns, not reaffirming these individuals at this point in time would be detrimental to the programs involved. He added that within one year the College of Education will be approaching its mandatory unit accreditation to be able to offer teacher, principal and superintendent degrees in the state of Nevada.

Regent Geddes understood why PERS retirees are rehired but asked why the Board requires reaffirmation every two years if a search or other interim steps are not taken to determine if a critical need is still present. President Ashley stated that they have heard this discussion from the Board before and are very sensitive to the concerns. Upon his request, the College of Education did perform a rigorous search process and both he and Provost Smatresk felt that an appropriate test of the marketplace had been conducted.

Regent Knecht asked what is the comparison for the College of Education's budget on the amount of compensation they have to pay to a PERS rehire versus what that person would be compensated during his or her last year before retirement. Regent Sisolak indicated that since the NSHE no longer makes PERS contributions for these individuals, there is a savings. He added that these retirees are rehired at their previous salary level and are not eligible for merit, but do receive COLA.

UNLV Provost Smatresk related that these PERS retirees are typically rehired at \$10,000 to \$20,000 below current market value. Regent Knecht asked how that was possible if the System always tries to pay market rates for faculty. Dean Brown replied that when rehired to fill critical shortage areas, the retirees are not hired back as permanent, tenured track faculty, and therefore have no right to pursue tenure which allows for the lower salary.

Regent Knecht stated that there is essentially two ways in which the System is saving. One is in being able to offer the below-market salary and the second is in the discontinuation of the PERS contribution for essentially the same person. From the rehire's perspective, they are receiving an income plus their retirement. He did not feel that there was a problem with this practice.

6. Approved – Continuation of PERS Retirees, UNLV (Agenda Item #12) – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Rogers agreed, adding that each individual had a vested right to receive their retirement income and their experience is very valuable to the System.

Regent Crear expressed his general concern for employment contracts that are initiated before Board approval is granted. Dean Brown stated these particular contracts were only extended until December 31, 2008, so that if not approved by the Board employment will only continue for a short time.

Provost Smatresk requested that since PERS benefits were not within UNLV's purview, their responses be confined to this specific hiring situation.

Regent Leavitt asked why the System did not engage in this practice more often. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich explained that there is a general statutory rule that this is not allowed. However, the Legislature did provide limited specific statutory authorization for the rehire of PERS retirees which is scheduled to expire on June 30, 2009, unless reapproved in the next session of the Legislature.

Regent Leavitt asked if it this could be considered for a permanent solution to increase opportunities and provide greater latitude to the campuses. Chair Wixom cautioned that this agenda item is to address the rehire of three specific individuals. A general discussion regarding PERS benefits can be placed on a future agenda.

Regent Geddes recently read a report on the number of faculty that will be retiring in the next few years. If the individuals choose to retire and the System rehires them back, it will just lead to further fiscal issues. He felt that each request, as well as the development of policies regarding the search process, needs to continue to be addressed by the Board.

Regent Sisolak requested that the Board receive a presentation from PERS to explain how the rehire process works, adding that if the specific authorization granted by the Legislature is beneficial then perhaps NSHE may want to lobby for re-approval.

Regent Rosenberg observed that the problem will eventually eliminate itself through attrition. He thought that the last time newly hired faculty from the universities or community colleges were allowed to participate in PERS was in approximately 1984.

Chair Wixom requested that the Board focus on the specific agenda item and that an analysis of the PERS benefits be placed on another agenda.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the rehire of the PERS retirees within the UNLV College of Education. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

7. Information Only – Handbook Revision, Extension of President’s Authority to Approve Employment Contracts for Law School Faculty (Agenda Item #15) - UNLV President David B. Ashley requested amendment of the NSHE Board of Regents *Handbook* (Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.4.2) to permit the UNLV president to offer contracts of employment with terms of up to five years to non-tenured faculty in the Boyd Law School after a minimum of three years of annual employment by such faculty. This is the first reading of a proposed NSHE Code amendment (*Ref. I on file in the Board office*).

President Ashley related that part of the motivation behind this request was for the purpose of accreditation and for certain types of ranking studies as well as to provide the faculty currently on three year contracts a more extended opportunity to be employed at UNLV.

Regent Whipple left the meeting.

Regent Knecht indicated that he was not yet convinced that those rankings were important enough to change NSHE’s policies and procedures. Dr. John White, Dean of the Boyd School of Law, UNLV, stated that this particular proposal primarily addresses how certain ranking organizations determine FTE. There are currently six faculty at the Law School that are in the three-year, faculty-in-residence status which count as .7 FTE. If those contracts were extended to five year contracts, they would be counted as one full FTE. Ten years ago when one year contracts were typical, UNLV was the standard setter in the country by offering three year contracts. Many schools now offer tenure and five year or seven year contracts.

Regent Knecht asked what significant benefit this proposal would have on the performance of the Law School in educating its students. Dean White replied that it would help to maintain the School’s competitiveness as well as aid in the retention and recruitment of faculty.

Regent Whipple entered the meeting.

Chancellor Rogers felt that rankings were very important because that is what draws the students to the institution. Recruiting better students results in a school’s ability to recruit better faculty and more students overall. With approximately 179 law schools in the entire country, rankings are watched very carefully.

Regent Sisolak felt that sometimes NSHE was committing to a greater contract length but that there may not be that commitment by the individual being hired. Dean White stated that people are free agents in that regard. He clarified that this would provide authority to the president to authorize a five year contract after the employee’s initial one year contract and probationary period, unless they were hired with much seniority and offered an initial five year contract which would then have to be brought to the Board for approval.

Regent Sisolak asked how many are not on tenure track after three years. Dean White stated that they do have a tenure track, but these are faculty-in-residence. This proposal will create an exception for the president to allow longer contracts for the faculty-in-residence at the law school.

7. Information Only – Handbook Revision, Extension of President’s Authority to Approve Employment Contracts for Law School Faculty (Agenda Item #15) – (Cont’d.)

Regent Crear asked if the proposed revision will allow President Ashley to approve five year contracts throughout the institution. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that this request very specifically applies to the Boyd School of Law and that a broader policy was not anticipated.

Chief Counsel Patterson clarified that the Board already authorizes all of the institution presidents to offer three year contracts to academic faculty members not on tenure track after they have been employed at the institution for three years. This revision allows the president of UNLV to offer faculty at the Boyd School of Law a five year contract instead of a three year contract.

Chair Wixom stated that the second reading of the proposed revision will be heard at the December Board meeting.

8. Approved – Delegation of Authority to Suspend or Reduce Operating Pool Disbursements (Agenda Item #26) - The Board of Regents approved delegation of authority to the Investment Committee to suspend or reduce disbursements to the campuses from the NSHE operating pool income, or to set forth conditions under which such disbursements would be suspended or reduced, if, in the discretion of the Committee, it is determined that market conditions or earnings warrant suspension or reduction of such disbursements.

Chair Wixom related that according to Board policy, the NSHE makes regular distributions from the reserve account assuming there are funds in that account to distribute. When the reserve account drops by a negative \$20 million, the distributions are automatically reduced from 3.5% to 1.8%. The question is should the System continue to make distributions of 1.8% when the account is in a negative status.

Ms. Ruby Camposano, Director of Banking and Investment, NSHE, related that as of the previous day, the account was down by \$18.1 million. Chair Wixom stated that the question before the Board was if it would be willing to extend authority to the Investment Committee to make some decisions as to whether those distributions should be terminated until the reserve account recovers.

Regent Sisolak observed that given this morning’s activity, the account may well have already reached that negative \$20 million status. He felt that the two issues are that distributions continue to be made and that there is a smaller balance in the account from which revenue can be earned. He questioned if once the account recovers, if the policy included an automatic trigger to return the distributions back to the 3.5% level.

Ms. Camposano indicated that she would not receive the NAV (*Net Asset Value*) until later that evening.

Regent Dondero asked what the repercussions would be if the disbursements were terminated. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the Board instituted the current investment policy to level the income distributed and to distribute it in such a

8. Approved – Delegation of Authority to Suspend or Reduce Operating Pool Disbursements (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

way that the principle value of the endowment is retained. If those distributions are suspended, it will be at a time when reductions in the institution's budgets from other sources are also being considered.

Regent Dondero asked if the distributed funds were earmarked for specific expenditures such as personnel. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the System does not have a policy that restricts or limits how those distributions are expended.

Chair Wixom asked if the disbursements were entirely discretionary. Ms. Camposano stated that the System gives its investment income to the State's general fund but how those funds are, in turn, allocated at the campus level is at the campus' discretion.

Regent Crear requested clarification of the account being down \$18 million or negative \$18 million. Regent Sisolak explained that if the endowment account started at \$100 million, a distribution is made to the campuses of 3.5% until that \$100 million drops by \$20 million. When that drop occurs, the distribution is reduced to 1.8%. Now the initial pool of \$100 million has decreased because the System continues to make the distributions even though that account has been losing 2%. Also, once the account drops by \$20 million, there is a trigger to reduce the distribution to 1.8% but there is not a trigger to move it back up to 3.5%.

Regent Crear asked if the question is if the Board wants to lower the distribution to 1.8%. Chair Wixom stated that under the Board's current policy, once this particular account is down by \$20 million, the distributions reduce from 3.5% to 1.8%. The concern is that continuing to allow distributions of even 1.8% will still create a drain on the account that will result in an even larger problem.

