BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Aspen Building, Sarah Winnemucca Hall
Western Nevada College
2201 West College Parkway, Carson City
Thursday, April 2, 2009, 8:30 a.m.
Friday, April 3, 2009, 8:00 a.m.

Members Present:	Mr. Michael B. Wixom, Chair Dr. Jason Geddes, Vice Chair Dr. Stavros S. Anthony Mr. Robert Blakely Mr. William G. Cobb Mr. Cedric Crear Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher Mr. Ron Knecht Mr. James Dean Leavitt Mr. Kevin J. Page Dr. Raymond D. Rawson Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Members Absent:	Mr. Mark Alden
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 Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mike Reed Chief Counsel Bart Patterson Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen President Michael D. Richards, CSN President Stephen G. Wells, DRI 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; Ms. Carmen Ortiz, 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, April 2, 2009, with all members present except Regents Alden, Knecht and Schofield.

Regent Anthony led the pledge of allegiance.

Ms. Stephanie Arrigotti and Ms. Maria Arrigotti offered the invocation through song *("Never Walk Alone").*

1. Information Only – Introductions *(Agenda Item #1)* – President Lucey related that Ms. Stephanie Arrigotti is a Professor at WNC and Ms. Maria Arrigotti once attended WNC and is currently on the faculty of TMCC.

   President Glick announced that the UNR Debate team of Mr. Max Alderman and Mr. David Pena has won two prestigious national debate championships including the National Parliamentary Debate Association National Championship and the National Parliamentary Tournament of Excellence. Mr. Alderman was present at the meeting as well as their coach, Mr. Phil Sharp, Director of Forensics, UNR.

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

   President Lucey introduced Ms. Winnie Kortemeier, Professor of Geology at WNC. Ms. Kortemeier has been teaching at WNC since 1989, was WNC's Outstanding Faculty member in 1999 and Instructor of the Year in 2000, and is currently completing her Ph.D. at UNR. Ms. Kortemeier provided a presentation on the activities of the WNC Geology courses *(full presentation on file in the Board office).*

Regents Knecht and Schofield entered the meeting.

In regards to Ms. Kortemeier's presentation, Chair Wixom asked for an explanation of "tufa." Ms. Kortemeier explained that tufa consists of minerals deposited by hot springs that can be found under certain lakes in the Great Basin, such as Lahontan Reservoir, Pyramid Lake and Mono Lake.

Regent Cobb asked if the geology classes could be audited. Ms. Kortemeier replied that the class could be audited and that administrators could also request to join the field trips.

President Lucey introduced Ms. Jeanette McGinley, WNC Student. This May, Ms. McGinley will be completing her Associates in General Studies and plans to continue her education at WNC through the nursing program. Ms. McGinley currently works for WNC as a student employee in the office of Student Financial Aid. She shared with the Regents several of her observations concerning the effect of the budget crisis on students.

Chair Wixom asked what percentage of WNC students currently received financial assistance and what the average amount of the award was. Ms. Lori Tiede, Director of Financial Assistance, WNC, related that approximately 30% of WNC students receive financial assistance, with the average combined award *(Pell Grants, loans, scholarships*

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

and work study) being approximately $7,000 to $10,000 per year, up to $14,000 per year for full-time students.

Chair Wixom asked what percentage of the WNC students will graduate with debt. Ms. Tiede did not have that information readily available. However, she estimated that of the 2,500 students receiving financial assistance, approximately 500 individuals had loans.

Chair Wixom asked how many financial aid counselors were available at WNC. Ms. Tiede replied that WNC had two advisors.

Regent Cobb asked how much of the approximate $7,000 annual award was specifically from a Pell Grant. Ms. Tiede explained that a full-time Pell Grant award is approximately $4,700 for the year *(two semesters)*. She added that approximately two-thirds of a student's award could be in grant funds with the remainder in loans.

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

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich introduced Mr. Bob Moulton, Interim Vice Chancellor and Director of System Computing Services.

Meeting recessed at 8:49 a.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 02, 2009, with all members present except for Regents Alden, Anthony, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt and Page.

3. Information Only – Public Comment *(Agenda Item #4)* – None.

4. Approved – Consent Agenda *(Agenda Item #5)* – The Board approved the Consent Agenda in its entirety.

(1). Approved – Minutes *(Agenda Item (1))* – The Board approved the minutes from the regular Board of Regents' meeting held February 5-6, 2009 *(Ref. C-1 on file in the Board office).*

(2). Approved – Allocation of Grants-In-Aid, 2009-2010 *(Agenda Item (2))* – The Board of Regents' approved the allocation of Grants-in-Aid for academic years 2009-2010. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 396.540(3) provides for tuition waivers for students from other states and foreign countries based on 3% of each institution's fall headcount enrollment. Board policy provides an equal number of grants-in-aid for Nevada students and requires that the total number of grants-in-aid allocated to each NSHE institution be approved annually by the Board. The recommended allocations are for academic year 2009-2010 and represent the total number each institution could award. In all cases, funding is not sufficient to support the maximum allowable number of grants-in-aid:

	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE
UNR	507	507
UNLV	837	837
NSC	64	64
CSN	1,253	1,253
GBC	101	101
TMCC	394	394
WNC	157	157

(3). Approved – Board of Regents' Scholar Award Recipient, TMCC *(Agenda Item (3))* – The Board of Regents' approved TMCC President Maria C. Sheehan's request to waive the Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15)* and award a second Nevada Regents' Scholar Award recipient from TMCC to Ms. Edith Gonzalez Duarte *(Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office).*

(4). Approved – Appointment to WestEd Board of Directors *(Agenda Item (4))* – The Board of Regents' approved Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols request for the re-appointment of Dr. William Sparkman, UNR, to an additional three-year term *(June 1, 2009 to May 31, 2012)* to the WestEd Board of Directors. WestEd is a nonprofit research, development and service agency that enhances and increases education and human development within schools, families and communities. The Board of Regents appoints three members of the Board to represent the Nevada System of Higher Education. The term of the other two members appointed by the Board of Regents will not expire until 2011.

(5). Approved – Tenure *(Agenda Item (5))* – The Board of Regents' approved the NSHE Presidents' requests for tenure for the following faculty members. Each applicant met the standards for tenure in the NSHE Code and was positively recommended by his or her institution following a peer review process.

CSN – *(Ref. C-5a on file in the Board office)*

Ms. Daveadele Abel
Mr. Robert Kenneth Aberle
Dr. Shankara Babu
Ms. Mary Bennett
Ms. Ann B. Bullis
Dr. Bertrand A. Chiasson
Mr. Christian M. Clark
Mr. Jacob D. Elison
Mr. Paul A. Herrle
Ms. Belinda Sue Hobson
Ms. Shannon Larson
Dr. Melodye Lehnerer
Ms. Laura S. Martin
Ms. Laura McBride
Dr. Rhett Michelson
Ms. Nathalie Odom
Mr. Jonathan G. Pearsall
Ms. Tiwaporn Pongmarutai
Ms. Amy Lynn Ragnone
Ms. Patricia M. Riede
Dr. Nancy Linda *(Penny)* Schwartz

GBC – *(Ref. C-5b on file in the Board office)*

Ms. Caroline Bruno
Ms. Wendy Charlebois
Dr. Dale Griffith
Dr. John Newman
Dr. Squy Wallace
Dr. Laurie Walsh

NSC – *(Ref. C-5c on file in the Board office)*

Dr. Daniel Grassian
Dr. Kevin Graziano
Dr. Shirlee Snyder

TMCC – *(Ref. C-5d on file in the Board office)*

Ms. Maria Arrigotti
Ms. Susan Bluhm
Mr. Dean Burton
Dr. Melissa Deadmond
Dr. Heather Graham-Williams
Mr. William Wade Hampton
Ms. Brenda Jahnke
Dr. Kathleen Kolbet
Dr. William Mehm
Mr. Kelly Oswald
Ms. Anne Witzleben

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

(5). Approved – Tenure *(Agenda Item (5))* – *(Cont'd.)*

UNLV – *(Ref. C-5e on file in the Board office)*

Dr. Gregory A. Borchard	Dr. Chin-Chin Hsu
Dr. Michelle Chino-Kelly	Dr. Matthew S. Lachniet
Dr. Christopher Decker	Dr. Scott A. Loe
Dr. Ian J. Dove	Dr. Daniel Proga
Dr. Michelle Elekonich	Dr. John Puthenpurackal
Dr. Timothy J. Farnham	Ms. Leticia M. Saucedo
Dr. Lisa Frink	Dr. P.G. Schrader
Dr. Brian P. Hedlund	

UNR – *(Ref. C-5f on file in the Board office)*

Dr. Dean Burkin	Dr. Monica Nicolescu
Dr. Wendy M. Calvin	Dr. Christopher Porada
Dr. Kristen Clements-Nolle	Dr. Vladimir Pravosudov
Dr. Mariah Debra Evans	Dr. Laurel Saito
Dr. Mary Hylton	Dr. G. Richard Scott
Dr. Stanislav Jabuka	Dr. Aleksey Telyakovskiy
Dr. Teruni Lamberg	Dr. Zong Tian
Dr. Chunlin Liu	Dr. Peter J. Weisberg
Dr. Tigran Melkonyan	Dr. Jeffrey Wong
Dr. Monica Miller	Dr. Wei Yan
Dr. Mircea Nicolescu	Dr. Ilia Zaliapin

WNC – *(Ref. C-5g on file in the Board office)*

Mr. Paul Eastwood	Ms. Deborah Ingraffia-Strong
Ms. Edda Gibson	Mr. Chard McCully
Ms. Emily Howarth	

(6). Approved – Capital Improvement Fee Request, CSN *(Agenda Item (6))* – The Board of Regents' approved CSN President Michael Richards' request of Capital Improvement Fee funds in the amount of $1,002,000 for the following essential campus infrastructure projects *(Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office).*

➢ Additional Parking at Charleston Campus South of the "K" Building.	$144,000
➢ Grading/Paving SW Corner of Charleston Campus.	$800,000
➢ Additional Parking Lot Lighting at Charleston Campus.	$58,000
TOTAL:	$1,002,000

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Consent Agenda. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt and Page were absent.

Regents Anthony, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt and Page entered the meeting.

5. Information Only – Chancellor's Report *(Agenda Item #3)* – Chancellor James E. Rogers related that the budget situation was changing much too rapidly to report any specific information.

6. Approved – Appointment, President, GBC *(Agenda Item #8)* – The Board of Regents' approved the appointment of Mr. Carl Diekhans as President of Great Basin College. The proposed salary and terms of the contract were identified at the Board meeting *(Handout on file in the Board office)*.

Regent Gallagher related that she had received numerous calls from the Elko community in support of Mr. Diekhans.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the appointment of Mr. Carl Diekhans as President of GBC. Regent Geddes seconded.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that no changes had been made between the existing and proposed contract terms.

Mr. Eron Sanchez, Student Body President, GBC, related that the student body was also in support of Mr. Diekhans, adding that the students have been allowed to participate in college decisions at a level never experienced before.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously. Regent Alden was absent.

7. Approved – Personnel Session – UNR President Milton D. Glick *(Agenda Item #6)* – The Board of Regents approved the periodic annual evaluation report of President Milton D. Glick. *(Full evaluation report and self-evaluation on file in the Board office)*.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich introduced Dr. Stan Albrecht, President of Utah State University, who performed the duties of outside consultant during this evaluation process. Dr. Albrecht had prepared a final evaluation report.

Dr. Albrecht related that the evaluation process included four major steps:

- A review of the self-evaluation prepared by President Glick.
- Participation in meetings with the Evaluation Committee and President Glick both prior to and following the campus and community interviews. *(While Dr. Albrecht had to leave prior to the conclusion of the post-review session with the Evaluation Committee, he was able to listen to an audio tape of that session and has attempted to integrate those comments into this report)*.
- Interviews and meetings with a broad range of individuals and groups who were invited to comment on the president's strengths and weaknesses.
- A review of a comprehensive Faculty and Staff survey prepared by the University of Nevada, Reno Faculty Senate Executive Board.