Chair Wixom asked when the distributions are scheduled to occur. Ms. Camposano replied that they are made on the third week of the following month, with the next distribution scheduled to occur the week of October 20, 2008. Chair Wixom asked if that distribution would be at 3.5%. Ms. Camposano stated it would be assuming that the level of loss does not reach \$20 million. If that occurred, the distribution would be reduced to 1.8%.

Regent Rosenberg expressed concern for the reduction in the initial amount of money from which revenues are generated.

Regent Knecht moved approval of delegating the authority to the Investment Committee to change the policy and practices.

Regent Knecht stated that he was comfortable in delegating this authority to the Investment Committee but he would request that the Board discuss some consideration of the System's investment policies on a future agenda. Chair Wixom agreed that particular discussion needed to be on a separate agenda.

Regent Whipple seconded.

8. Approved – Delegation of Authority to Suspend or Reduce Operating Pool Disbursements (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom stated that the manner in which this item was placed on this agenda does not allow the Board to terminate or alter the distributions in any way but to delegate its authority to the Investment Committee to address the issue.

Regent Geddes requested clarification of what specific authority the Board would be delegating to the Investment Committee. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated that the Investment Committee could suspend the distributions, lower the amount of distribution or set specific triggers. By delegating that authority, the Board would effectively amend its previous action to say that the Investment Committee may act in its discretion based on current market circumstances.

Regent Leavitt specified that once that authority is delegated to the Investment Committee, the Committee's actions will be reported to the full Board but no further Board action is necessary. Chief Counsel Patterson added that the Investment Committee already has substantial discretion to address these issues. Whatever decisions the Investment Committee makes will be reported and, if the Board would like to discuss those decisions, it may place that discussion on a future agenda.

Regent Knecht asked if the Investment Committee is delegated the authority to act, that would mean that when that Committee report is presented to the Board, the Board could raise or take exception to that action. Chief Counsel Patterson indicated that was correct, adding that if this motion is adopted, the action taken by the Investment Committee would be in effect until such time as the Board took further action. For example, if the Investment Committee were to suspend the 1.8% distribution, that would become effective immediately at the Investment Committee meeting. If subsequently, the Board placed a discussion on the agenda and took action to say it does not want to suspend the 1.8% distribution, then at that point it would no longer be suspended. However, during the interim period of time, the Investment Committee's action would be in effect.

Regent Geddes stated that by virtue of its placement on the Investment Committee report means it is placed on the agenda. Chief Counsel Patterson indicated it would unless the Board decided it wanted it placed separately on the agenda.

Regent Sisolak asked if this would create an additional Investment Committee meeting. Chair Wixom stated that he and Regent Dondero would work to coordinate that meeting to be posted within the next five days.

Regent Sisolak requested that the presidents be prepared to provide information on how the campuses currently budget these funds. Chair Wixom stated that he will place that particular Committee report on the next main Board agenda so that the Board may take whatever action it so chooses.

Regent Sisolak asked if the \$20 million was based on intra-day or end-of-day. Ms. Camposano stated that she receives the report based on end-of-day. Chair Wixom stated that ambiguity should also be addressed in the agenda item.

8. Approved – Delegation of Authority to Suspend or Reduce Operating Pool Disbursements (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked to receive an update from Ms. Camposano on the status of the account during the morning of the next day's meeting.

Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

9. Approved – Bank Financing for the Tropicana Parking Facility, UNLV (Agenda Item #7) –  
The Board of Regents approved the Budget & Finance Committee's recommendation to approve UNLV President David B. Ashley's request for a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education, on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to issue a 30-year fixed rate, tax exempt revenue bond in an amount to net \$13.5 million to finance the construction of the Tropicana parking structure (*Ref. BF-6 on file in the Board office*).

President Ashley reported that through the preferred vendor process, it was indicated that the impact on financing would be less than \$13 million, that the structure would be available before commencement of classes in the fall of 2009 and would yield a net of 975 spaces. He noted that parking is a critical long-term issue facing the campus and reminded the Regents that parking is a self-supporting activity and this project would be paid for through those revenues.

Regent Gallagher left the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked how many levels the proposed structure will have. Mr. Gerry Bomotti, Vice President of Finance and Administration, UNLV, stated that the proposal is for four levels, three of which are to be above ground.

Regent Sisolak asked if that was the maximum number of levels allowed. Mr. Bomotti stated that it was not, but when considering the location and the time it will take to fill and empty, they felt that four floors would be more appropriate. Regent Sisolak asked if the height would be approximately 35 feet and how much height was available. Mr. Bomotti indicated the height to be approximately 40 feet, and that to the west of the area restricted by the airport's flight path, the maximum available height would be 100 feet and the remaining area is negotiable.

Regent Sisolak asked if it would be beneficial to design the structure so that additional levels could be added and what the comparable cost difference would be. Mr. Bomotti replied that although it was possible, it would increase the cost of the proposed project. The campus was very concerned about the height of the structure as well as the time it will take to fill and empty not only for students, faculty and staff but also for activities at the events center. The second phase of this project will include a second four level garage to the south.

Regent Sisolak asked what the cost would be to build one eight level structure as opposed to two four level structures. Mr. Bomotti replied that he could not specifically answer that question, but the proposed plan was the best value based on the structure's location and their needs.



9. Approved – Bank Financing for the Tropicana Parking Facility, UNLV (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher entered the meeting.

Mr. Bomotti related that in the case of the existing Cottage Grove parking garage, the original four-level structure cost approximately \$15,000 per space. Two years after its initial construction, two additional levels were constructed for approximately \$13,500 per space. The proposed Tropicana parking garage is approximately \$12,900 per space. He noted that filling and emptying of the Cottage Grove garage at key times in the morning and afternoon is problematic.

Regent Rosenberg asked what affect this project will have on student parking fees. Mr. Bomotti replied that UNLV was projecting an approximate 10% increase in parking fees for the next few years for students, faculty and staff.

Regent Sisolak asked if non-students would be charged during events or if the students would bear the full cost. Mr. Bomotti estimated that the debt retirement for this bond is approximately \$915,000 to \$920,000 per year. Of that amount, the Thomas & Mack Center has committed approximately \$250,000 per year for which they will receive use of the structure within certain parameters.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the resolution.  
Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

10. Information Only – Fire Science Academy (FSA) Progress Report (Agenda Item #8) - UNR  
President Milton D. Glick provided a progress report on the Fire Science Academy as directed by the Board of Regents at the August 7-8, 2008, Board meeting.

President Glick reported that 24 different customers have joined the stakeholders group. To-date that group has held two all-member meetings and has created several teams to study different aspects of the target goal. The seven components being developed include an increase in tuition for the clients, a surcharge to be paid by the companies that use the facility, vendor/supplier sponsorship, collaborations and a consortium with Texas A&M as well as local/federal funding and corporate giving. They are also considering the possibility of a sale to the trade association or Texas A&M as well as alternative uses for the site. The stakeholders have not submitted a plan that President Glick was prepared to recommend to the Board. However, President Glick requested that the stakeholders be given until the December Board meeting to submit their plan, including his recommendation and options.

Regent Geddes asked if the commitments were sufficient enough to close the funding gap. President Glick indicated that although he could share the following proposals, they are not committed by the stakeholders, nor is he endorsing them. The proposals include a tuition increase over five years totaling approximately \$ 300,000, a surcharge of approximately \$1.3 million, vendor sponsorship of approximately \$500,000, collaborative partnerships of approximately \$300,000, state and local funding of

10. Information Only – Fire Science Academy (FSA) Progress Report (Agenda Item #8) – (Cont'd.)

approximately \$400,000, federal support of \$4.5 million and corporate giving of approximately \$500,000. If those proposals actually occur, that would create \$7.5 million that could be used to reduce the debt as long as none of that is designated as operating funds. Many of these numbers still need to be approved at the corporate level of the stakeholders. President Glick stated that his goal is for \$7.5 million in uncommitted money plus hold harmless.

Regent Geddes asked what Texas A&M is exploring. President Glick stated that UNR has proposed a sale to them. However, they do not see that as a solution but would rather form a consortium.

Regent Leavitt asked President Glick if the different stakeholders have been informed that time is of the essence. President Glick stated that UNR has conveyed that the final decision will be made at the December Board meeting. The stakeholders have been given a deadline of October 27, 2008, to submit their best and final offer.

Regent Leavitt asked if that proposal could be distributed to the Board members within 24-hours of receipt. President Glick related that he had planned to include the proposal with the December meeting materials but, upon the Board's request, could provide it as soon as possible.

Regent Sisolak noted that \$4.5 million of the proposed funds were from the federal government and asked which of the stakeholders has guaranteed those funds. President Glick replied that although he did not know, he has told the stakeholders that federal funds without a guarantee will not be acceptable.

Regent Sisolak asked how federal funds could be guaranteed. President Glick related that a guarantee could be in the form of a single appropriation that is paid over five years. However, it may not be realistic to secure that guarantee by December.

Regent Rosenberg asked that the proposal be sent to the Regents as soon as possible and that President Glick's recommendation be submitted with it.

Regent Schofield left the meeting.

Regent Gallagher related that Texas A&M and other institutions interested in receiving federal funds through homeland security are forming a consortium to apply for those funds. President Glick indicated that the stakeholders have taken this very seriously and have come to realize that the situation is very real. They do not want this facility to close, primarily because they do not want to create a single vendor situation.

Regent Dondero asked if the potential source of federal funds was from the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act. President Glick indicated that was not the case, adding that only the federal government could appropriate those funds.