7. Approved – Personnel Session – UNR President Milton D. Glick *(Agenda Item #6)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Dr. Albrecht continued that, per Board of Regents' policy, President Glick was evaluated on the following eight criteria:

- Budgetary Matters and Fiscal Management.
- Academic Administration and Academic Planning.
- Student Affairs.
- Personnel Management.
- Decision Making and Problem Solving.
- External Relations and Fundraising.
- Relationship to the Board.
- Progress towards Master Plan and Other Performance Goals.

Dr. Albrecht stated that, in summary, President Glick's strengths include several common themes such as being a good communicator, transparent, a straight-shooter, reflects a high level of integrity in all he does, has a high level of energy, visible in the community, positive and patient, has assembled a strong team and someone with whom you can disagree without it becoming personal. The strengths identified during the interview process also correlated with the findings of the faculty and staff survey and are also consistent with those personal goals the president had set for himself.

Dr. Albrecht related that the majority of those interviewed struggled to identify specific weaknesses. Some expressed concern about the strength of the president's commitment to fundraising and was seen as somewhat conflict-adverse. Some respondents noted that the President sometimes had a tendency to make early judgments that resulted in discounting certain people.

Dr. Albrecht indicated that areas of concern included:

- The School of Medicine issue must be made a first priority. Several members of the Committee agreed that this was not something that could be addressed without the full and personal attention of the President. There were challenging geo-political and demographic issues as reflected in the population growth of Southern Nevada, particularly in Clark County. However, it was clear that President Glick understood the importance of the issues and indicated in the exit interview that this issue would receive greater attention from both him and UNR's Provost as they move forward.
- There were concerns that President Glick is restrained in flexing what is perceived as his very positive entrepreneurial muscle because of constraints imposed by the System that require all institutions to be similar in certain aspects such as fee structure, admissions and so forth. Increased opportunities for mission differentiation, with proper Board oversight, could very well enhance opportunities to become more entrepreneurial and to build the enterprise.

In conclusion, Dr. Albrecht related that he found a remarkable and reoccurring consensus among those interviewed that President Glick is leading the University of Nevada, Reno, with clarity, steadiness and a high level of effectiveness during a challenging time. President Glick is open and transparent in his style, he communicates well and he expends

7. Approved – Personnel Session – UNR President Milton D. Glick *(Agenda Item #6)* – *(Cont'd.)*

enormous personal energy in being accessible to the UNR community and to a broader set of constituents around the state. He is inclusive in his decision-making and understands and practices shared governance thus causing others to feel they are a part of the process. President Glick does not panic in the face of enormously difficult budget challenges, leading others to feel a high level of confidence in his leadership.

Regent Leavitt felt that President Glick was respected for his academic knowledge and accessibility, adding that UNR was very fortunate to have that. He expressed ongoing concern with the issues surrounding the School of Medicine and the Fire Science Academy. However, he recognized that it may take several years to reach resolution.

Regent Cobb echoed Regent Leavitt's comments. However, he indicated his disappointment in the lack of community members surveyed and asked that future evaluations include approximately fifteen interviews with outside community members. Dr. Albrecht agreed that was a weakness in the process and was something to be considered. He noted that an additional weakness was the limited number of interactions with students. Chair Wixom indicated those two points would be kept in mind for future evaluations.

Regent Rawson observed that many legislators held President Glick in high regard and felt that could be a reflection of input from the community. He noted that the comment related to President Glick being restrained by the System should be of concern to the Board. He also expressed concern with the problems that President Glick inherited, specifically the School of Medicine.

Regent Cobb requested more detail in terms of the reference in the report to "long standing and on-going problems" associated with the School of Medicine and how those problems could be eliminated in the future.

Regent Rawson noted that the number of faculty that did not agree with President Glick on anything was reported as 4.5% and asked Dr. Albrecht if that was an unusually low percentage. Dr. Albrecht indicated that the return rate on the questionnaire was relatively moderate with most of the comments being of a positive nature. That low number reflected the general sense of satisfaction and the strong support for the leadership that President Glick is providing.

Dr. Albrecht urged the Regents to consider the concerns expressed by Regent Rawson. He related that Utah was also challenged to define their two research institutions and allow them to explore entrepreneurial opportunities without constraining them with system expectations.

Regent Leavitt noted that this had been the first evaluation conducted under the new evaluation policy and asked Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich to highlight the differences as well as the pros and cons of the new rules. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that under the new policy, the consultant was able to move beyond the Committee to

7. Approved – Personnel Session – UNR President Milton D. Glick *(Agenda Item #6)* – *(Cont'd.)*

conduct one-on-one confidential interviews. It was felt that the new process was successful in allowing more frank conversations. It also has the benefit of placing a substantially less burden on the Regents. Overall, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich felt the new process worked well with the exception of the noted weaknesses that need to be worked out.

Regent Crear was not as convinced that, in general, the process was efficient or adequate enough to reveal the issues. The consultant's report revealed that improvement was needed in certain areas including diversity and multiculturalism. He requested the Board's input on how to establish definable goals and measures moving forward.

Regent Gallagher related that in the past, the Board had set goals for the presidents that were to be reported on an annual basis. Although that procedure had obviously fallen by the wayside, she felt that had been important and worthwhile. Dr. Albrecht felt that opportunities for improvement were really an issue for the Board to manage.

Regent Cobb noted that page 10 of the evaluation report does include some comments on diversity, although they may not have been as comprehensive as Regent Crear may have liked.

Chief Counsel Patterson related that the Chancellor performs annual evaluations in between the three-year periodic evaluation conducted by the Board. The question then becomes, during those annual evaluations, if the Board wants to have some control of the issues or be able to direct the Chancellor to follow up on those issues. Regent Crear felt that since the evaluations are provided to the Regents, the Board should also be involved in opportunities for improvement.

Chief Counsel Patterson replied that the basic terms of the contract and the evaluation are separate processes. He was not sure if it was feasible for the Regents to identify specific items in a contract that must be done or some action will be taken. That is why he suggested that the Board offer direction to the Chancellor on points of concern that need to be addressed. Under the rules of the Board of Regents, it is the Chancellor and not the Board that has authority over discipline of the presidents.

Regent Leavitt stated that it was helpful to read the annual evaluations of the presidents. The Periodic President Evaluation Committee is conducted in the third year of a four year contract. The Board has given that disciplinary process to the Chancellor. He felt that the Board had received a comparable amount of information with significantly less time required by the Regents. He suggested that perhaps there are not enough Regents reading the annual evaluations.

Chair Wixom indicated that in the future he would like the Board to address limitations imposed by the System that prevent the presidents from accomplishing their objectives. Specifically, that conversation needed to occur with regard to UNR's development of a capital campaign.

7. Approved – Personnel Session – UNR President Milton D. Glick *(Agenda Item #6)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chair Wixom also felt that Regent Crear's observations in relation to diversity were well taken. He added that it becomes difficult to hold the presidents accountable if the Board itself has not established clear objectives. His also indicated that further improvement could be made to the evaluation process to increase student and community input.

Chair Wixom felt that it would be appropriate for the Student and Academic Affairs Committee, with input from the presidents, to address the concerns related to limitations imposed by the System that prevent the presidents from accomplishing their objectives.

Regent Geddes noted that some of these topics may also be appropriately addressed by the ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee.

Regent Cobb asked if Dr. Albrecht would conduct a critique of the evaluation process. Chair Wixom added that it would not need to be extensive, adding that the Board would be very appreciative of any general ideas for process improvement. Dr. Albrecht replied that he would be happy to provide that input.

Regent Anthony left the meeting.

Regent Crear felt that President Glick was doing a great job, that he enjoys working with him and felt he was an asset to the System. His observations were related more to the process itself.

Chair Wixom requested that under Regent Crear's leadership, the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee address what the Board's expectation should be in terms of diversity and multiculturalism, adding it would be helpful to provide the presidents with a clear understanding of the Board's expectation. Regent Crear indicated that the Committee had already begun to work towards that result.

Regent Blakely felt that it was unfair to hold the presidents accountable for expectations that were not clear. He did not want it to be an issue that stopped the Board from moving forward with President Glick's contract.

Regent Leavitt moved approval of acceptance of the periodic annual evaluation report of President Milton D. Glick as well as President Glick's self-evaluation report. Regent Cobb seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Anthony were absent.

Dr. Bill Follette, Faculty Senate Chair, UNR, related that although the response rate from the faculty survey was not terribly high, it was higher than received during the previous president evaluation. He related that the strengths and areas for improvement were organized in such a way that they revealed largely shared themes from throughout the campus. One of those themes was an appreciation for President Glick's work with and support of diversity. The empirical data reflects that diversity is up at UNR, adding that President Glick has stated that he takes responsibility for the diversity mission of the University.

8. Approved – Presidential Contract, UNR *(Agenda Item #7)* – The Board of Regents approved the extension of UNR President Milton D. Glick's existing contract, including a determination of the employment terms and conditions *(handout on file in the Board office)*.

Regent Anthony entered the meeting.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that no changes had been made between the existing and proposed contract terms.

Regent Geddes moved approval of extending the existing contract of UNR President Milton D. Glick. Regent Page seconded. Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously. Regent Alden was absent.

President Glick related that he has had a very rewarding experience at UNR and appreciated the opportunity to continue serving. He agreed that one of the most important aspects of an evaluation is to point out where improvement could be made and pledged to work on those areas.

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

(3). Approved – Board of Regents' Scholar Award Recipient, TMCC *(Agenda Item (3))* – *(Cont'd.)*

President Sheehan introduced Ms. Edith Gonzales Duarte, TMCC's additional Regent Scholar Award recipient. Ms. Gonzalez Duarte thanked President Sheehan and the Regents for this very high honor.

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules *(Agenda Item #9)* – The Board of Regents approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed's request for approval of the summer term salary schedules for 2009 *(P&GM Chapter 3, Section 5). (Ref. BoR-9 on file in the Board office.)*

Vice Chancellor Reed related that discussion of this item had been deferred from the February 2-3, 2009, Board meeting. He felt that it was critical to point out that the proposed revision would not affect further changes to student fees for the summer term. He added that the summer term operates on a self supporting budget and asked that the capacity for each campus to serve their summer students be taken into consideration.

Regent Crear asked if the term "self-supporting" meant that the students' fees were increased to support the summer school program. Vice Chancellor Reed replied that fees for summer school are raised over time. However, the fees for this summer had already been set in December 2008.

Regent Crear observed that the reference material, specifically for UNR, had changed from the previous meeting's material and requested clarification if the salaries were being raised for the 2009 summer term or not. Vice Chancellor Reed replied that UNLV was requesting to correct a typographical error and CSN was requesting a minor change to

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

correct their per instructional unit compensation. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich explained that UNR's request for an increase had been withdrawn. Therefore, the reference material was revised to appropriately reflect the Board's current policy as it relates to UNR.

Regent Crear asked if, except for the correction of UNLV's typographical error, the Board was being asked to increase summer school salaries. Vice Chancellor Reed replied that WNC has also requested a change. President Lucey added that WNC's request would not affect student fees.

Regent Crear referred to the reference material and observed that CSN's request involved an increase for "class sizes of 17 or greater *(that)* will result in full prorata pay or ~~$820/IU~~ $833/IU *(instructional unit)*, whichever is greater." He asked if under the proposed increase, class sizes of 17 or greater will result in faculty receiving an increase to $833 per credit unit. Ms. Patty Charlton, Senior Vice President for Finance and Facilities, CSN, explained that as a result of the COLA increase approved during the previous legislative session, CSN's full and part-time *(adjunct)* faculty will actually experience a decrease in their per instructional unit compensation between the spring and summer semesters. For example, adjunct faculty that are teaching in the current spring semester are receiving $801 per instructional unit. However, under current Board policy, if those same adjunct faculty were to teach during the summer semester, their per instructional unit compensation would decrease to $770.

Regent Crear felt that if that were the case, then a request to raise salaries was in fact being made although he had just been told it was not. Ms. Charlton explained that per Board policy, summer term salaries are considered separately and this request is to allow the summer term salary to be consistent with the fall/spring salary.

Regent Crear stated that this brought him back to the same point that he made at the last meeting in that how could a salary increase be justified when cuts were being considered in other areas. He understood that this was an attempt to rectify a situation but questioned if this was the appropriate time to make those adjustments. He also felt that he had been misinformed when he was told that this was not a request to increase faculty salary.

In reference to WNC, Regent Crear noted that the reference material indicates "The salary for a summer session course shall be 75% of the revenue generated from registration fees, not to exceed $~~900~~ ***1,200*** per credit." He asked if registration fees had been increased to provide for the salary increase. President Lucey explained that students will not be affected by this change because summer session is a self-supporting budget.

Regent Crear asked in what way summer term semesters are self-supporting and where the funding comes from. Ms. Connie Capurro, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, WNC, replied that summer school programs are supported directly through student fees, adding that the institutions could not afford to run a summer school program if the supporting revenue did not exist. This increase was being requested to allow the

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules
(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)

instructors to take in more students per unit. It will not cost the students additional fees but will allow the revenue to go directly to the faculty member instead of the institution.

Regent Crear asked if the summer term was then a profit center and, if WNC was able to pay instructors more without increasing student fees, where had the previous revenue gone. Ms. Capurro explained that each summer a slight change occurs in the revenue received from student fees. Regent Crear questioned that it is being said that student fees will not be raised, yet the fees had been raised in December 2008 and now an increase in salaries was being requested. Ms. Capurro related that upon a lengthy discussion between the WNC Faculty Senate and Administration, it was felt that WNC was in a position to share the revenue between the institution and the faculty. She added that it was more of a fair market labor consideration. Regent Crear indicated that he understood, but felt that the student fee and faculty salary process had been piece-mailed and perhaps student fees were being too heavily relied upon.

Regent Page agreed with Regent Crear that it raised questions when a request for a salary increase followed a request for a fee increase. He suggested that in the future, fee increases and salary increases be presented to the Board at the same time. He understood that the summer program had to be self-sufficient but he did not understand why tuition and salary increases were requested at separate meetings.

Chair Wixom asked Vice Chancellor Reed to respond specifically to the concerns expressed by Regents Page and Crear. Vice Chancellor Reed related that due to the discussion at the previous Board meeting, the next round of student registration fees and faculty salaries will be presented to the Board simultaneously. In response to Regent Crear's concerns, Vice Chancellor Reed stated that the student fees set by the Board in December 2008 reflected the will of the campuses to offer a healthy and vibrant summer school program. The salaries being offered may or may not change, depending upon the needs of the campuses to offer summer programs in a way that is productive to the students and that will allow for completion of degrees in a reasonable time.

Regent Blakely felt that the two options before the Board were to leave the salaries as they were or adjust them based on summer term class sizes. He asked what successful argument existed to do anything but leave the salaries just as they are. He stated that he had asked the same question at the previous Board meeting and it could not be answered at that time either. He indicated that he would not support the request unless a satisfactory response could be provided.

Ms. Sondra Cosgrove, Faculty Senate Chair, CSN, explained that since summer courses are accelerated, the faculty workload also increases. There is a tremendous demand for summer classes, even if the fees have increased. Regent Blakely asked again what would compel him to raise the salary based upon the fact that student demand has increased. Ms. Cosgrove indicated that since the faculty is not required to teach during the summer, they will weigh their options for supplemental income carefully.

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Blakely felt that the faculty should receive their normal rate of pay between the semesters, adding that he did not see a justification to increase the salary. Ms. Charlton clarified that for CSN, if the request was not approved, the part-time faculty will actually receive a cut in pay from $801 in the spring semester to $770 during the summer semester. Regent Blakely understood that a cut in pay was difficult. However, he added that there were many without jobs at all.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

Regent Schofield agreed that summer faculty were very much underpaid. He wanted to support this issue but the information brought forward appeared to be contradictory. He recommended that this discussion be deferred to a future meeting or that staff provide the necessary clarification so that a vote could be taken.

Regent Crear entered the meeting.

Regent Geddes did not understand why the summer term salary structure was different among the institutions while the regular term salary schedules were consistent. He indicated that he would like to see the entire policy revised to be more consistent.

Regent Knecht felt that the proposal was for a modest increase, adding that the adjunct faculty was vastly underpaid for the services they deliver. He indicated that he was prepared to support the request feeling that it was both clear and fair. In response to Regent Geddes' concern, Regent Knecht related that one price does not always apply at all times. He was not disturbed that some diversity existed in the rates among the different institutions.

Regent Leavitt felt it was important that the campuses retain as much flexibility as possible. Regent Geddes clarified that he was not against the entrepreneurial spirit but wanted to see a more consistent policy that was applicable year round.

Regent Rawson observed that there were many irregularities within the System, adding that the funding formula does not provide adequately or equally. He did not feel that it was reasonable to require faculty that wanted to teach on their off time to do it for less pay and expressed his support for the proposed policy revision.

Regent Cobb agreed with Regent Geddes concern as to why there is a distinction between summer and regular term salaries. He echoed Regent Crear's question as to what exactly the Board was being asked to approve. Specifically, he asked if the request affects a change from the status quo. Vice Chancellor Reed replied that it does affect a change from the previous summer term rates. Regent Cobb requested that a detailed explanation be provided of exactly what changes were being requested.

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Ms. Charlton replied that for CSN, the request was for a change in their full-time faculty rate from $820 to $833 and their adjunct faculty rate from $770 to $801. She clarified that although this is a change from the previous summer's rate, it is not a change from the current spring semester rates.

Vice Chancellor Reed clarified that the change for UNLV is only to correct the transposition of a number. For UNR, a change is no longer being requested. Regent Crear asked if changes were requested for UNR at the last meeting. Vice Chancellor Reed related that there was a proposed increase in salaries for UNR at the last meeting that has since been withdrawn.

Regent Page moved approval of *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules as presented. Regent Leavitt seconded.

Regent Rawson felt there would be less difficulty if the fall, spring and summer rates were not on separate schedules. He asked that this issue be considered at a future discussion.

Chair Wixom felt that no one disputed the importance of fairness and equity, but he requested that responses be limited directly to the questions brought forward by the Regents.

Mr. Stephen Bale, Faculty Senate Chair, TMCC, related that TMCC's request would actually save their institution money by reducing the full time faculty rate for the summer semester. With regard to the COLA, the community colleges were requesting that the amount approved by the legislature last fall be applied to the summer term salaries as well.

Ms. Capurro stated that WNC's faculty were not being paid more for this summer than the previous, it is the cap that is being raised.

Chair Wixom asked, if CSN's request was not approved, would salaries decrease. Ms. Charlton replied that the adjunct faculty teaching this semester will experience a decrease if they agree to teach during the summer semester. Chair Wixom clarified that they are not talking about summer to summer, but rather semester to semester. Ms. Charlton indicated that was correct. Chair Wixom restated that if this action is not approved, what the adjunct faculty is receiving per hour will actually go down from the spring to summer semester. Ms. Charlton indicated that was correct.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that per the direction the Board, the campuses were attempting to address the System's shamefully low adjunct faculty salaries. For the first time last year, the legislature approved a COLA appropriation for part-time faculty. What CSN has brought forward is a proposal to meet the Board's continual intent to raise the part-time faculty salaries by requesting they be able to compensate their faculty at the

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

same level year round. At TMCC, this means a downward adjustment. At UNLV it is the correction of a typographical error. UNR's request was withdrawn. At WNC the request is for the same amount but with the cap removed. The System is following the Board's direction with respect to the lowest paid faculty within the System. The style of presentation was the same as has been provided to the Board every year for the last 25 years. The System will try and find a better way to present this information but he felt the information was presented in a way that was in compliance with the Board's direction.

Regent Blakely stated that from his perspective, if nothing is done, the salaries will stay where they are with a possible small differential. The reference material does not clearly make the argument as to why he should support the increase.

Chair Wixom observed that additional costs will not be incurred to the System because it is summer school and therefore self supporting. The reduction in salary that will be experienced at CSN is not from summer to summer, it is from spring to summer. The question before the Board is to make the salary between the spring and summer terms consistent. He added that the salaries in the summer are being paid for by a self supporting budget, whereas the salaries for the spring/fall semesters are paid through state funds.

President Lucey stated that this process becomes complicated by the variable ways in which adjunct faculty are compensated from one institution to the next. Chair Wixom stated that relates back to Regent Geddes' earlier comments. However, CSN has an anomalous situation which they believe is an aberration of the COLA appropriation, which they are attempting to correct. President Lucy added that a theme among the campuses is to use their summer school programs to address the serious need to provide more courses and seats for students. However, the campuses do not have the state's support during the summer as they do during the academic year.

Chair Wixom asked if the proposed revision affects WNC. President Lucey replied that it did by allowing WNC to increase the cap.

Upon a roll call vote Regents Leavitt, Page, Rawson, Schofield, Wixom, Anthony, Cobb, Gallagher, Geddes and Knecht voted yes. Regents Blakely and Crear voted no. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

Regent Cobb asked if the summer school per credit hour reflected in the policy had been approved by the Board. Vice Chancellor Reed indicated that it had been approved by the Board..

Regent Cobb asked for clarification regarding the disparities between the per credit hour compensation among the institutions. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the disparity was a historical artifact from the way in which the campuses have brought their requests forward to serve their individual needs. At the Board's request, a discussion to revise that policy could be placed to a future agenda.

9. Approved – *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules *(Agenda Item #9)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Cobb observed that there appeared to be a 30-40% disparity in faculty salaries between UNR and UNLV. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that a chart could be provided to the Regents that will reflect the differences in faculty salaries and the differences in fees to determine if a more consistent policy was necessary. Regent Cobb felt that would be enlightening. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that information would be provided to the Board.

Meeting recessed at 2:58 p.m. and reconvened at 3:15 p.m. on Thursday, April 2, 2009, with all members present except for Regents Alden, Cobb and Leavitt.

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

Ms. Elizabeth Cook, Student at WNC and CSN, related that sign language interpreters are required to hold a baccalaureate level degree. However, American Sign Language *(ASL)* courses are not currently recognized by UNLV to fulfill language requirements. Since Ms. Cook is a resident of Las Vegas and does not have the economic resources to remain in Carson City, she must return to Las Vegas but she will not have the access or support to finish her education. She related that American Sign Language is recognized on federal levels and by every other public higher education institution in Nevada.

Regents Cobb and Leavitt entered the meeting.

Chair Wixom asked Ms. Cook if she will receive an Associate's degree in American Sign Language. Ms. Cook replied that she will have earned an Associate's degree in General Studies, Deaf Studies and in Interpreting.

Chair Wixom asked Ms. Cook if she was saying that upon transfer to UNLV, that institution will not recognize the ASL courses she has taken. Ms. Cook elaborated that at UNLV, depending on the degree program up to six units may be transferable as humanities credits. Chair Wixom observed that there may not be a uniform process of transferring ASL classes from the community colleges to the universities. He asked Ms. Cook if she would be seeking a baccalaureate degree in American Sign Language or a more general degree program. Ms. Cook indicated that she would be seeking a more general degree program since a baccalaureate in American Sign Language was not currently offered.

Chair Wixom asked if American Sign Language credits were transferable to UNR. Ms. Jannet Vreeland, Vice Provost, UNR, replied that their institution does recognize ASL courses to meet their language requirements.

President Ashley clarified that since baccalaureate degrees were not "generalized," transferability of the ASL courses would depend on the curriculum chosen by Ms. Cook.

President Maryanski related that NSC offered a baccalaureate degree in Deaf Communication. Ms. Cook replied that she had been told that program was not moving forward. President Maryanski indicated that they were currently seeking faculty but would be happy to speak with Ms. Cook about their program.

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

Regent Knecht stated that the Board should not be in the role of micromanager and, unfortunately, not every institution could be all things to all people. However, he did feel that ASL programs were vitally important. He was hopeful that Ms. Cook could be accommodated at NSC. However, that would not solve the problem of not enough ASL and Deaf Studies programs. Regent Knecht requested that a status report be provided at a future meeting on the program offerings at all seven teaching institutions, specifically CSN, NSC, UNLV and WNC. He would also like to request that the Student and Academic Affairs Committee provide some serious focus and attention to these programs and to present proposals that the Regents could consider.

Regent Geddes requested that report address if ASL could or should be recognized as a language requirement. In addition, he was aware that some of the K-12 teachers learn sign language through their curriculum and asked that this also be addressed through the Student and Academic Affairs Committee's efforts.