10. Information Only – Fire Science Academy (FSA) Progress Report (Agenda Item #8) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Anthony requested clarification that President Glick's goal in December is to report to the Board that \$7.5 million has been proposed above the cost of operating. He asked if that level of funding was not achieved, would alternative plans be proposed. President Glick indicated that in December, he plans on laying out all the options that may include closure or alternative uses and making a preferred recommendation to the Board.

Regent Gallagher related that Texas A&M is very concerned that the Elko facility not close. Mr. Ron Zurek, Vice President of Administration and Finance, UNR, added that the partnership arrangement being considered with Texas A&M includes a potential lease agreement that would allow Texas A&M to offer training in certain climate conditions that cannot be offered in their region. Texas A&M can offer certain certifications to their students that the Elko facility does not currently offer that could be offered under the collaboration.

President Glick stated that he has been very direct with the stakeholders. He thanked Mr. Zurek and Ms. Denise Backlawski, Executive Director of the Fire Science Academy, UNR, for their efforts in trying to find solutions that meet the established target. UNR's goal is to find a way to keep the facility open and to deal with as much of the operating deficit as possible. The long term goal would be to find a way to remove the burden of the capital debt from student fees.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked what percentage of students access the facility via commercial air traffic from Elko and if reduction of those flights would further impact the ability of the students to access the facility. President Glick stated that at one time there were flights from Las Vegas and Reno directly to Elko, now the only air service is from Salt Lake City. Mr. Zurek related that the issue of airlines is not on the list of major concerns. Regent Sisolak stated his concern was for the available capacity to fly students to Elko. Mr. Zurek replied that when there are capacity issues, the students fly into Salt Lake City and then take a bus to Elko.

Chair Wixom stated that no one is questioning the quality of the institution or the good faith of the stakeholders. What is being questioned is the facility's ongoing viability. It is important that the stakeholders come forward with a viable plan that can be acted upon at the December meeting.

11. Information Only – Non-Traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners (Agenda Item #9) – Dr. Ann McDonough, UNLV Dean of University College and Academic Success Center and Professor and Director of Gerontology, and Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presented to the Board an update on Non-traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners. This two-year grant includes all NSHE institutions and is led by Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and funded by the Lumina Foundation. Nevada is one of three states selected to participate, and institutional leaders will focus on strategies to increase college degree attainment for Nevada's adult learners (Ref. A on file in the Board office).

11. Information Only – Non-Traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners  
*(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that the purpose of this grant was to identify and reach out to those individuals that are in good standing but have dropped out of one of the four-year institutions with 90 or more credits or from a community college with 30 or more credits and that have not gone on to other colleges in the country. Data from the community colleges for the previous five years and universities for the previous ten years, for students between the ages of 25 and 65, revealed that there are currently over 21,000 adults residing in Nevada that meet that characteristic. She emphasized that those are students that could complete their degrees in one year's time.

Dr. McDonough thanked Vice Chancellor Nichols for identifying this grant opportunity and mobilizing all seven NSHE teaching institutions for a common good. Dean McDonough related that the southern institutions are working on a pilot project that involves thousands of City of Las Vegas firefighters that want to return to college and earn their degrees. That pilot group will allow CSN, NSC and UNLV to identify user-friendly existing degree pathways for these students to finish their degrees. The outcomes of that group will be assessed and expanded to other adult learners.

Regent Schofield thanked Dean McDonough for her efforts. He related that he has visited UNLV's Academic Success Center several times with family members and that office does everything possible to accommodate and help the students.

Chair Wixom asked Vice Chancellor Nichols if the 21,000 individuals identified were statewide or just within Clark County and how those individuals were identified. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that they were statewide. Through NSHE's database, they were able to identify those students that had been enrolled in the last five or ten years but not taken a class in the last year. That list was then checked with the National Clearinghouse to make sure those students had not enrolled in another institution and then the list was pared down to only those students who had dropped out with a 2.0 or higher and did not have a financial lien on their record. Those names have been distributed to the institution that was last attended and those institutions are compiling current contact information.

Chair Wixom asked if there was a realistic way to reach out to individuals that may have begun, but not completed, their education in another state but currently reside in Nevada. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that in addition to encouraging those 21,000 identified students to complete their degrees, the purpose of this project is really a broad policy-based study with the eventual outcome that the System needs to take a serious look at why the students had dropped out and why they have not returned. She anticipated that various barriers would be revealed. From those outcomes, the System can aggressively create a campaign to reach out beyond the 21,000 students identified to all college ready adults within the state.

Chair Wixom felt that those students identified would have a great deal of information that the System wants in regards to what it is doing right or wrong and ways in which it could be more effective. He noted that there are two market groups, the System's former students and other individuals. Our focus should be on the System's former

11. Information Only – Non-Traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners  
(*Agenda Item #9*) – (*Cont'd.*)

students. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that they are not excluding either type of student but are focusing on those individuals that can be reached within an identifiable group.

Chair Wixom related that approximately one year ago, he and Chancellor Rogers met with the K-12 superintendents. At that meeting, he heard a uniform request for more assistance for teachers and administrators to seek advanced degrees.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich asked if this grant also looks at potential policies at the institutions which might be barriers. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that it would, adding that there are many successful policies but that some just do not fit this group.

Vice Chancellor Nichols has met with the faculty senate chairs to alert them that the faculty may be requesting exceptions for this particular category of student. She emphasized that the intention is not to lower standards, but rather to remove artificial barriers if the learning outcomes are the same.

Dr. McDonough added that the method and timing of course delivery is challenging for many adult learners. For example, firefighters are on 24-hour shifts for a certain number of days per week. They are working with Dr. Richard Lee, Vice Provost of Educational Outreach, UNLV, to identify blended learning ecologies.

Regent Rosenberg asked if the deans could make exceptions for unique situations. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that there needs to be one particular person for the point of contact that understands the flexibility needed for these adults and can work to get them through. If it is understood that an exception can be made for something that is not significant, it will more likely result in that student's success.

Chair Wixom observed that when dealing with particular groups of students, inter-institutional cooperation may be helpful and asked if those efforts were in place. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that UNR and TMCC have formed a partnership. However, due to the geography involved, GBC and WNC will be operating individually. In the south, there is a very exciting partnership between CSN, NSC and UNLV.

Dean McDonough stated that the southern institutions are working on developing a close partnership. There are also a number of benchmark meetings that are required by the grant. For instance, there is a videoconference scheduled for the following week with roughly sixty participants across peer institutions. There have been some large and difficult issues to overcome such as how the firefighters with paramedic certificates can obtain credit for that certification.

Chair Wixom related that the student services module of the iNtegrate project could facilitate the kinds of services that will be needed for this project. Ms. Robyn Render, iNtegrate Project Director, NSHE, stated that integration between the requirements for the adult learners and the services within the System will come together as the system is designed. It is a little early to address this level of detail but they are aware of the need. Chair Wixom asked that this remain high on the priority list as the two projects are a natural fit for each other.

11. Information Only – Non-Traditional No More: Policy Solutions for Adult Learners  
(*Agenda Item #9*) – (*Cont'd.*)

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich added that Vice Chancellor Nichols has assigned almost one full person from her staff to track the meetings and collaborations involved.

12. Approved – Prepaid Tuition Students and NSHE Summer School (*Agenda Item #10*) - The Board of Regents considered a request from the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada to clarify the basic summer school fee to be covered under the Nevada Prepaid Tuition Program. The Board approved the option to have the institutions absorb the differential in cost between summer school and regular semester tuition (*Ref. B on file in the Board office*).

Regent Schofield left the meeting.

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that on behalf of Chancellor Rogers, she sits on the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada. The Nevada Prepaid Tuition Program is a Section 529 qualified tuition program, in which basic college fees can be purchased before a child reaches college age. There are currently over 10,000 plans that have been purchased by Nevadans. When a pre-paid tuition plan is purchased, it is similar to purchasing an insurance plan that guarantees, once the child reaches college-going age, their basic tuition fee will be paid by the Plan. The types of plans available include a community college plan for two years at the community college rate, a two-year community college two year university plan at that rate or a four-year university plan at that rate. The cost of each plan is based upon a prediction for what the basic fee per credit (*60 credits for a two year plan and 120 credits for a four year pan*) will be at a NSHE institution as set by the Board of Regents. It is also transferable to an out of state or non-NSHE institution at the same rate as set by the Board of Regents.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that an issue has arisen over the cost of summer tuition. Since the state of Nevada does not support the basic cost of instruction for summer school, NSHE institutions come to the Board of Regents and set their own basic fee for the cost of providing summer school, which may be the same or higher than the fall or spring semester fee. For the past few years, UNR and UNLV have set their basic summer fee at different rates. Therefore, the College Board does not know which rate to pay. There are two potential solutions, one is that for Nevada Prepaid Tuition Program students only, the colleges and universities accept the basic fall/spring fee with no additional cost (*Option 2*). The other option would be that the pre-paid tuition pays the basic rate and the student pays the difference which would then appear on their statement as a summer surcharge (*Option 1*). According to the data for the last two summers, the impact falls most heavily on the universities with a total loss of \$9,000 (*approximately \$7,000 for UNLV and \$2,000 for UNR*). She related that it was important to find a better way to define this at this particular meeting because the actuarial for the plans being purchased now have to be determined very soon. She also felt that everything should be done to support and promote this program as it increases the college going rate in Nevada.