Regent Rawson related that a statute existed regarding the acceptance of ASL courses as a foreign language, adding that the institutions should be in compliance.

Chair Wixom asked President Maryanski to follow-up with Ms. Cook regarding the opportunities available at NSC. The larger issue could then be addressed by the Student and Academic Affairs Committee. Ms. Cook added that although it is statutorily recognized as a foreign language, it is not recognized or taught at UNLV in that manner. Chair Wixom stated that her point was well taken and would be addressed.

10. Approved – Graduate Research Assistants at DRI *(GRAD)* Student Association *(Agenda Item #10)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of DRI President Stephen G. Wells to establish a Graduate Research Assistants at DRI student association *(Ref. BoR-10 on file in the Board office).*

President Wells related that DRI's mandate includes the fostering of faculty and students with talent. Their commitment to that mandate is demonstrated through the support of approximately 45 to 70 students each year through $1.7 million derived from non-state resources. DRI treasures the role it plays at the universities in its ability to teach and supervise these students. The graduate students work daily with the DRI faculty and are a remarkable asset to the institution. In response to his solicitation for methods and structural elements to improve communication, the graduate students developed a plan for establishing their own association.

President Wells introduced Ms. K.C. King and Ms. Elise Comartin, graduate students at UNR and DRI. Ms. King explained that creation of the student association would better represent the interests of the students that are working at DRI. Basic goals of the proposed association include having a voice with the DRI administration and the Board of Regents as well as developing a relationship amongst the graduate students in becoming a resource for each other. They have also discussed the development of an orientation manual to assist the incoming graduate students as well as the need to recognize the importance of recruitment.

10. Approved – Graduate Research Assistants at DRI *(GRAD)* Student Association *(Agenda Item #10)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Geddes expressed his support, adding that, as a former graduate student himself, he felt this would help the students feel more connected to their campuses.

Regent Crear moved approval to establish the Graduate Research Assistants at DRI *(GRAD)* student association. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

11. Approved – Honorary Degrees *(Agenda Item #11)* – The Board of Regents approved all nominated recipients for 2009 Honorary Degrees *(Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 14, and Procedures and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 1(2))*. *(Ref. BoR-11a on file in the Board office.)*

A. Honorary Doctorate Degrees: *(Ref. BoR-11b)*
   - Mr. Paul Bible, UNR.
   - Ms. Annette R. Whittemore, UNR.

B. Honorary Baccalaureate Degrees: *(Ref. BoR-11c)*
   - Ms. Kim Miller, GBC.

C. Honorary Associate Degrees: *(Ref. BoR-11d)*
   - Mr. Neil Friedman, CSN.
   - Mr. Howard Rosenberg, WNC.
   - Mr. Roger Williams, WNC

Regent Anthony moved approval of the Honorary Degree nominees. Regent Page seconded. Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously. Regent Alden was absent.

12. Approved - *Handbook* Revision, Institutional Bylaws *(Agenda Item #12)* – The Board of Regents approved Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich's request for amendment to the NSHE Code concerning the process for reviewing and approving institutional bylaws, unit bylaws, and student government constitutions *(Title 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.3)*. This was the second and final hearing *(Ref. BoR-12 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Geddes recalled a situation that had occurred at UNR and requested confirmation that a process existed that allowed appeal to the Board should a technical correction be made after the students had voted. Mr. Eli Reilly, ASUN President, UNR, related that due to that specific situation, the ASUN's internal processes have shifted to require that any constitutional change must now be submitted to the institutions legal counsel prior to being submitted to the president's office.

Regent Geddes asked if that was the process followed by the other institutions as well. Mr. Scott Wasserman, Chief Executive Office of the Board of Regents, stated that the proposal includes a provision in the policy concerning student government constitutions that requires review by the institution's legal counsel prior to the change being voted upon by the student body.

12. Approved - *Handbook* Revision, Institutional Bylaws *(Agenda Item #12) – (Cont'd.)*

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich added that in response to the concerns expressed by the Board at the first reading of this revision, additional language was incorporated that provided automatic approval if the request was not approved or acted upon by the Chancellor within 45 days.

Regent Page moved approval of amendment to the NSHE Code *(Title 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.3)*. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

13. Withdrawn - *Handbook* Revision, DRI Bylaws *(Agenda Item #13)* – Due to the Board of Regent's approval of Agenda Item #12 - *Handbook* Revision, Institutional Bylaws, Agenda Item #13 was withdrawn (*BoR-13 on file in the Board office).*

14. Approved – Institutional Mission Statements *(Agenda Item #14)* – The Board of Regents approved changes to, or reaffirmation of, existing mission statements as presented *(Ref. BD-2 and Handout on file in the Board office).*

Chair Wixom related that over the last two years, one of his objectives has been to revisit the mission statements of the institutions and the System. He felt this discussion was also particularly important to the Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee agenda item to be addressed later in the meeting.

Regent Leavitt asked Vice Chancellor Nichols to address the purpose, importance and relevance of the mission statements. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that the System receives many questions about the institutions' mission statements. When the Chair of the Board asked the presidents to discuss and sign off on each others' mission statements, it served a dual purpose of further understanding how their missions fit together and how each is defined. Within that context, the Board has established a very formal and proper mission statement for the System as well as a more limiting mission for each type of institution in the master plan. Although the master plan has not been reviewed in some time, the presidents of each institution are very aware of the parameters of their type of institution. Since the Board has provided limitations under which each type of institution functions, it is not necessary for each institution to specify information such as level of degree offered or admission policies within each of their mission statements. Upon the request of the Chair, the presidents began a review of their mission statements, adding that the master plan is then based on the mission statement of the institution. It is within that context that the Board is considering the mission statements presented that day.

Regent Leavitt, as Chair of the Board Development Committee, asked each of the presidents that had changed or revised their mission statements since June of 2008 to inform the Board of the changes and the process that their institutions engaged in.

President Sheehan replied that as a new president, her first charge was to conduct a general review of TMCC's master plan as well as its mission and vision statements. Starting

14. Approved – Institutional Mission Statements *(Agenda Item #14)* – *(Cont'd.)*

immediately upon her arrival in August 2008, a number of meetings were held and then the project was turned over to a subcommittee of TMCC's Planning and Budget Development Committee. The process was very comprehensive and included input from faculty, students, the community and even retirees. Upon completion, TMCC had developed their vision statement, plus mission statement as well as a delineation of their values. She felt that an institution should review its mission statement annually to realign or to reaffirm its applicability. A vision statement did not previously exist and their mission statement had been a much longer document. TMCC's vision and values drive their strategic master plan which then attach to the setting of their funding priorities. Regent Gallagher appreciated the way that TMCC's document was focused. Regent Leavitt agreed that it was one of the most concise documents. Mr. James Stokely, ASTM Public Relations and Recruitment Director, TMCC, thanked President Sheehan for allowing him to be involved in the process, adding that it had been a wonderful opportunity.

President Diekhans related in July 2008, GBC had just completed the development of their mission statement. That process was then followed by development of their commitment statements that in turn are being used to develop their strategic plan. Dr. Mike McFarland, Vice President of Academic Affairs, GBC, explained that essentially the mission statement was not changed, just revised and reworded. Over the course of two years, a committee comprised of faculty and administrators refined it and developed the commitment statements. GBC's six year strategic plan, which is fundamentally based upon the mission and commitment statements, will be presented to the Board in October 2009.

President Richards related that in June of 2008, CSN began the process of reexamining their mission statement. The resulting mission statement is now essentially one sentence and is supported by a vision statement and a statement of values. Dr. Sondra Cosgrove, Faculty Senate Chair, CSN, related that this process was very important to faculty, students and staff. Their first goal was to shorten the mission statement into something that was succinct and then expand it with the development of a vision statement and value statements. A committee was established and once a draft was established, several town hall meetings were held with faculty, staff and students. Initially the concise nature of the statement caused some concern. However, those concerns were eliminated once President Richards provided assurance that the mission statement could be revised annually as the institution's needs changed.

President Ashley related that in August 2008, UNLV brought to the Board their strategic plan as created during the 2007/08 academic year. During that process, UNLV defined its identity and values. The mission statement includes an explanation of what UNLV is and what UNLV expects to be, followed by a statement that UNLV makes its important decisions based on the list of shared values. President Ashley related from the institution's previous planning efforts, they had found that there was not enough connection between the allocation of resources and what was put in the plan. The goal in taking on this exercise was a promise to the community to create a level of transparency in terms of what resources were available to UNLV and how the resources would follow the plan.

14. Approved – Institutional Mission Statements *(Agenda Item #14)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Leavitt requested that the presidents of the institutions that are requesting reaffirmation of their statement provide an explanation of their institution's status.

President Glick related that upon his arrival two years ago, UNR had begun the process of reviewing their mission statement. That process had been delayed until the arrival of Provost and Executive Vice President, Dr. Marc Johnson. Provost Johnson is now in the process of developing a detailed but light strategic plan, which had been submitted to the faculty for their review and input. Provost Johnson added that the mission describes the scope of work and responsibility given to the institution as directed by the Board of Regents. That fundamental scope of work will not change. A more standard mission statement was developed that will be supported by a dynamic list of goals.

President Wells related that DRI started a strategic planning process in 2002 and then followed up with several leadership retreats in 2005 through 2007. During that process they felt that it was important for their institution to remain loyal to the legislative mandate that defined the formation of DRI. That legislative mandate focused DRI as contributing to the security of the nation and promoting the welfare of the state of Nevada and its citizens through educational scientific research. Then several goals were listed including conducting fundamental scientific, economic, social or educational investigations, to encourage and foster a desire in students and faculty to do research, discover and develop talent, acquire and disseminate knowledge and promote research throughout the System. Since 2007, their institution has remained loyal to that mandate.

Regent Leavitt asked Regent Rawson to elaborate on his experience in the legislature with mission statements. Regent Rawson stated that if you place a compelling purpose in the law, it helps to defend future challenges. On the basis of health and welfare of the people, some civil liberties are taken for the good of the whole. It seemed to him that the Board has an obligation to write a preamble stating the real need or value to the System's purpose. Higher Education is essential to the quality of life, specific to the health and welfare of the people of the State of Nevada and therefore it should be given a broad range in how that is accomplished. He felt that the Board's current mission statement could be revamped to provide further protection when challenges to its constitutional authority arise. Regent Leavitt asked that to be placed as an item on a future Board Development Committee agenda.

President Maryanski related that in 2008, NSC Provost, Dr. Lesley DiMare began the strategic planning process. During that process it was decided that NSC would be best served by focusing, rather than modifying, their mission as a comprehensive four-year institution mode. That strategic plan should be brought to the Board later this year. Provost DiMare related that in September 2008, after a one-day retreat with an outside consultant, a Strategic Planning Committee was appointed and has been meeting nearly every Friday since. A strategic plan has been drafted that includes six overarching goals that support NSC's mission statement and are further supported by strategies and tactics. That plan will be sent to the faculty, staff and students for input and then brought to the Board, possibly in August.

14. Approved – Institutional Mission Statements *(Agenda Item #14)* – *(Cont'd.)*

President Lucey related that in 2000, upon WNC's accreditation evaluation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, their institution embarked on a major planning process and development of a mission statement. That statement was approximately two pages long and was approve by the Board in 2000. At that time, WNC also developed its first six-year strategic plan. A report is submitted annually and becomes more focused with each passing year. In 2006, President Lucey related that she had reported to the Board that the WNC mission statement was going to be reviewed and shortened and then brought back to the Board for their approval. Although the mission statement has been modified, the content has not changed. Ms. Anne Hansen, Director, Information and Marketing Services, WNC, added that their mission statement is still supported by their values and vision statement.

Regent Knecht requested that time be given for due consideration to determine if the mission statements were complementary and consistent with the System's mission. He also asked that this discussion be continued to a later time while NSC and UNR continue with their processes.

Regent Gallagher asked if the Board Development Committee had approved the statements or if approval was pending discussion by the full Board. Regent Leavitt related that due to a legislative hearing, the presidents were not available for discussion at the committee meeting. Due to the significance of this topic, he felt it was important that it be presented to the full Board. He added that he was not in a hurry to pass this and was not troubled by Regent Knecht's suggestion.

Regent Anthony asked if it would be appropriate for the Board to vote upon those institutions that had completed their process. That would allow the other institutions time to complete their process and make their presentations at a later time.

Regent Schofield echoed Regent Anthony's statement.

Regent Crear also felt that the institutions had placed much effort into this process and would like to see closure.

Chair Wixom expressed his deep appreciation to the institutions for their efforts. His preference would be to accept the mission statements as prepared, with the understanding that there are some that are still in-process. However, he asked for input on what extent measures such as graduation and completion rates, going-to-college rates and diversity should be reflected in the individual and/or System mission statements.

Regent Leavitt felt that perhaps this item should have been bifurcated. Upon completion of the discussion on the institutional mission statements, Vice Chancellor Nichols would be addressing the System's mission statement. Chair Wixom clarified that his question was more related to whether those types of issues should be reflected in the individual mission statements. If they should, then perhaps the institutions need to further revise their statements. If they should not, then the Board should move forward on its vote.

President Lucey agreed that the Board needed to place its energy into developing performance indicators and the strategic planning that follows from the mission

14. Approved – Institutional Mission Statements *(Agenda Item #14)* – *(Cont'd.)*

statements. The mission statements are the documents that inspire their communities and guide their individual academic communities. The Board needs to play a very important role in the next stage which is development of a plan to improve student success in program completion/graduation rates and to ensure institutional excellence through development of individual performance indicators.

President Sheehan related that the individual mission statements were more of a broad piece to a larger plan. The System has provided direction on a number of specific areas for consideration, including student access and success.

President Richards echoed President Sheehan's concept but added that the mission, vision and values statements were the foundation for the strategic plan. The Board's approval of the mission statements would help to move the process to the next level.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich noted that he had never been completely satisfied with the accountability measures that the System publishes on an annual basis. This year that report was changed from System to campus-specific data. It may be appropriate for the Board to review those accountability statements and then make recommendations. Then the presidents could utilize some of that discussion for their own process and it could also become an appropriate part of the presidents' evaluation.

Regent Gallagher felt that the types of measures indicated by Chair Wixom were really separate from the mission and vision statements and were more appropriate to development of a strategic plan. Chair Wixom agreed, adding that his question is at what point in time are those benchmarks established.

Regent Knecht related that he assigns the utmost priority to the central importance of the mission statements. However, he felt that the process of education and planning would continue if the mission statements were not approved at this meeting, adding that the statements should be given more time for consideration.

President Maryanski clarified that NSC had not made any changes to its mission statement, just to the implementation process. President Maryanski indicated that NSC is asking the Board to reaffirm its mission statement.

Regent Anthony moved approval of reaffirmation of existing mission statements that have not been revised, and approval of mission statements that have been revised, as presented. Regent Page seconded. Upon a roll call vote, Regents Page, Rawson, Schofield, Wixom, Anthony, Blakely, Cobb, Crear, Gallagher, Geddes and Leavitt voted yes. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent. Regent Knecht abstained.

Regent Knecht related that his abstention reflected his deep respect and appreciation for all of the work that the institutions had done but he remained deeply uncomfortable.

14. Approved – Institutional Mission Statements *(Agenda Item #14)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Vice Chancellor Nichols suggested that the full Board, or through the Board Development Committee, review the NSHE mission statement and, as a part of that, review the Board's broader goals, principals and targets. The NSHE mission statement should be reviewed by the Board and then from that discussion, there should be a re-evaluation of the master plan including the kind of very specific goals that the Board should be holding the institutions accountable for and which should be reported annually in the Accountability Report. That conversation could begin with the NSHE mission statement in June although it may continue over the course of a couple of meetings.

Chair Wixom felt that the Board did not spend enough time re-evaluating its objectives and asked that the future conversation include ways in which those goals could be kept in the forefront. He asked that this agenda item be brought back at the June meeting to allow evaluation of the mission statements, including development of matrices.

The meeting recessed at 4:52 p.m. on Thursday, April 2, 2009, and reconvened at 8:00 a.m. on Friday, April 3, 2009, with all members present except for Regents Alden, Knecht and Schofield.

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

Mr. Anthony Ruggiero, President, State of Nevada Board of Education, requested the Board of Regents' support in opposition to efforts by several legislators to change their board's governance structure to appointed rather than elected. Mr. Ruggiero related that the State Board of Education is in support of Assembly Concurrent Resolution #2 that provides for a study to look at the governance structure in Nevada regarding education.

Regent Crear asked if the System's lobbyists have taken a position on this particular bill. Chair Wixom did not believe that they had. Regent Crear asked for clarification that the System's lobbyists were representing the Board's position. Chair Wixom confirmed that is occurring, adding that with respect to this issue, an update on legislative proposals will be discussed later on the agenda. He recommended this discussion occur at that time.

Regent Leavitt related that he personally shared Mr. Ruggiero's views and thanked him for addressing the Regents.

Regent Cobb indicated his lack of support for an assembly bill that calls for a member of the Board of Regents to serve in some capacity on the State Board of Education.

Chair Wixom requested that the Board wait until Agenda Item #17 to further discuss specific legislative issues.

Regent Knecht entered the meeting.

Mr. Steven Bale, Faculty Senate Chair, TMCC, related that the Faculty Senate Chair-Elects have been appointed to replace the current chairs beginning in June. He thanked the Regents for the opportunity to have worked with them and introduced TMCC's Faculty Senate Chair Elect, Mr. Scott Huber.

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

Dr. Bill Follette, Faculty Senate Chair, UNR, thanked the Board and the UNR Faculty for allowing him to serve for the last year. He introduced incoming Chair, Dr. Elliott Parker.

Ms. Sondra Cosgrove, Faculty Senate Chair, CSN, also thanked the Board and introduced incoming Chair, Dr. Mark Rauls.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich noted that the Faculty Senate Chairs' request to meet on a monthly basis has been a wonderful opportunity to discuss and head off many concerns and issues. He thanked them for their time and commitment. Chair Wixom agreed that the Faculty Senate Chairs have been an incredible resource over the last year and the Board very much appreciated their time, dedication and commitment.

15. Information Only – Regents' ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee for the Nevada System of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #15)* - Chair Michael B. Wixom led a discussion on the implementation of a Regents' ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee. This Committee was first presented to the Board of Regents at its December 2008 meeting. At that time Chair Wixom presented the charge of this Committee to include, but not be limited to, advising the Board and making recommendations to the Board on the following items: (1) the consideration of amendments to current policies which are either outdated or unduly cumbersome or which inhibit the ability of campus management to respond to changing circumstances; (2) review of the eight institutions for models of cost savings and efficiency so that best practices can be shared across the System; (3) review of models that will improve student recruitment, retention and degree completion rates; (4) review of models for maximum utilization of campus facilities; (5) review of opportunities for privatization and outsourcing that do not further impact the System's budgets; (6) review of employment and personnel practices and policies, including, but not limited to, faculty workload and participation in the State Classified System; (7) review of models for more efficient and flexible capital financing, construction and renewal, including a review of the viability and utility of the participation of the State Public Works Board; and (8) review of governance models to determine areas where the Board of Regents can govern more efficiently, whether that is in the form of fewer meetings, fewer reports or the like. The Chair sought discussion of procedural matters relating to the ad hoc Committee, including, but not limited to, the duties and goals of the Committee and suggestions for the Chair's potential appointments to the Committee that draw from every sector of the State *(Ref. BoR-15 and Handout on file in the Board office).*

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that initially, it was indicated that such an ad hoc committee would largely be composed of representatives from the Nevada community. However, he felt that would short circuit the advice of the professionals the System has hired to perform those jobs, particularly the presidents. He added that the presidents would relish the opportunity to show the Board exactly how the institutions could improve. Then business leaders from throughout the state could be incorporated into those discussions. He also cautioned not to overlook the significant public relations aspect of this effort, adding that the System does not do enough to tell people what it does or how it goes about doing it. It was important that the right ambassadors from the business community be utilized.

15. Information Only – Regents' ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee for the Nevada System of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #15)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chancellor Rogers echoed Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich's concern that the System does a poor job of selling its product. The System is really seeking the business community to ratify and affirm what is already being done. He felt that the process should include an initial internal analysis followed by the engagement of a consultant to review the information and determine the System's shortcomings. Then, within that timeframe, the System should begin to engage the support of the business community and the community-at-large.

President Wells suggested that perhaps the presidents could initially collect the information and work together as a team. Then at the appropriate time a community group, lead by an external consultant, could conduct a review of that information and provide feedback. The consultant could then work with the presidents on the results of that analysis to provide a final presentation back to community leaders. Although it is a bit of a staged process, it provides the presidents an opportunity to be on top of the issues.

President Ashley related that the presidents had the opportunity to begin addressing many of the issues at their retreat in August of 2008. At that time, a list of three categories was developed that included: 1) efficiencies that already existed but were not readily known; 2) barriers that could be removed to achieve further efficiencies; and 3) areas that the presidents knew they were inefficient and where solutions must be sought. Although the discussion had somewhat been motivated by the legislative cycle, it was also instigated by the need to share information amongst themselves. He felt there was much the presidents could offer to each other.

President Sheehan noted that each of the eight tasks currently delineated on the agenda were significant in their own right. She asked if the presidents would be allowed to narrow the scope and provide a suggestion as to what the true focus should be or if all eight areas were to be addressed. Chair Wixom replied that the list was made as exhaustive as possible with the understanding that each issue may not be fully explored. He envisioned a three or four tier process that would include: 1) a directive from the Board to the presidents to narrow the scope to a more focused list of recommendations to be presented at the June Board meeting; 2) to solicit outside guidance with the appropriate expertise to review and consider the presidents' recommendations; 3) to engage business and community leaders to review and make recommendations so that the stakeholders *(taxpayers and constituents)* will have an opportunity to see what has been done; and 4) to have the resulting recommendations from the first three steps presented back to the Board by the end of the year. He emphasized that he did not want this effort to extend into a multi-year process.

Regent Geddes noted that the Chancellor's February 10, 2009, memorandum *(Ref. BoR-15)*, summarized the steps the institutions have already taken to realize efficiencies. He also felt that this initiative was a positive step in focusing the Board's on-going efforts. He noted that this process may also assist with the concerns expressed that perhaps the campuses could be doing more if the Board would identify those areas in which the Board is preventing them from moving forward.

15. Information Only – Regents' ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee for the Nevada System of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #15) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Leavitt felt that the approach recommended by Chair Wixom was wise. However, he was confident in what the System staff and presidents were doing and wanted to make sure that the appropriate business and community leaders were involved. He also felt that the plan needed to include a 5th part that tells the community the System's story.

Chair Wixom indicated that was a point well taken and emphasized that the phrase "business community" needed to be broadened to include community leaders and stakeholders.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich indicated the importance to not lose the effectiveness aspect of this initiative by focusing solely on efficiencies. The community needs to know that the presidents and System are using resources wisely and are appropriately focusing on education.

Regent Page added that as a new Regent, he was amazed at the many things that are happening at the campuses. He suggested that perhaps it would be an appropriate project for some of the marketing classes to create a campaign for each of the campuses.

Regent Anthony agreed with President Sheehan, that the mission of the proposed committee needed to be made very clear.

Regent Crear related that he has frequently observed that many wonderful things happening at the institutions are unknown outside of the Board meetings. He hoped this would be taken to heart.

Regent Cobb concurred with Regent Crear. He related that as a result of recent discussions with Chancellor Rogers, he will be asking the presidents to send him five good things that are currently happening at their campuses so that he may prepare a document that champions the System. However, he felt that unless there was involved participation from the community, any findings would be found to be not credible. He added that perhaps the process outlined by Chair Wixom was not the right mechanism.

Regent Gallagher emphasized that the System has to educate the public on how academia functions, how it depends on the faculty and why decisions are made differently in higher education. She felt that the majority of people do not know that education is run from the bottom up. She suggested that the first step be the assembling of a group of community members that could be educated and then ask them for their input. She also felt very strongly that the System does not tell its story well.

Chair Wixom agreed that there needed to be a clear understanding of the expectations. He felt that the way in which the agenda item was written could be a starting point for the presidents to refine and identify areas to focus or restructure.