12. Approved – Prepaid Tuition Students and NSHE Summer School (Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Wixom sought clarification that there are two proposals for the Board's consideration. One proposal is for the institutions to absorb the difference between the cost of regular semester and summer semester tuition and the second proposal is for the students to pay the difference. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that was correct.

Regent Geddes asked if this will apply to plans purchased going forward or to plans that have already been purchased. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that the proposal before the Board today will apply to all current plans as well as those going forward.

Regent Geddes disclosed that he is a current participant in the 529 Savings Plan. He felt that perhaps changing the fees after the plans had been purchased places uneasiness in the program. He supports the first option presented but asked what the alternative would be if nothing is done and the actuaries are set. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that if neither option is approved by the Board of Regents', the Board of Trustees of the College Savings Plans of Nevada will provide a solution.

Regent Geddes stated that there are two plans, the Nevada Pre-Paid Tuition Plan and the 529 Savings Plan. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that this request only applies to the Nevada Pre-Paid Tuition Plan.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

Regent Anthony asked why the Board of Trustees for the College Savings Plans of Nevada was not making this decision. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the board sought the Board of Regents' clarification before it makes a determination. Regent Anthony expressed concern that it would be unfair to make those students, for which a plan has already been purchased, pay the difference.

Regent Crear entered the meeting.

President Ashley felt that the small amount of tuition that UNLV would lose (\$7,000) could be absorbed by the institution.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the option to have the institutions absorb the differential in cost between summer school and regular semester tuition. Regent Geddes seconded.

Regent Rosenberg stated that he could support the option that the students pay the difference only because he felt the institutions could not afford to lose any more money.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern that these plans had been purchased with the understanding that it would pay for the full cost and now it is apparent it will not. He felt the reputation of the program would be impacted.

12. Approved – Prepaid Tuition Students and NSHE Summer School (Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg asked if there was a middle ground that only those plans purchased going forward would be affected. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that part of the problem is that the plan contract states it will pay for an out-of-state institution at the same rate as the in-state university rate for summer school but there is not a specific summer school rate since UNLV and UNR set their own. This decision is to clarify and keep good faith with the students that do attend in-state institutions as well as out-of-state students.

President Glick stated that UNR would also be able to absorb the difference in cost.

Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

The meeting recessed at 3:45 p.m. and reconvened at 4:01 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 2008, with all members present except Regents Alden, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple

13. Approved – Employment Contract, Head Softball Coach, UNR (Agenda Item #11) - UNR  
President Milton D. Glick requested approval of a five-year employment contract for Matthew Meuchel as Head Softball Coach, effective July 1, 2008, at a base salary of \$70,000 annually plus compensation benefits up to 50% of his monthly base salary per round for post-season play and an additional \$1,000 for winning Conference Coach of the Year, and a courtesy car, including all associated registration fees (*Ref. C on file in the Board office*).

Regent Crear moved approval of the employment agreement for UNR's Head Softball Coach.  
Regent Anthony seconded. Motion carried.  
Regents Alden, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

14. Approved – Hire of PERS Retiree, UNR (Agenda Item #13) - UNR  
President Milton D. Glick requested approval of the hire of Walter Nicks, PERS retiree, by the Nevada Seismological Laboratory, University of Nevada, Reno (*Ref. G on file in the Board office*).

Regent Geddes moved approval of the hire of PERS retiree for the Nevada Seismological Laboratory, UNR. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.  
Regents Alden, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.



15. Approved - Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNR (Agenda Item #14) - UNR President Milton D. Glick requested approval of amendments to the Bylaws of the University of Nevada, Reno, including the renumbering of the bylaws, revisions to the general bylaws and provisions governing grievance committees, evaluations and application for tenure and promotion (*Title 5, Chapter 7*) (*Ref. H on file in the Board office*).

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the requested revision to NSHE *Handbook*, UNR Bylaws, Title 5, Chapter 7. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

16. Approved – Handbook Revision, Tenured Faculty Evaluations – (Agenda Item #16) - UNLV President David B. Ashley requested approval of revisions to the NSHE Code (*Title 2, Section 5.12.2*) to allow each institution to utilize either a four-tiered or two-tiered evaluation of tenured faculty as well as a narrative every three years if applicable. Pursuant to discussion after the August Board of Regents' meeting, a provision was added to address the preparation of the three year narrative progress assessments. This was the second and final reading of a change to the NSHE Code (*Title 2, Section 5.12.2*) (*Ref. J on file in the Board office*).

Regent Geddes asked what impact an unsatisfactory mark would have on the faculty member's next evaluation and what process is in place to help them achieve a level of satisfactory. Dr. Nasser Daneshvary, Faculty Senate Chair, UNLV, replied that if a rating of unsatisfactory is received, the evaluation will include reasons and remedies to achieve satisfactory upon the next review.

Regent Geddes asked what would occur after receiving two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings. Dr. Daneshvary replied that in that event, a review will be conducted by a committee of the faculty member's peers.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the revision to the NSHE Code (*Title 2, Section 5.12.2*). Regent Dondero seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Schofield, Sisolak and Whipple were absent.

The meeting recessed at 4:15 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 2008, and reconvened at 8:01 a.m. on Friday, October 3, 2008, with all members present except Regents Anthony and Sisolak.

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) - The Board discussed the 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget Request that was submitted to the Governor. The Regents, institutional presidents and staff discussed various options for the development of future contingency plans in the event that the 2009-2011 NSHE budget as submitted is not fully funded. The Board approved the Chair's recommendation that the Chair, Chancellor Rogers and Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich will have discussions with the Governor's office regarding the short term process, about being responsive about the information already provided and how to

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)

submit the information to the Governor's office in a way that it can be useable for them as they prepare their budget, without specific levels, but rather in general terms, so that they can meet their responsibilities. Secondly, an agenda item will be crafted for the December meeting to address general policy and general revenue discussions that would provide some guidance to the presidents within the System. It would not include specific dollar levels of cuts.

Chair Wixom related that through his discussions with each of the presidents, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, he has determined that there are really two separate issues. The first issue is short-term and is in regards to the process in which the budget is submitted. The second issue is procedural and relates to how the System actually implements the budget cuts as they are announced by the Governor's office. With respect to the short-term process issues, he is encouraged by the System's discussions with the Governor's office that occurred earlier that week. In regards to the ongoing procedural issues, Chair Wixom related that although the presidents are dealing with something of a moving target, they are planning in the most constructive way possible.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Regent Leavitt felt this discussion was unnecessary as there is a great deal of time between now and the legislative session in which planning is taking place and there are ongoing discussions between the System and the Governor's office.

Regent Knecht stated that the Governor has a constitutional obligation to submit a balanced budget to the Legislature. When the estimates from the Economic Forum become available in early December, the budget submissions provided by every state department will be reviewed. If NSHE does not submit a reduced budget, his understanding is that the Budget office will take the business-as-usual budget and reduce it as necessary. The problem then is that when that budget is forwarded to the Legislature, the accompanying detail and backup will not have been modified to reflect the changes made by the Budget office. When the legislative session begins, the decisions made by the money committees will be affected by the inconsistent details and backup materials. He understands the concept of shared governance and appreciates the process that the institutions have to go through. That level of consultation and decision making cannot occur overnight. However, he felt that the type of single-digit budget cuts made to-date could be done without much process. Going forward, if and when additional and larger cuts are requested, those decisions will be much more painful and will require much more process and consultation. He was aware that the institutions are preparing contingency plans out of necessity, which he had expected them to do. He felt that if the System was able to submit a reduced budget after the December Board meeting, whatever inconsistencies are contained within the backup materials will not be held against the System as they would be if there was the perception that the System is not complying with the request for a reduced budget. He felt that the institutions need to provide a range of contingency plans to be considered by the Board at the December meeting ranging from single digit to approximately 18 percent reductions. At the higher level, he understands that the contingency plans brought forward would not be detailed but rather conceptual in nature. However, on the lower end, the contingency plans

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)

should be fairly specific and concrete in detail and involve policies if in fact they include program cuts. Those program cuts would not need to be specified and could be characterized as undetermined. In his opinion, those actions would reflect that the Regents have done everything possible to comply with the Governor's request. He would support that the institutions and System staff be directed to bring a range of contingency plans before the Board in December.

Chair Wixom related that one of the points discussed between Chancellor Rogers and the Governor's office was how to respond and what information was necessary. One of the understandings was that much of the information that the Governor requires had already been submitted in the Chancellor's memorandums. Through continued discussions with the Governor's office, that idea will be explored further. Regent Knecht expressed concern that the Chancellor's memorandums will not meet the level of detail and information needed by the legislative committees.

Regent Alden stated that pursuant to the Nevada Revised Statutes, the Board of Regents is an autonomous board that has three duties including to act as a Board of Directors to administer the System, submit a budget to the Legislature and to set policy. Since the Board of Regents is not the funding authority, it is charged with submitting a budget that will meet the needs of higher education. That is different than what the Governor's charge is. The Board has met its obligation and set a budget for the needs of the System. The only area of difference that he has with the process is for the rule of "spend it or lose it" and for the setting of administrative salaries.

Regent Rosenberg did not recall the Governor's office specifying how the requested cuts were to be made, adding that the presidents need to be left to do their jobs. He commended President Glick for listening to the faculty. The Board has done its best to protect the students and the programs that those students will need. The Governor also has to have a certain amount of faith in the System and to provide a specific number from which the System can respond. Planning is being done and the Chancellor's memorandums do provide information on where the System is going and what may happen.