Chair Wixom also felt that the concerns regarding the credibility of the process were valid. He related that his initial assumption was that in order to gain that credibility the process had to start from outside the System. His concern with going forward with that

15. Information Only – Regents' ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee for the Nevada System of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #15) – (Cont'd.)*

assumption was that it would not be as efficient since so much had already been done internally. Secondly, engaging individuals that are unfamiliar with the System would require a significant learning curve on their part which may not be the most effective or efficient use of their time. He felt that conducting the first steps of this initiative internally would provide those community members with something to work with and from which to respond. He added that business and community leaders could not simply be ambassadors and they must have a stake in the process.

Chair Wixom reiterated that Vice Chair Geddes will lead the presidents' efforts to focus this initiative and asked that he present that report to the full Board at the June meeting. At that time, the Board may consider several decisions including providing further direction to the presidents, engaging a third party consultant as well as decisions regarding community and business leader involvement.

Regent Gallagher emphasized the importance of not only engaging the appropriate people but in expanding education efforts out into the general community.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

Dr. Follette expressed his concern that an efficiency analysis would be meaningless without first defining the goals and expected outcome from the onset. He felt that the establishment of mission statements alone would not be an adequate representation of all the components that the System would like to assess. Graduation and completion rates are reasonable metrics but do not fully represent the public good that the university does. He appreciated that the Regents would like to see a presentation in June but felt there was an enormous amount of work to be done for it to be a meaningful study.

Chancellor Rogers related that upon assuming his duties five years ago, he had stated that the System did not sell its product well and over the years he has not seen a great deal of improvement in that area. He asked why, as a large source of employees, so little is known about the System. He felt that studies would not do any good until people begin to sell the product.

Regent Cobb added that the student leaders could also become ambassadors and asked them to submit five points from their perspectives.

Regent Crear entered the meeting.

Chancellor Rogers related that there had been a rally at UNLV with approximately 3,000-5,000 people in attendance. However, he felt that the students were disappointed that very few employees were in attendance. He then asked the student leaders for their input.

Mr. Adam Cronis, CSUN Student Body President, UNLV, felt that since the budget issues began, there has been more unity between staff, faculty and students. However, he felt that the comments expressed were true. He felt that the students need to do more of their own marketing, adding that perhaps that was indicative of what they could also do after graduation.

15. Information Only – Regents' ad hoc Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee for the Nevada System of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #15) – (Cont'd.)*

Mr. Ryan Crowell, NSSA Student Body President, NSC, related that the faculty support at their institution was good but there was always room for improvement.

Mr. David Waterhouse, ASCSN Student Body President, CSN, related that he has worked very closely with the CSN Faculty Senate and felt that they had been very helpful in supporting and participating in the rallies.

Chair Wixom directed Vice Chair Geddes to work with the presidents to determine the appropriate focus of this initiative and to present their findings at the June Board meeting. At that time, the Board will identify how to conduct a third party review and how to identify the community leaders that should be engaged. He asked the presidents to take Dr. Follette's concerns into consideration throughout their process. He stated that there was a danger in the perception that academia overanalyzes issues, adding that would not happen in this case as something needed to be done now.

16. Information Only – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget *(Agenda Item #16)* - The Board continued its discussion of the 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget Request that was submitted to the Governor, including new developments from the 2009 legislative session and financial status of the state and the corresponding impact on budgets.

Chair Wixom reported that pending a specific response from the legislature, there was not a great deal of information to report. He assured the Regents that all of the discussions with legislators have been within the parameters set by the Board.

Chancellor Rogers indicated that once the legislature determines a number, the System will quickly adjust accordingly.

Regent Gallagher asked Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich when that determination would be made. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that information was expected upon distribution of the Economic Forum projections on May 1st.

Regent Rawson related that the difficulty with this situation is that the deficit can only be resolved from just two or three different areas including human services, education and public safety. However, education made up approximately half of that budget. The legislators truly feel that they are between a rock and hard place. Serious cuts and adjustments to the System's budgets are very impressive but take a long time to recover from. He added that, although the economy is bad, there are more students enrolled today than when the economy was good. One request that the System could make to the Legislature is that it be granted the authority to role unspent funds at the end of each year into a higher education reserve account rather than returning it to the general fund. Chancellor Rogers stated that there was currently a bill that addressed that. Chair Wixom indicated that the Board would discuss that particular bill during the next agenda item. Regent Rawson cautioned that although the presidents need to be looking for efficiencies, they also needed to be careful not to cut themselves so short that they could not do business.

16. Information Only – Discussion of 2009-2011 NSHE Biennial Budget *(Agenda Item #16)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chair Wixom related that a special Board meeting will be scheduled after May 1st when the Economic Forum projections are released.

Regent Rawson requested that as the economic crisis passes, that the System consider its energy consumption and if capital expenditures should include installation of voltaic cells on every building. Although not an immediate return, installation of such measures could put the System in an energy-independent status within ten years. Regent Schofield felt that would be sensible and asked how that could be accomplished. Chair Wixom replied that several members of the Board also have an interest in that issue and asked that it be placed on a future agenda.

17. Information Only - 2009 Legislative Proposals *(Agenda Item #17)* - The Board of Regents heard an update on the status of legislative proposals that may impact the NSHE that were currently being considered by the legislature and discussed potential legislation for the 2009 Session.

Ms. Crystal Abba, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs, NSHE, explained that one of her roles is to track legislation and assist in coordination of legislative testimony. There is a critical deadline of April 10th for all legislation to pass its house of origin. What is notable about this session is that currently the System is tracking 70 measures that either directly or indirectly impact the NSHE.

Ms. Abba reminded the Board that SB 490, passed by the 2007 legislature, took away the Board's BDR authority for the 2009 and 2011 legislative sessions. The System's authority to submit five BDR's per legislative session will be restored in 2013.

AB 401 addresses the NSHE's bonding capacity by extending the ability to request additional bonding capacity for another twenty years.

AB 520 is the Governor's bill that creates five stabilization funds including Capital Improvement and One Time Expenditures, K-12, Higher Education, General Government Functions and the Department of Health and Human Services. This bill provides unrestricted general fund balances at the end of the fiscal year to be allotted depending on each area's existing portion of the general fund appropriations. However, the first 25% would go to the Capital Improvement and One-Time Expenditure fund. If that bill were to pass as currently written, the NSHE would receive 19% of the remaining 75%.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich added that was not the bill that the System is lobbying for. The System has language drafted for a specific NSHE stabilization fund to encourage the effective utilization of unexpended funds for when times are tough. Ms. Abba added that there was not yet a sponsor of the NSHE's bill. However, the language could also be added to an existing measure.

Regent Rawson felt that even if the System was not successful in establishing a stabilization fund during this session, serious effort needed to be placed in developing a plan that will extend 50 to 100 years in the future.

17. Information Only - 2009 Legislative Proposals *(Agenda Item #17) – (Cont'd.)*

Chair Wixom asked if the stabilization bill originally supported by the Board was consistent with Regent Rawson's concerns. Ms. Abba replied that it was. Chair Wixom felt that the Board should stay with its original intent. He added that this will be discussed further at the end of this presentation.

Ms. Abba continued that there were several bills affecting the Millennium Scholarship including SB 209, AB 11, AB 96, AB 158, AB 347, AB 351 and AB 212.

AB 188 provides a fee waiver for the spouse and children of National Guard members killed in the line of active duty. This provision is supported to the extent that it is already part of Board policy.

SB 148 provides fee waivers for members of the U.S. Armed Forces, Reserves and National Guard that outlines certain criteria that individuals must meet in order to qualify for the waivers. This measure is supported to the extent that portions of it are currently part of Board policy. However, rather than taking a position on the remaining portions, the System provided a cost estimate for the first fiscal year of approximately $60 million, mostly in foregone tuition for members of the U.S. Armed Forces that are currently residing outside of the state of Nevada, who would then become eligible under the fee waiver programs. The second year was estimated to cost approximately $64 million. While the intent behind the measure is very honorable it is also very expensive.

AB 505 requires the Department of Education to work in consultation with the Board of Regents and the Nevada System of Higher Education to plan and ensure that high school pupils are ready for post secondary education. That same provision is also in Senator Horsford's bill for a World Class Education.

SB 387 would remove the exception granted to the NSHE to provide salaries that are in excess of 95% of the Governor's salary.

Regent Schofield left the meeting.

Regent Geddes asked for more information on SB 32. Ms. Abba related that the language for SB 32 provides that if a closed meeting is held to consider the character, alleged misconduct or professional misconduct of an appointed public officer or someone who serves at the pleasure of a public body, within 30-days the findings of that closed meeting must be made public. However, there is a provision in state law that excludes presidential evaluations from that process. That is a measure that is being tracked for amendment purposes only.

Regent Geddes requested further explanation of SB 330, Initiative for a World Class Education. Ms. Abba related that this initiative includes a provision for the alignment of curriculum between K-12 and post-secondary education and includes a component for workforce development.

17. Information Only - 2009 Legislative Proposals *(Agenda Item #17) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Geddes requested that the System track any bills that address State Public Works Board *(SPWB)* issues to determine if there is an opportunity to exempt the NSHE from their purview. Ms. Abba related that AB 298 was heard earlier that week and does remove the NSHE from the purview of the SPWB. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich clarified that provision was only a portion of that bill, adding that the bill includes other portions that the System has historically not supported.

Regent Cobb asked to receive a copy of AB 298 and suggested that in the future, a reference be available to assist the Regents in tracking the discussion more easily. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that there was a very sophisticated and detailed bill tracking mechanism that was felt to be too cumbersome to review at a meeting. However, a summary will continue to be sent to the Regents. He encouraged the Board members to provide feedback if that summary is not useful so that improvements could be considered.

Chief Counsel Patterson related that AB 519 and AB 275 deal with efficiency of state boards and address creation of statewide efficiency committees, which may impact or duplicate some of the measures that the Regents are currently considering. Also, SB 279 addresses public disclosure of consulting arrangements involving faculty. This Board has adopted a very detailed policy about that reporting that maintains confidentiality while the conflict is vetted internally within the System. There may be some interest by this Board on the outcome of that measure as it essentially attempts to override this Board's position on the confidentiality of those documents.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Chair Wixom felt that the Board may need to take formal action with respect to AB 519 and SB 275. He requested that the Board's on-going effort related to efficiency and effectiveness be communicated to the Legislature with the request that it be allowed to come to some fruition before being legislatively mandated. Vice Chancellor Nichols clarified that SB 275 is up for a hearing this afternoon. It is a very broad bill that does not target higher education and is advisory in nature. However, there was no question that it would pull this Board's efforts into the legislative conversation if it were come to pass. She felt that the Board may want to take the position that the System be at the table in an advisory capacity only. Chair Wixom indicated his concern that this legislation may infringe upon the Board of Regents' authority as a separate constitutional body. He felt it was one thing to apply these efforts to a legislatively created body but another thing entirely when it is applied to a separate constitutional body.

Vice Chancellor Nichols assured the Regents that the staff will not take any position that the Board of Regents has not affirmed in its policies, conversations or actions. If the Board has not expressed an opinion on an issue, then staff simply states that the Board does not have an opinion. In a case such as this, the staff has planned to clearly convey the Board's efforts and that legislation could not be constructed in such a way to impinge upon the constitutional autonomy of the Board as a decision making body. Any findings would be considered by the Board as advisory only. Chair Wixom asked that in connection with

17. Information Only - 2009 Legislative Proposals *(Agenda Item #17)* – *(Cont'd.)*

those particular items, that staff convey to the legislature that the Board is undertaking its own initiative. He also expressed his serious concern for the constitutionality of any measure that would infringe upon the autonomy of the Board of Regents.

Ms. Abba elaborated that the difference between SB 275 and AB 519, is that SB 275 identifies areas where savings and increased efficiencies may be found specifically within the NSHE, with recommendations being made to the legislature. However, the commission established by AB 519 would be granted subpoena authority. Chair Wixom stated there was a significant constitutional issue with that measure and offered to testify at the hearing.

Regent Leavitt shared Chair Wixom's concerns. He added that any infringement upon constitutional autonomy would not be supported in a court of law.