Regent Geddes requested that the campuses prepare for all potential scenarios for reductions between 5% and 20%. The Governor has a responsibility to submit a balanced budget and, once he releases a specific number, the Board will provide direction to the campus presidents who will then respond. Through that process the System has met its constitutional obligation and will continue to do so.

Regent Geddes asked that a more general discussion of the System's priorities occur at the December Board meeting. He felt that the majority of the decision making needed to be left to the presidents but he wanted to make sure that those decisions were being made based on the direction of the Board.

Regent Sisolak asked exactly what the System's constitutional responsibility is. Chancellor Rogers related that Article II, Section 6 of the constitution of the State of Nevada contains a mandate that the state will fund common education and higher education. He related that in the state of Florida, the legislature had interpreted that an

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)  
adequate level of funding for education was a minimum amount, to which the Florida State Supreme Court ordered that the minimum amount was not adequate and ordered the governor and legislature to adequately fund education or face penalties. Any one person can retain the services of an attorney to bring a suit on their behalf, and those in a similar situation, against the legislature to adequately fund education.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich added that the case of King vs. Board of Regents indicates, within the limitation of taxing authority, that the exclusive control for the decisions with respect to financial matters rests with the Board of Regents subject only to the ability of the state to make laws of general application which can overlay it.

Chair Wixom stated that in response to the valid points raised by both Regents Knecht and Geddes, he felt the question of if the memorandums contained an adequate level of detail needed to be further discussed with the Governor's office. In response to the level of detail needed for the legislative process, based on what is being done institutionally, he felt the System should be able to respond to legislative questions based upon what is being done now. Chancellor Rogers agreed, adding that the Governor's office has indicated concern that if a final number is provided at the last minute, that the System be able to immediately present a plan. He has assured them that the System will be able to quickly respond to a request for a specific reduction. He felt that Regent Knecht's request was just not reasonable at this time.

Chair Wixom asked Regent Geddes if his concerns could be addressed through a general policy discussion as opposed to a specific benchmark discussion. Regent Geddes stated that it would, adding that it should be more of a discussion from the Board as to what the overall policy should be, not so much a discussion on the details to be critiqued by the Board.

Chair Wixom asked if Regent Geddes is requesting a general policy discussion to provide guidance to the presidents as they move through their planning process. Regent Geddes indicated that he was and added that he wanted to make sure that the decisions made by the presidents are consistent with the authority and policy direction provided by the Board.

Chair Wixom asked Regent Knecht if through discussion with the Governor's office it is determined that the Chancellor's memorandums provide the information needed and the System would be ready to discuss specific detail during the legislative session, would that satisfy his concern. Regent Knecht stated that it may. His concern is if the System does not have enough consultation or provide enough detail, the Budget office will make their best effort with what they have been provided. He felt that some of the legislators will be asking why the NSHE was not able to comply with the Governor's request as other departments had. The explanation is that the System has a process and does not have the opportunity that the other departments have in a head position that could issue a control and command order to comply. He clarified that he does understand that contingency planning is taking place on the campuses and he is assuming that the information and the detail is also being developed. If the System is communicating that information to the Governor's office then it will help solve the

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)

problem. However, to the extent that the level of reduction goes beyond single digits, the System will have to, at a minimum, make a decision whether that is done across the board or strategically. That, in his mind, is a policy decision that this Board needs to make and make with full information as to what the options are and what the campuses will do with various levels of cuts. He felt there needed to be two levels of potential reduction for consideration in order for the Board to make an informed decision in December.

Regent Geddes felt that the NSHE was different than other agencies in that it has an elected Board with constitutional responsibilities and is not a division of the Executive branch. That responsibility needs to be taken very seriously. He noted that some of the processes currently in place tend to be time consuming in terms of gathering information and bringing that information forward. He asked that System staff begin to prepare information on those policies that the Board needs to address so that action can be taken. For example, he cited the policy for the trailing three year WICHE average that may no longer be appropriate going forward.

Chancellor Rogers felt it was essential that the System be able to negotiate from the broadest arena possible. To set limitations at this time would be a mistake. He would like the negotiating team to have as much flexibility and authority as the Board feels comfortable conveying and promised that they would not make a decision or bind the Board before reporting all of the facts to the Board.

Regent Dondero asked if the Regents could be provided a priority list to be referenced when considering the budget reductions. Chancellor Rogers indicated that such a list could be infinite until the final number is known.

Regent Whipple agreed with Regent Dondero, adding that a list of the top 10 issues would be helpful. He asked Regent Geddes for more specificity as to how he felt this should be handled. Regent Geddes replied that he is not questioning what is being done by the presidents or Chancellor. He wanted an opportunity for the Board to reiterate and reaffirm what its priorities are and understood what the Chancellor was requesting in terms of flexibility. He felt that this situation will not end with the current budget crisis, adding that the System's processes needed to be long-term and not just applicable to this biennium.

Regent Whipple asked if Regent Geddes' concern was that this be a priority for this and future biennia, including the process of expenditures and revenues. Regent Geddes responded that was accurate, noting the situation with tuition should perhaps be addressed sooner rather than later. Regent Whipple agreed and asked if discussion regarding the generation of revenue as well as expenditures should be added to the agenda for the December meeting. Regent Geddes indicated that discussion should not necessarily include specific amounts but rather a summary of what policies are in place, what options are available and what the Board should be looking at in terms of policies to provide the greatest flexibility. Regent Whipple requested that the anticipated agenda item for the December meeting be crafted in a manner general enough to allow for discussion of the matters raised by Regent Geddes.

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher felt that the Board could not ask the presidents to plan for something specific without knowing what the specific reduction will be. The Board must be very careful not to request actions that will leave the institutions in a position that will be difficult for them to recover from, and this must include taking into consideration the morale of the faculty and staff.

Regent Schofield felt that the Regents need to support the Chancellor in his efforts. NSHE is unique in that it has a Chancellor that knows the political system and has the resources necessary to move forward. He agreed with Regent Dondero's request to set a list of priorities.

Regent Whipple stated that the Chancellor can only do what the Board directs him to do, adding that he was not sure if the Chancellor should know what the Board's priorities are if the Board itself is not clear. In response to Regent Gallagher, he indicated that he certainly was not suggesting that the Regents should direct the presidents to start identifying where the cuts will take place. He would like to hear input from the other Regents regarding the Board's priorities before decisions are made.

Chair Wixom sought the Board's support in continuing discussions with the Governor's office regarding the information that the System needs to present so that office can fulfill their obligations while also fulfilling the obligations of the Board within the parameters of its duty as a separate constitutional body. Then, from a long-term perspective, an agenda item could be included for the December Board meeting to discuss general priorities of the Board, broad revenue issues and general planning issues with the understanding that the general outcome of the discussion would not be at specific levels that would create issues for the respective institutions but would be at a level that would provide them with general policy guidance.

Regent Gallagher agreed with Chair Wixom's approach.

Regent Knecht asked what essentially would be noticed as the range of the discussion and possible action for the December meeting and what information would come before the Board from the institutions and System staff. Chair Wixom stated that he envisions this particular agenda item as not having the level of detail that Regent Knecht has referred to but a more general discussion of the general priorities of the Board, with the understanding that some of those discussion will take time to accomplish.

Regent Gallagher observed that by the December Board meeting, the continuing discussions between the System and the Governor's office will have taken place and will allow for a better idea of what information is needed.

Regent Sisolak asked if there was a motion on the floor. Chair Wixom clarified that a motion had not been formally made.

Regent Knecht stated that he understood very well the process and legal limitations faced by the System staff and presidents in planning for the situation. However, he had been very clear that on the single digit level he felt there are things that could be done that do

17. Approved – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)

not require that much process and do not have as much legal constraint placed upon them. He felt he was also very clear that on the higher, double-digit level, he is not looking for specific information but rather conceptual information in order to make informed policy and priority decisions.

Regent Leavitt stated that he was completely satisfied that Chair Wixom will draft the agenda language appropriately. He was not sure a motion or wide agreement was necessary that day.

Regent Sisolak moved to accept the Chair's recommendations and to draft language to allow for a broad discussion at the December meeting. Regent Crear seconded.

Regent Knecht requested to have the motion restated. Chair Wixom restated that the course of action would be that he, Chancellor Rogers and Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich will have discussions with the Governor's office regarding the short term process, about being responsive about the information already provided and how to submit the information to the Governor's office in a way that it can be useable for them as they prepare their budget, without specific levels, but rather in general terms, so that they can meet their responsibilities. Secondly, an agenda item will be crafted for the December meeting to address general policy and general revenue discussions that would provide some guidance to the presidents within the System. It would not include specific dollar levels of cuts and it would not be at the levels of specificity that Regent Knecht has mentioned.

Regent Sisolak confirmed that his motion entailed this course of action.

Regent Schofield expressed his concern that the Board leaves Chancellor Rogers enough flexibility to conduct successful negotiations.

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

8. Approved – Delegation of Authority to Suspend or Reduce Operating Pool Disbursements (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Ms. Camposano reported that the previous day's end-of-day operating reserve account balance was down \$21.1 million.