Chair Wixom asked if, due to current Board policies, the System was in opposition to legislation that introduces salary limitations *(SB 387)*. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that was correct. Chief Counsel Patterson did not want to over-emphasize the constitutional authority issues, particularly in academic and personnel matters. However, any provision that would specifically limit salaries does infringe upon a core function of the Board.

Regent Cobb asked if it was known what the prospect was for that bill. Ms. Abba replied that a hearing had not yet been held.

Ms. Jessica Lucero, GPSA President, UNLV, expressed concern that SB 80 *(P-16 Council)* did not correctly indicate the System's title, nor did it account for a graduate-level education. Chair Wixom related that at this time the P-16 Council is informational and advisory in nature. However, he asked that Vice Chancellor Nichols express the importance of a graduate-level education to the P-16 Council. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that although it causes some discomfort, the measure does reference the official corporate statutory name of the university. Ms. Abba added that the purpose of SB 80 is to provide Legislative Counsel Bureau staffing to the P-16 Council and does not amend the charge or authority for that Council.

The meeting recessed at 9:52 a.m. and reconvened at 10:12 a.m. on Friday, April 3, 2009, with all members present except for Regents Alden, Gallagher and Leavitt.

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18)* - Each of the institutions and System Administration were requested to provide a report on their efforts undertaken in relation to their public relations, branding, marketing and recruitment. At this meeting, representatives from WNC provided an overview of their current and planned public relations, branding, marketing and recruiting efforts. Both in-state and out-of-state strategies were discussed, as appropriate *(Ref. BoR-18 on file in the Board office).*

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)*

Ms. Anne Hansen, Director, Information and Marketing Services and Mr. John Kinkella, Dean, Student Services, at WNC, provided the following presentation:

- WNC Service Area:
  - 7 Nevada Counties.
  - 18,000 Square Miles.
  - 200,000 Residents.

- Learning Centers:
  - Fernley.
  - Hawthorne.
  - Lovelock.
  - Smith Valley.
  - Yerington.

- WNC Vision:
  - Mission Statement - Western Nevada College inspires success in our community through opportunities that cultivate creativity, intellectual growth and technological excellence, in an environment that nurtures individual potential and respects differences.
  - College Goals:
    1. Improve student success in program completion and graduation rates.
    2. Ensure institutional excellence in teaching, programs and services.
    3. Embrace our college's many communities and respond to their diverse needs.

- WNC Brand - WNC's brand is derived from the reality of our community's characteristics:
  - Widespread area with large numbers of place-bound residents.
  - Remote communities who need an educated populace with broader workforce skills.
  - Low percentage of college graduates.
  - Large population of first-generation college students.

Regents Gallagher and Leavitt entered the meeting.

- Market Positioning – the college will differentiate itself from other area educational opportunities by:
  - Being exceptionally convenient in class offerings and services.
  - Offering ideal learning opportunities with small class sizes and a wide range of student age groups.
  - Being highly flexible in meeting needs of individuals as well as business, government and community groups.
  - Offering a more affordable educational opportunity.

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)*

- WNC Brand Concepts:
  - Personalized Approach.
  - High Quality Education.
  - Building Community.

- Target Markets:
  - New and recent high school graduates.
  - Pre-college students, especially, high school juniors and seniors.
  - Underserved populations, especially Latino and Native American groups.
  - Adults who are likely to require employment skills and continuing training.
  - Adults seeking personal enrichment or re-entering the work force.
  - Current and past WNC students.

- Public Relations/Information:
  - Mass Media Placement.
    - TV/Radio.
    - Print.
    - Online.
  - WNC Web Site.
    - Registration Information.
    - Testimonials.
    - Features.
    - News
  - Special Events.
    - Multicultural Festival.
    - Recycled Art(icles) Contest.
    - Deaf Pride Day.
    - Faces, Voices & Stories Cultural Series.
  - Targeted Publications.
    - Academic Program Guide.
    - Postcards.
    - Brochures.
    - Posters.
    - Fliers.
  - Community Outreach.
    - Service Clubs.
    - Coffee with Carol.
    - Intercollegiate Athletics.
    - Musical Theatre.

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)*

- Public Relations/Information: - *(Cont'd.)*
  - Partnerships.
    - Foundation Events.
    - Program Advisory Boards.
    - Community Advisory Boards.
    - Annual Report.

- Advertising:
  - Direct Mail.
    - Class Schedule Mass Mailings.
    - Targeted Post Cards.
    - Letters.
  - Targeted Advertising.
    - Business.
    - Athletics.
    - Health.
  - Mass Media.
    - Online.
    - Radio.
    - TV.
  - Campus Video Screens.
    - Event Information.
    - Student Services.
  - Inquiry Follow-up.
    - Personal.
    - Mail.
    - Phone & E-mail.
  - Web Site.
    - Newspaper.
    - MySpace.
    - Facebook.
  - Specialty Media.
    - Street Banner.
    - Event/Campus Signage.
    - Movie Screen.

- Outreach
  - Bridge to Success.
    - High School Outreach Program.
  - Student/Faculty/Student Services Partnership.
    - Academic Skills Center.
    - Electronic Alert.
    - Peer Mentor Program.

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18)* – *(Cont'd.)*

- Percentage of Service Area High School Graduates Continuing to WNC:
  - 2005/2006 – 18%.
  - 2006/2007 – 23%.
  - 2007/2008 – 26%.

- Full-Time Students Seeking Degree/Certification *(2007/2008 Annualized Enrollment):*
  - 2001/2002 – 612 students.
  - 2002/2003 – 659 students.
  - 2003/2004 – 733 students.
  - 2004/2005 – 776 students.
  - 2005/2006 – 795 students.
  - 2006/2007 – 829 students.
  - 2007-2008 – 869 students.

- WNC Retention from Fall to Spring:
  - 1997/1998 – 48%.
  - 1998/1999 – 49%.
  - 1999/2000 – 51%.
  - 2000/2001 – 51%.
  - 2001/2002 – 51%.
  - 2002/2003 – 54%.
  - 2003/2004 – 55%.
  - 2004/2005 – 54%.
  - 2005/2006 – 54%.
  - 2006/2007 – 58%.
  - 2007/2008 – 58%.

- Total Degrees & Certificates Awarded:
  - 1998/1998 – 339.
  - 1998/1999 – 375.
  - 1999/2000 – 355.
  - 2000/2001 – 364.
  - 2001/2002 – 406.
  - 2002/2003 – 421.
  - 2003/2004 – 399.
  - 2004/2005 – 412.
  - 2005/2006 – 392.
  - 2006/2007 – 416.
  - 2007/2008 – 457.

- Newspaper Coverage *(Topics & Tone)* – January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2008:
  - Total 1,939 News Articles.
    - 1,036 Positive *(Events, Awards, Academic Programs, Athletics).*
    - 892 Neutral *(Athletics, Events, Academic Programs).*
    - 11 Negative (*Editorial, Economics).*

- Information Desk – January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2008.
  - Total 27,980 Requests for Information.
    - Walk Up: 20,871.
    - Phone: 5,441.
    - E-mail: 1,750 *(estimated).*
    - US Mail: 41 *(Information Packets Sent).*

- Web Site – March 1, 2008, through February 28, 2009:
  - 265,950 visits to WNC site *(+1.16%).*
  - 4,695,838 page views *(+12.91%).*
  - 4.38 average pages viewed per visit *(+11.62%).*

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)*

- Community Support for College – 2008 survey of business, professionals and community leaders:
  - 86% had a favorable impression of WNC.
  - 86% had a favorable impression of the college educational opportunities.
  - 82% had a favorable impression of WNC faculty members.

Regent Knecht asked if the information and strategy presented had been created for this presentation or if it reflected WNC's efforts on a continuing basis. Mr. Kinkella confirmed that the materials presented that day reflected WNC's ongoing efforts.

Regent Knecht asked what WNC's annual marketing budget was. Ms. Hansen replied that their annual budget was $110,000. Regent Knecht observed there was quality and quantity of marketing being done within the WNC service area.

Regent Schofield expressed his pride in WNC and thanked President Lucey for their proactive efforts with recidivism.

Regent Crear asked if WNC's marketing budget included media and overhead. Ms. Hansen replied that it included printing costs and media production, although postage may come from a separate account. Regent Crear asked where the video vignettes were shown. Ms. Hansen replied those clips were shown on the WNC website and during presentations at local events. Some of the videos are targeted toward specific academic areas and were made from the television advertisement footage.

Regent Crear asked if WNC felt their reach within their service area was sufficient that people understand WNC to be an option for them. Ms. Hansen replied that "top of the mind" awareness is very important with the number of communities located within small rural pockets. Mr. Kinkella added that their "high touch" approach has helped to increase the awareness of WNC as an option that leads to success.

Regent Cobb asked if it was known, nationally, what percentage of community college students then transfer to universities for degree completion. President Sheehan indicated that nationally that was approximately 30%.

Regent Cobb asked why the retention calculation ran from fall to spring and not spring to fall. Mr. Kinkella replied that the first semester of college is typically the hardest, and if the students make it through the first semester, they usually return in the spring.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that over the years he has enjoyed watching President Lucey change the culture of WNC to a college of first choice for the area's high school seniors.

Chair Wixom stated that he was particularly impressed with the first year completion rates. At some point in the future, he would like to discuss how that was accomplished and how that could be extrapolated to the other institutions. He also noticed the

18. Information Only - Public Relations, Branding, Marketing and Recruitment Efforts, WNC *(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)*

exponential increase in on-line students and asked how many students utilized those services. Ms. Hansen replied that approximately 1,200 to 1,300 students participated in on-line classes. Chair Wixom asked how many of those students also took traditional classes. Ms. Hansen replied that although the exact number was not known, many of their students take a combination of traditional and on-line classes.

Chair Wixom indicated that in the future he would like to understand all of the parameters of on-line learning to make sure that the institutions are maximizing the efficiency on-line learning, understanding there may be an increased cost associated with on-line classes, but given the ability of on-line classes to allow students to progress more efficiently and effectively. Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated that discussion would be placed on a future agenda.

19. Information Only - Review of Consent Agenda Guidelines *(Agenda Item #19)* - At the request of the Board of Regents, Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents, Mr. Scott Wasserman, provided a review of existing consent agenda guidelines *(Ref. BoR-19 on file in the Board office).*

Mr. Wasserman related that the agenda building process begins with inclusion of all items submitted by the presidents or the Chancellor's Cabinet. The Chancellor's Cabinet then meets to review those items, and pursuant to the following criteria, may make a recommendation as to which items are appropriate for the consent agenda. Although the presidents may also make a recommendation as to which items be placed on the consent agenda, all items are also reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet. At the Board meeting, the Regents may request that any consent agenda item be pulled from the consent agenda to be discussed and voted upon separately.

The following are examples of non-controversial, routine items that can be included on a consent agenda:

- Committee and previous board meeting minutes.
- Minor changes in a procedure.
- Routine revisions of policy.
- Standard contracts that are used regularly
- Capital Improvement fee requests.
- Routine personnel issues.

Chair Wixom asked if there were any concerns regarding the standards being used. Noting that there were no concerns or objections raised by the Regents, Chair Wixom stated that the current standards would continue to be used.

Chair Wixom thanked President Lucey and the staff of WNC for hosting the Board meeting. He also thanked TMCC's audio and visual staff, the UNR Police Department and the SCS staff.

Regent Crear left the meeting.

20. Approved - Board Meeting Dates Calendar Year 2010 *(Agenda Item #20)* - The Board of Regents approved the proposed meeting dates and venues for the Board of Regents' meetings for calendar year 2010.

- February 11-12, 2010 CSN – *West Charleston Boulevard*
- April 22-23, 2010 WNC
- June 17-18, 2010 TMCC
- August 12-13, 2010 UNR
- October 7-8, 2010 DRI – *Las Vegas*
- December 2-3, 2010 UNLV

Regent Leavitt asked that in the future, a legislative reception be held on the Thursday evening of the April Board meetings when they run concurrently with the legislative session. Chair Wixom indicated that would be taken under consideration in the future.

Regent Geddes moved approval of the proposed 2010 Board meeting schedule. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Crear were absent.