Chair Wixom stated that he and Regent Dondero will begin working with System staff to schedule an Investment Committee meeting for the following week. Regent Sisolak requested that the presidents be present at that meeting.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

18. Information Only – Handbook Revision, Committee Consolidation Proposal (Agenda Item #17) - This proposal was brought forward for discussion and consideration by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Regents as a result of conversations and trends occurring within the Nevada System of Higher Education relating to the necessity to examine all possible avenues of efficiency and cost savings. An important part of this process is to consider combining the duties of some of the eight existing standing committees and one long term non-standing ad hoc committee (*the Technology Committee*). This proposal would amend the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Title 1, Article VI, Section 3, to reduce the number of committees to six standing committees. The six standing committees would be the Cultural Diversity Committee, the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee, the Audit Committee, the Business and Finance Committee, the Investment and Facilities Committee, and the Health Sciences System Committee. This was the first reading of a revision to the Board of Regents' Bylaws. Amendments to the Bylaws must be approved by not less than two-thirds of the members of the Board (*Ref. K on file in the Board office*).

Chair Wixom felt that although these efforts would result in further cost reduction and streamlined operations, his primary concern is that committee meetings present enormous challenges for the Regents, presidents and staff. He also recognized the need to balance that with the Regents' obligations and responsibilities while making sure the Board does not become ineffective in their effort to become more efficient.

President Wells appreciated the Board's attempt to become more efficient and requested that, in addition to reducing the number of committees, the Board also consider reducing the number of committee meetings to four per year.

Regent Schofield expressed his immense support for research involving renewable energy. He would support the proposed consolidation so far as the long-range goals do not become neglected. He felt that Nevada could gain world-wide benefit through its potential resources in solar, wind and geo-thermal energy.

Regent Whipple felt that it was very appropriate that this Board recognize the current fiscal environment and complimented Chair Wixom for his drive to reduce expenses. He related that during his tenure as Board Chair he had attended an Arizona Board of Regents' meeting. He stated that one of the highlights of his visit was learning the amount of funding their research programs bring to that system. That was the genesis for creating the Research and Economic Development Committee. However, he recognized that since the conception of that committee the research funds generated have not been consistent. He agreed with Regent Schofield and shared his passion for the potential competitive advantages available in the state of Nevada. He also does not want to lose site of the overall goal and emphasized that the System needs to diversify its sources of additional funding.

Regent Whipple stated that a Technology Committee meeting had not been held since the initiation of the iNtegrate implementation process. Although he agreed with the need to consolidate committees he expressed concern for that project's follow-through process. Additionally, he was concerned that the Technology Committee differs from other committees as its bylaws state that the Chair of the Technology Committee also sits on its oversight committee that oversees the iNtegrate projects implementation. He



18. Information Only – Handbook Revision, Committee Consolidation Proposal (Agenda Item #17) – (Cont'd.)

asked that consolidation of the Technology Committee be delayed for six months to allow more time for the project's implementation to become more established. During that time, he would not call any meetings or spend any money if it was not absolutely necessary.

Regent Geddes asked if it was possible to assign a Regent or two to the oversight committee without having the full Technology Committee and they could report back to the Board. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the internal appointment geared towards a committee chairmanship was over-looked. If this recommendation goes forward, the proposed revision would need to be changed to reflect that appointment.

Regent Geddes felt that it would be worthwhile to consider quarterly meetings with the possible exception of the Investment Committee. He stated that the Investment Committee may need to meet monthly through the end of the year. He shared some of the same concerns as Regent Schofield that the details may be lost. He felt there was a potential for the Student and Academic Affairs Committee to become too burdensome with the added research component. He proposed that perhaps the committees be reorganized into the Academic and Research Committee and a Cultural Diversity and Student Affairs Committee. He felt that would provide for a better balance of workload, time commitments and common missions.

Regent Gallagher supported the plan but suggested that the previous practice of providing quarterly reports be reinstated to help address the various concerns. She agreed with Regent Geddes that the Student and Academic Affairs Committee is already overloaded. She related that many times ad hoc committees suddenly become permanent committees until the Board becomes overwhelmed. She felt the Health Sciences System Committee would no longer be needed in another twelve to eighteen months. She agreed that there were too many committee meetings. However, she felt that quarterly meetings would not allow enough time for the Board to properly address its business.

Regent Schofield felt that technology could not afford to be neglected. He asked the Board to consider combining technology and research into one committee. Chair Wixom clarified that research and technology were not being abandoned but merged into different committees.

Regent Crear felt that if the System was serious about having cultural diversity as one of its core values then it needed to remain a standing committee. He noted that cultural diversity is listed as one of UNR and DRI's core values. Other than the Chancellor's unofficial diversity program, there is no other formalized and official means of dealing with cultural diversity issues within the System. He felt it was extremely valuable to maintain the integrity of the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee, although he was not certain why it had been diluted with the security issues. He felt that as a corporate entity, the NSHE has many diversity issues that need to be addressed so that the System can be a leader and true to what it says is one of its core values. He

18. Information Only – Handbook Revision, Committee Consolidation Proposal (Agenda Item #17) – (Cont'd.)

understood the need to accept these changes due to a time and resources commitment. However, he felt that the Regents committed to the time involved when they were elected to serve on this Board.

Regent Leavitt thanked Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich, Vice Chancellor Nichols, and Chief Executive Officer of the Board Wasserman for their hard work on this Board Development action. He related that this proposal was specifically brought forward at this time due to the pending changes that will take place with the 2008 election cycle. He indicated that the implementation date was scheduled for July 2009. The proposal also includes changes to the Board Development Committee in that the Committee would be merged with the Board and governed by the Chair and Vice Chair, which he felt was an outstanding and appropriate suggestion. He stated that every standing committee proposed to be restructured was for the sake of efficiency with no intension to underscore the importance of the issues. He felt that a discussion regarding the number of meetings to be held each year should be placed on another agenda.

Regent Knecht did not feel that there should be a trade-off between efficiency and effectiveness. After consulting with many individuals, he felt the solution was to have four committees that meet at each Board meeting. He also suggested folding the Investment Committee in with the Budget and Finance Committee.

Regent Whipple asked Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich to elaborate on recent contractual developments with a software vendor. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich explained that the System was recently informed that the software vendor for the current student information services software (*INFORMS*) will be suspending support and maintenance in 2010. This reinforces the wisdom of the Board to move forward with the iNtegrate project at this time.

Regent Whipple asked when the iNtegrate project will be fully implemented. Ms. Render replied that the orientation for the first series of institutions is scheduled for the Fall of 2010. The second series is scheduled to occur in the Fall of 2011. The reason that the suspension of the current student information system is not directly impacted by those scheduled go-live dates is that student financial aid is the primary regulatory component of the student information system that needs to be in place. Those federal regulations will come out in the spring 2010 and will be incorporated into the new system by the time any institution goes live.

Regent Whipple asked how the proposed consolidation plan will be revised to address the oversight function of the Technology Committee. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that staff will make sure the appropriate revisions are incorporated before the second reading is presented to the Board.

Regent Sisolak agreed with much of what President Wells had stated in regards to the number of meetings. He also agreed with Regent Crear that the Regents knew what they were getting into when they ran for election to this office. He stated that part of the responsibility falls on the committee chairs in facilitating informational agenda items so

18. Information Only – Handbook Revision, Committee Consolidation Proposal (Agenda Item #17) – (Cont'd.)

that they do not require as much of the committees' time. He also recognized that when the presidents and their staff have to be present at meetings, they are not available on campus and there must be a balance.

President Maryanski related that heritage, meaning diversity, was also a core value of Nevada State College. He supported President Wells' suggestion of quarterly meetings, adding that would also help to minimize travel expenses for staff.

President Glick also supported President Wells' recommendation, adding that as much as he would like to, he cannot be at every meeting as they sometimes conflict with each other. He suggested creating an agenda at the beginning of each year to make sure that every one of these priorities is visited regularly and in-depth on a policy and outcome level.

Regent Schofield indicated his support for holding more committee meetings during the main Board meeting. Although that may extend the overall length of the main meeting, he felt it would be more efficient.

Chief Counsel Patterson stated that the number of meetings is not included as part of this agenda item but is also something that is within the authority of the Chair and Vice Chair to determine and does not require two readings of the Board. He is currently in the process of reviewing the *Handbook* to determine those items that have built up over the years that require Board approval. This will provide the Board with the opportunity to review and determine which items, within its fiduciary responsibility and oversight, it still wants to be involved with and which items should be delegated. Chair Wixom requested that Chief Counsel Patterson continue that review.

Chair Wixom stated that the two issues before the Board are to remember the responsibilities that the Regents took on when they ran for their elected positions and balance that with not allowing the number of committees to overwhelm core issues. He and Vice Chair Rosenberg had asked that every committee item have a time frame related to it. He sensed that time allotment has become irrelevant and asked that the committee chairs be aware of that time.

Regent Knecht asked Chair Wixom to clarify if the committee chairs are bound by a five or ten minute item. Chair Wixom replied absolutely not, clarifying that his suggestion is that the posted times be the upper limit, which is being regularly exceeded.

Chair Schofield left the meeting.

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

President Richards introduced Las Vegas City Councilwoman Lois Tarkanian and Las Vegas City Fire Chief Greg Gammon who were present for agenda item #22 (*Investment Committee Report*).

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

Mr. Ryan Crowell, NSA President, NSC, stated that the NSA supports and is united on Chancellor Rogers' remarks and his memorandums. Specifically, on the NSC campus, they are working to promote civic virtue and uniting the local community since the budget situation connects them all. He felt that education is the foundation of a successful democracy and that needed to be stressed to the community. He related to the Board that they can expect to see more activism from the students.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Mr. David Waterhouse, ASCSN President, CSN, thanked Chair Wixom, Chancellor Rogers and the Board for their hard work. Due to CSN's underfunding, their campus is at risk of being dangerously affected by the budget cuts including closure of six of their twelve learning centers. A number of students and parents have called to express concern for how those closures will affect their local communities. At CSN, their mission includes providing access and serving as many students and communities as possible. CSN is at risk for having to turn away up to 8,000 students next year and questioned where those students will go for classes such as English as a Second Language or GED preparation classes. Mr. Waterhouse referred to an e-mail that he received from a student expressing their concern for how the potential budget cuts would affect her family and community.

Ms. Jessica Lucero, GPSA President, UNLV, understood that Nevada is behind in raising tuition and fees but cautioned that the students would not be in favor of increases. She related that in UNLV Provost Smatresk's letter included with the Chancellor's memo of June 19, 2008, he stated that UNLV is currently 15% lower funded than comparable universities. To increase tuition and fees cannot be the only answer. She asked that the Board keep in mind that graduate student tuition was recently increased. She noted that graduate students are still being paid \$10,000 for Master level stipends and \$12,000 for Ph.D. stipends. As tuition is increased, student stipends are not increasing equally.

Mr. Adam Cronis, CSUN President, UNLV, thanked Ms. Lucero for her work with the graduate students. He related that as a whole, the NSA Board, under the leadership of Mr. Crowell, has come together for the first time in a long time. He recognized that the Governor is not in an ideal situation but the goals of the Regents and the System in making education as inclusive and of the highest quality as possible is at risk. He felt that they could be facing a situation in which there is an entirely different system that will not be available to those students with different socio-economic backgrounds. He completely affirms and supports the comments made by the other student body presidents. He thanked Chancellor Rogers in working closely with the student governments.

Mr. Eron Sanchez, SGA President, GBC, related that as a student in his 30's who went back to school, he is a prime example of a non-traditional student. In the interest of giving back to the institution he has decided to work tirelessly in the area of student life. The students at GBC are 100% behind the Chancellor and the Board.

Regent Whipple left the meeting.

19. Approved – Investment Committee (Agenda Item #22) - Chair Thalia Dondero reported that the Investment Committee met on September 26, 2008, and heard a report from Mr. Gus Nuñez, Manager, State Public Works Board (*SPWB*), concerning the operations of the Board and its staff, including its role relative to the development and management of the biennial Capital Improvement Program. The presentation clarified the *SPWB*'s methodology for prioritizing the statewide capital projects that will be recommended to the Governor for inclusion in the *Executive Budget*. Mr. Nuñez may be asked to return to the Committee to discuss how users, including *NSHE*, might mitigate the costs associated with its professional services fee structure, and to explore how sustainability and life-cycle cost factors could be better estimated for future capital improvement projects.

Chair Dondero requested Board action on the following committee recommendations:

- Minutes - The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the August 1, 2008, Committee meeting.
- Based on Cambridge Associates' presentation, the Committee recommended approval of a portfolio rebalancing by investing \$4 million dollars in the equity portfolio and \$7 million dollars to the total return funds. The other half of the recommended allocation to the equity portfolio, an additional \$4 million dollars, will be invested in 30 days from October 3, 2008. The Committee also recommended a supplemental agenda item for the October 3, 2008, Board meeting for the full Board to consider delegating authority to the Investment Committee to suspend or reduce disbursements to the campuses from the *NSHE* operating pool income, or to set forth conditions under which such disbursements would be suspended or reduced, if, in the discretion of the Committee, it is determined that market conditions or earnings warrant suspension or reduction of such disbursements.
- The Committee recommended approval of President Richards' request for the Interlocal Agreement and Ground Lease in order to construct, on the southwest part of the Charleston Campus, a single structure to house a Fire Station and College Instructional Space. Minor changes to the agreement will be brought back to the Committee at a future meeting.
- The Committee approved staff's recommendations for modifying deferred maintenance practices, and directed staff to pursue, in concert with System Presidents and Business Officers, the development of an associated policy, with the goal of presenting both *Handbook* and procedural modifications for the Committee's consideration at its December 2008 meeting.
- The Committee approved the first draft of the Capital Assets "Flow Process" Reference Guide and Checklist, and directed staff to work directly with the Business Officers to expand the elements of the reference guide as appropriate, particularly with respect to ongoing operations and maintenance matters.
- The Committee approved the Real Property Transaction Checklist, and directed staff to incorporate the document into the Regent's *Procedures and Guidelines Manual* for use as a reference guide for institutions in submitting requests for the Committee's consideration.

19. Approved – Investment Committee (Agenda Item #22) – (Cont'd.)

- The Committee recommended approval of the addendum to the October 2007 MOU which details how the debt payment for the Shadow Lane Campus will be shared among the schools utilizing the campus.

Regent Whipple entered the meeting.

- The Committee recommended President Ashley's request for approval to enter into a long-term agreement with Kaplan, Inc., for the lease of retail space in the new UNLV Student Union.
- The Committee recommended approval of Interim President Diekhans' request for approval of the Paul and Gwendolyn Leonard Center for Student Life expansion project, encompassing the remodeling, expansion and transformation of GBC's current Community Center. In recognition of the gift, approval was also recommended to name the building after the donor.
- The Committee recommended President Richard's request for approval of a Gift Agreement in the amount of \$8,200,000, to the CSN Foundation from the Engelstadt Family Foundation, to fund educational services and a building project at CSN. In recognition of the gift, approval was recommended to name the Health Sciences School and Building the "Ralph and Betty Engelstadt School of Health Sciences."
- The Committee recommended President Ashley's request to delegate authority to Chancellor Rogers to finalize and execute an exchange of real properties in order for UNLV to acquire title to the Paradise Campus.

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

Regent Sisolak commended Regent Dondero for her efforts as Investment Committee Chair.

Regent Whipple requested more information regarding the exchange of real property related to the Paradise Campus. Chair Wixom related that the System had the opportunity to enter into a property exchange and the authority delegated to the Chancellor was specifically within a set parameter to affect the transfer in a timely fashion.

Regent Whipple asked if the transaction had been completed. Chancellor Rogers indicated that although final meetings were currently being arranged, the transfer was basically complete. The System will be receiving approximately 10.5 acres of title to the Paradise Campus in exchange for property at the Thomas and Mack Arena. The System will be allowed to continue using that area for parking with the option to buy it back if and when the Airport Authority builds other parking. The transaction does not involve an exchange of money. Regent Dondero added that UNLV will also retain the revenue from the billboards.

19. Approved – Investment Committee (Agenda Item #22) – (Cont'd.)

Councilwoman Tarkanian felt that this project will receive national recognition as a public cooperative agreement.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

20. Approved – Audit Committee (Agenda Item #18) - Chair Steve Sisolak reported that the Audit Committee met on October 2, 2008. Regent Crear requested that a report of out-of-state vendor usage be prepared and presented to the Committee. Assistant Vice Chancellor Sandi Cardinal reported that the external audit contract expires with the June 30, 2008, financial statement audit. The contract will be bid in November 2008 with interview of firms by the Audit Committee at a future meeting.

Chair Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the August 7, 2008, Committee meeting.
- The Committee recommended for approval the following internal audit reports:
  - School of Dental Medicine, Dental Equipment Review, UNLV
  - Performing Arts Center, UNLV
  - Grants-in-Aid & Fee Waivers, NSC
  - Grants-in-Aid, DRI
  - Human Resources, DRI
  - Grants-in-Aid & Fee Waivers, TMCC
  - Cash Funds, CSN
- The Committee recommended for approval the Internal Audit Department Work Plan for the year ending June 30, 2009.
- The Committee recommended for approval a change in the audit requirement for outgoing presidents. An audit of the outgoing president will be combined with the audit of the interim president. In instances where the interim appointment is anticipated to exceed 1 year, the Audit Committee Chair and Assistant Vice Chancellor Sandi Cardinal will review whether separate audits of the outgoing president and interim president will be performed. This review will be reported to the Audit Committee.

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

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

Chair Wixom thanked President Wells and DRI for their hospitality, including Ms. Cindy Sargent, Ms. Lisa McClain, Mr. Walter Shingles and the entire facilities staff. He also thanked President Richards for lending CSN's audio/visual equipment for the webcast and thanked CSN audio/visual staff Mr. Greg Hampton and Mr. Eric Garner in addition to SCS staff, catering and the UNLV Police Department.

21. Approved – Budget & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #19) - Chair Ron Knecht reported that the Budget & Finance Committee met on October 2, 2008, and heard the following reports: NSHE State Supported Operating Budget to Actual Comparison for fiscal year 2007-2008; State Accountability report for fiscal year 2007-2008 reconciling the Board of Regents' approved budget to actual revenues and expenditures per legislative Letter of Intent; Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2007-2008; self-supporting budget revenue and expenditure revisions of the NSHE for fiscal year 2007-2008; transfers of State Supported Operating Budget funds between functions for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2007-2008; transfers of expenses from non-state budgets to state funds after May 1, 2008, for fiscal year 2007-2008; and a report about peer institutions, including how they have been identified in the past, for what purpose, and what they have been historically used for as related to the budget.

Chair Knecht requested Board action on the following committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the August 7, 2008, Committee meeting.
- The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2007-2008 Accountability Report reconciling the Board of Regents' approved budget to the fiscal year-end actual revenues and expenditures.
- The Committee recommended approval of a resolution to allow the NSHE, on behalf of UNLV, to issue a 30 year fixed rate, tax exempt revenue bond in an amount to net \$13 million to finance the construction of the Tropicana parking structure.
- The Committee recommended approval for UNLV to move forward to complete a design/build agreement to replace the UNLV McDermott Physical Education facility swimming pool.
- The Committee recommended approval of a \$2,050,000 bridge loan from the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation to the NSHE on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno, for final funding of the Nell J. Redfield Auditorium.
- As requested by the Business and Finance Committee, Mr. Zurek and Mr. John Carothers, Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations, UNR, contacted UNR Foundation counsel regarding two questions which the Committee wished to have confirmed. Foundation counsel indicated that the Foundation to University loan transaction had been thoroughly reviewed when first proposed and was emphatic that 1) it is not a prohibited transaction, and 2) the interest income earned on the Foundation loan is not unrelated business income subject to excise taxation. The proposed loan from the UNR Foundation to the University is totally consistent with the public purpose of this public foundation as defined by the Internal Revenue Service.



21. Approved – Budget & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

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

Regent Sisolak noted that the request made in agenda item #7 (*Bank Financing for the Tropicana Parking Facility, UNLV*) was for \$13.5 million, which differed from the Committee's recommendation of \$13 million. President Ashley clarified that \$13.5 million was the upper limit, and that the preferred vendor will likely cost less than \$13 million.

Regent Knecht modified the Committee Report to reflect authority for \$13.5 million. Regent Rosenberg agreed to the friendly amendment.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

22. Approved – Cultural Diversity & Security Committee (Agenda Item #20) - Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Cultural Diversity & Security Committee met on October 2, 2008, and heard a report from Dr. Bruce McBride, Executive Director of Economic Crime and Justice Studies at Utica College of Syracuse University, on the external evaluation of the UNLV police department that assessed if operations were effective and appropriate.

The Committee also received a report on initiatives at DRI and NSC to promote diversity and other matters related to inclusive practices at each institution. Students from NSC shared with the Committee their real life experiences and the challenges they have had to overcome in seeking a college degree. The report also included information on NSC's Upward Bound program.

Ms. Christine Clark, Chair of the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Council, highlighted the issues that the Council is considering, including best practices for diversity in higher education.

Chair Crear requested Board action on the following committee recommendations:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the August 7, 2008, Committee meeting.

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

23. Approved – Student & Academic Affairs Committee (Agenda Item #21) - Chair Jason Geddes reported that the Student & Academic Affairs Committee met on October 2, 2008, and heard an update from Nevada State College representatives on the “deactivation” of its Master of Arts in Speech-Language Pathology. This program will be placed on hold pending approval by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association that is necessary for accreditation purposes. Next, the Committee heard a report on the current processes for reviewing and approving new academic programs in the context of the Board’s review and approval of institutional academic master plans and the NSHE Planning Report.

The Committee also heard a report on the recent efforts of UNR and UNLV in participating in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The VSA is a voluntary initiative for 4-year public colleges and universities that is designed to improve public understanding of how public colleges and universities operate.

Mr. Tony Fong, Senior Policy Associate from the Regional Educational Laboratory at WestEd, reported on a recent study on the grade 12 mathematics coursework of remedial versus non-remedial students enrolled at NSHE institutions. This report is intended to provide a better understanding of those courses that are associated with college preparedness and ultimately college success.

Finally, the Committee reviewed a summary report on the institutional review of existing academic programs or those programs that have been established for at least ten years. In addition, a summary report was provided for new academic programs implemented in the last five years.

Chair Geddes requested Board action on the following committee recommendations:

- Minutes - The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the August 7, 2008, Committee meeting.
- The Committee recommended elimination of the Master of Arts in French and Bachelor of University Studies at UNLV.

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

In regards to the deactivation of NSC’s Master of Arts in Speech-Language Pathology, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich asked if reactivation of that program would require Board action. Regent Geddes indicated that since no students were currently participating in that program and due to the change in accreditation process, a formal motion was not taken for deactivation. Upon approval by the accrediting body, NSC will inform the Committee when the program is active again.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

24. Approved – Research & Economic Development Committee (Agenda Item #24) -Chair Jack Lund Schofield thanked Regent Geddes for assuming the role of Acting Chair at the September 25, 2008, Committee meeting. He also thanked the Board and System staff for their efforts, particularly Dr. Penny Amy, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, NSHE, for her hard work on this Committee.

Chair Schofield reported that the Research & Economic Development Committee met on September 25, 2008, and heard an update from Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich on the Walker Basin Project. The project continues its focus on increasing communication between researchers and stakeholders, and completion of the research projects along with how the sum of the research impacts the project as a whole. Communications with the rural stakeholders continue to improve. In fall of 2009, NSHE will host an international symposium around the research that has been done in support of this project and how such research relates to other arid lands, desert terminus basins and ecosystems around the world.

Dr. Amy reported that in response to the committee members' request to evaluate how more recognition might be given for outstanding researchers, the Research Affairs Council recommended a Regents' Rising Researcher Award. The award will be given annually by each research institution in NSHE in recognition of early achievement and future promise. The recommendation was due to the fact that the Regents' Researcher Award usually goes to a person with a long career of excellence in research. These awards will go to faculty having been part of NSHE for a shorter period of time and will have no monetary component. The Committee approved the NSHE Research Affairs Council's request for a *Handbook* change (*Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 17*) to establish the new award and a *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* change (*Chapter 8, Section 2*) to describe the criteria and process by which faculty can apply and be awarded this recognition of their research efforts and potential.

Dr. Bill Schulze, Director of the Nevada EPSCoR and System Sponsored Programs Offices, presented an explanation of the Federal Demonstration Project Phase 5 and its goals to streamline research administration. The NSHE is a member of the Project and will participate with the other members in finding ways to make it possible for researchers to spend more time on research and less time on research administration. In the first four phases, the member institutions served as testing grounds for ways to streamline research processes and these are now implemented across all institutions in the United States.

Mr. Ian Rogoff, Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Nevada Institute for Renewable Energy Commercialization (*NIREC*) described the Institute's goal to bring researchers, experienced entrepreneurs, business executives and venture capital to promote the commercialization of renewable energy technologies. One of NIREC's successes is a vertical axis wind turbine company now based in Reno, Nevada. He also promoted the concept of Commercialization Accelerators to synthesize promising research with business skills. NIREC's institutional partners include UNLV, DRI, UNR and UC Davis.

24. Approved – Research & Economic Development Committee (Agenda Item #24) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Schofield requested Board action on the following committee recommendations:

- Minutes - The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the July 31, 2008, Committee meeting.
- The Committee recommended the establishment of the Regents' Rising Research Award to be given to one faculty member at each of the three research institutions in recognition of early achievement and future promise and a *Handbook* change (*Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 17*) to establish this new award as well as a *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* change (*Chapter 8, Section 2*).

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

25. Approved – Health Sciences System Committee (Agenda Item #23) - Chair Dorothy Gallagher reported that the Health Sciences System Committee met on September 25, 2008. Chair Gallagher thanked representatives from the University of Nevada, Reno who provided the Committee with an overview of the facilities on the health sciences portions of the UNR campus. This overview included an update on the progress of the design of the new UNR health sciences buildings, as well as a general program overview by representatives from the University of Nevada, School of Medicine, the Orvis School of Nursing and other UNR health sciences programs. Chair Gallagher also reported that she is continuing to meet with representatives from the health sciences programs throughout the NSHE institutions to help promote improved communication and collaboration among programs.

Dr. Maurizio Trevisan, Executive Vice Chancellor and CEO, Health Sciences System, provided an overview of the Health Sciences System Action Plan which will help guide the activities for the Health Sciences System over the next year and beyond. Dr. Trevisan also provided an update on the Health Sciences System fundraising activities, including providing a summary of the total funds collected and expended to date.

Vice Chancellor Marcia Turner provided the Committee with an update on the status of the MOU regarding the sharing of costs associated with occupancy at the Shadow Lane Campus. She reported that the participating institutions were involved in the development of an addendum to the October 2007 Shadow Lane MOU, to clarify the amount of square feet assigned to each institution and the timing of related payments for assigned space.

Board action is requested to approve the following recommendations of the Health Sciences System Committee:

- Minutes - The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the July 31, 2008, Committee meeting.
- The Committee recommended approval of the Health Sciences System Action Plan.

25. Approved – Health Sciences System Committee (Agenda Item #23) – (Cont'd.)

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

Regent Gallagher reported that due to the work of Executive Vice Chancellor Trevisan and the UNR and UNLV Provosts and Public Health faculties, a very good program has been developed for future presentation to the Board.

Regent Crear thanked Regent Gallagher for arranging the tour of the UNR medical and dental facilities. He encouraged all of the Regents to visit those facilities, adding that it was a very eye-opening experience.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

26. Information Only – New Business (Agenda Item #25) - Chair Wixom announced that the next meeting of the Investment Committee will be held on Friday, October 10, 2008, at 9:00 a.m.

Regent Knecht requested that an agenda item be placed on the December meeting for the Board to review, and possibly act on, the investment policies currently followed. He has spoken with Vice Chancellor Reed and staff can, at the Chair's direction, prepare a report on how the investment funds are operating and how endowment funds have fared in terms of indexed and non-indexed funds. Chair Wixom requested that discussion be placed on the next regularly scheduled Investment Committee meeting in December.

The meeting adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Prepared by: Jessica C. 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 December 4-5, 2008, meeting.*