21. Approved – Audit Committee *(Agenda Item #21)* – Acting Chair, Regent Dorothy Gallagher, reported that the Audit Committee met on April 2, 2009, and received follow-up responses for six internal audit reports that were presented to the Audit Committee at the August and October 2008 meetings.

The University of Nevada, School of Medicine Practice Plans presented a follow-up response to their external audit Management Letter for the year ended June 30, 2008. In addition, the (UNSOM) reported on the Practice Plan Receivables at the request of the Audit Committee. The Committee requested another follow-up response on the UNSOM Practice Plans at the June Audit Committee meeting.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Sandi Cardinal updated the committee on the performance audits that have been performed by the Internal Audit Department.

Action items
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Audit Committee.

- Minutes – The Committee recommends for approval the minutes from the February 5, 2009, Committee meeting.

21. Approved – Audit Committee (Agenda Item #21) – *(Cont'd.)*

- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommends for approval the following internal audit reports.
  - ✓ Grants-in-Aid & Fee Waivers, UNR.
  - ✓ Intercollegiate Athletics Department, UNR.
  - ✓ Student Health Center, UNR.
  - ✓ Center for Business & Economic Research, UNLV.
  - ✓ Travel and Accounts Payable, NSC.
  - ✓ Theater Department, TMCC.
  - ✓ Associated Students of the College of Southern Nevada, CSN.
  - ✓ Fallon Facilities Department, WNC.
  - ✓ Fallon Motor Pool, WNC.
  - ✓ Grants-in-Aid & Fee Waivers, GBC.

Regent Gallagher moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden and Crear were absent.

22. Approved – Budget & Finance Committee *(Agenda Item #22)* - Chair Ron Knecht reported that the Budget and Finance Committee met on April 2, 2009, and heard the following reports:

- All Funds revenues and expenses of the NSHE for the second quarter of fiscal year 2008-2009.
- NSHE Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets and the status of state appropriations for the second quarter of fiscal year 2008-2009.
- Budget transfers of state appropriated funds between functions for the second quarter of fiscal year 2008-2009.
- The Committee reviewed a comparison of tuition and fees of the NSHE institutions with two-year and four year public institutions in the WICHE *(Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education)* region. The comparisons show that NSHE tuition and fees are not high in comparison to the other WICHE institutions and that access should not be limited due to cost. The purpose of the tuition and fee comparisons is to prompt thought and discussion on the college going culture.

Action items:
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Budget and Finance Committee:

- Request is made for approval of the minutes from the February 5, 2009, Budget & Finance Committee meeting.

22. Approved – Budget & Finance Committee *(Agenda Item #22) – (Cont'd.)*

Action items: - *(Cont'd.)*

- The Committee recommends approval for the Nevada System of Higher Education to expend excess student registration fees for the purpose of funding additional part time faculty and to seek Interim Finance Committee authorization to expend any additional non-resident tuition and any additional registration fees, not utilized for part-time faculty costs, within the state operating budgets for fiscal year 2008-2009.
- Request is made for approval the redistribution of funds generated by registration fees for FY 2010 and FY 2011 to ensure that allocations are appropriate under the new definitions approved at the February 2009 meeting.

Regent Knecht moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden and Crear were absent.

23. Approved - Student & Academic Affairs Committee *(Agenda Item #24)* - Chair Jason Geddes reported that the Student and Academic Affairs Committee met on April 2, 2009, and heard the following reports.

Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presented to the Committee information concerning student directory information, included a proposed revision to the Board's policy regarding the release of such information that will be brought back to the Committee at a later date for action (*Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 26*). The Committee discussed particular requirements to alert students to their ability to opt out and asked for further information on commercial vendors at each institution.

In addition, Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols reported on the Higher Education Opportunity Act (*P.L. 110-315*) and its various reporting and other requirements aimed at greater transparency and accountability in higher education. Increased levels of federal financial aid have been set in this Act.

NSHE Director of Financial Aid, Sharon Wurm, presented the annual *NSHE Financial Aid Report* for 2007-08 that included information on financial aid programs and funding sources across the System. Total financial aid to students has increased, primarily due to more loans and scholarships for students.

Action Items:
Board action was requested to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2009, meeting of the Student and Academic Affairs Committee.

Regent Anthony moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden and Crear were absent.

Regent Crear entered the meeting.

24. Approved – Cultural Diversity & Security Committee *(Agenda Item #23)* - Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee met on April 2, 2009, and received a report by representatives from Nevada State College and Business Center North *(serving DRI, GBC, TMCC, UNR and WNC)* on policies and practices related to business relationships and interactions with business enterprises owned by minorities, women or persons with disabilities. Nevada State College and Business Center North were asked to bring back a plan to increase the number of relationships and interactions with such business enterprises. The Presidents have expressed a commitment to working on a Vendor Diversity direction and policy.

Representatives from WNC presented a report on initiatives to promote diversity and inclusive practices across the institution. Faculty diversity was identified as the primary challenge WNC faces. Student representatives discussed organizations and opportunities that contribute to the growing diversity of WNC.

NSHE Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Council Co-chairs Dr. Christine Clark and Mr. Larry Mason, reported on the outcomes of recent meetings of the Council including a recent retreat and expressed appreciation to all the members of the Council and to Regent Crear.

Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presented the *NSHE Crime Statistics Report* required pursuant to the Jeanne Clery Crime Statistics Act that includes current and historical data on various crimes that have occurred on each campus. Questions were raised about differences between institutions, particularly UNLV and UNR. Future meetings will give institutional police chiefs the chance to address some of the Committee's questions.

Action Items:
Board action was requested to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2009, meeting of the Cultural, Diversity and Security Committee.

Regent Crear moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

25. Approved - Technology Committee *(Agenda Item #25)* - Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Technology Committee met on March 30, 2009, and heard the following matters:

- Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich provided an update on the activities to establish permanent leadership for the System Computing Services *(SCS)* organization at NSHE and with respect to information technology strategies. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich presented the study by Phil Goldstein Associates which proposed a 6-month plan for permanent leadership.

25. Approved - Technology Committee *(Agenda Item #25)* – *(Cont'd.)*

- Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich introduced Bob Moulton, Interim Vice Chancellor of IT for SCS. Since January, Interim Vice Chancellor Bob Moulton has been dialoguing with management and staff at SCS to focus on building a culture of service, timeliness and responsibility. Further, Bob is working to build a set of strategies to rebuild communications with all stakeholders, especially the campuses. One tangible component of that strategy is customer Service Level Agreements, which will enable SCS to measure the success of the services and technologies they are delivering.

- Moving forward, Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated a governance structure for Information Technology needs to be developed that is proactive so the presidents are involved at key decision making points. However, it was clear that by both consensus and Phil Goldstein's recommendation, the iNtegrate Project should remain separate from SCS for now. While iNtegrate Project Director Robyn Render concurred that the momentum and progress of iNtegrate cannot afford any major disruption at this time and recommended no changes be made, she acknowledged that the Vice Chancellor of IT would be involved with strategy and have a seat on the project committee.

- Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that it was his intention to develop the position description based on Phil Goldstein's study and move forward immediately with a search for a permanent Vice Chancellor. This individual will be required to use the resources of SCS to compliment long term planning and provide a framework in IT governance that maximizes the use of technology dollars, understands and compliments campus roles, communicates well with campuses and implements campus missions.

- Chair Crear led a discussion among Committee members and staff to update all on recent developments, current status and future direction of the iNtegrate project. The discussion included general project progress and project risks. Director Robyn Render reported that "all is well" with the project and that it has met all of the milestones and target dates. Director Render conveyed that NSHE is being good stewards of the iNtegrate funds and have been maximizing resources. Hardware for the project has been installed and is being configured; hardware and software have been paid for. Funds have been transferred to institutions to support backfill, but are inadequate.

- The Committee discussed the budget for the iNtegrate project, including the impact on the project of the reversion of money previously appropriated by the legislature, new developments from the 2009 legislative session and updates on the status of the funding of the project.

- Director Robyn Render discussed the written response to the legislature on January 27, 2009, informing them that the project is moving full speed ahead and acknowledged that NSHE still requires the $10 million reverted to meet the original project goals for Student Information System implementation. Without the additional funds, the project may not be able to complete the implementation for all seven institutions nor fulfill its contractual obligation with consultants CedarCrestone, Inc.

25. Approved - Technology Committee *(Agenda Item #25)* – *(Cont'd.)*

- Chair Crear asked Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich what the climate was with the legislature in receiving the previously reverted $10 million. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich responded that it was possible NSHE could receive stimulus funding and he was "cautiously optimistic." Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich advocated NSHE implementing this project as if it were going to find that $10 million.
- Director Render reported that there are inadequate resources to support institution specific costs, mainly backfill, for their implementation. Vice Chancellor Mike Reed and the Business Officers worked with Director Render to develop strategies for revenue generation based on increasing the technology fee, in line with the definition that is in the Handbook. However, it was made clear that the fee increase proposal does not have anything to do with the $10 million project deficit.
- Regent Wixom asked if these fees would "sunset" after the implementation of the project in July 2011. Director Render responded that the costs to the institutions are recurring beyond implementation and the fees were also intended to continue. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reminded the Committee that uses of the technology fee are separately reported to the Board every year, and that pursuant to prior action of the Committee, that report can include any use for the iNtegrate project.
- Regent Wixom expressed concern about the legality of fees to the extent that these are used to cover operational expenses. Chief Counsel Bart Patterson stated that the legality of the fees would be a Board policy issue and that the technology fee is not characterized as one of the special fees. Therefore technology fees are not subject to the same type of restrictions under Board policy as the special use fees previously discussed by the Board. This fee was first proposed to provide technology for students, and Chief Counsel Patterson affirmed that was an appropriate use. However, Chief Counsel Patterson recommended that the Board should revisit sun-setting the fees at the completion of the implementation.
- Regent Wixom stated certain expenses are the obligation of the institutions. Over time we can shift burdens to students without realizing it, and they need to be involved in an open discussion of the technology fees. Chair Crear asked the campus representatives if student leadership is aware that the technology fee is an ongoing fee. President Richards stated CSN has met with student leaders for their input and they understand the need for ongoing resources to support this project. President David Ashley confirmed UNLV students have also expressed support for the fee; Vice President Delores Sanford confirmed the same for TMCC students.
- Regent Wixom moved for the adoption of the fee structure, so long as the Board revisits the fees on an ongoing basis or at the end of the project implementation and there is a full discussion at the Board meeting in April on whether the technology fees are appropriate.

25. Approved - Technology Committee *(Agenda Item #25)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Action Items:
The Board was requested to consider the action items in two parts.

- Approval of the minutes from the December 2, 2008, meeting.
- The Committee recommends to the Board approval of the proposed increase to the Technology Fee to supplement the budget for the iNtegrate project with the caveat that the recommendation be heard and considered separately by the full Board. Further, the recommendation also includes that the fee increase be revisited by the Board at the completion of implementation of the iNtegrate project.

Regent Crear moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations with the exception of the fee increase, which was considered separately. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

Ms. Render related that the business officers have been working over the last few months to determine the actual outstanding costs that have or will occur for ongoing support of this project. Institution-specific costs will vary by institutions. In all cases, the costs represent back-fill for functional and technical staff and includes some of the costs that the shared instance institutions will incur for using SCS resources, minor technology and communication device costs, and new technical staff required by certain institutions to fulfill implementation and ongoing efforts. The business officers have analyzed the costs and have recommended an increase of $1.50 to the technology fee at the community colleges and Nevada State College and an increase of $3.00 to the technology fee at the universities.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that pursuant to the Committee's discussion, these fees and the use of the funds will be separately stated and reported on an annual basis. This is to ensure that the Committee has oversight to ensure that these funds are expended in the manner they were intended for.

Regent Crear added that there had been discussion that the proposed fee increase would only be in place during implementation of the project and not for the ongoing needs of the program. The way the proposed increase is currently written, it will be an ongoing fee that will continue past the implementation of the project. There was also concern expressed that once the fee has been increased, there should be the ability to review the fee once the implementation is over to consider if it is sufficient to sustain the on-going needs of the program. There was also the issue of having reverted $10 million back to the Legislature that may not be returned to the System. The question before the Board is if the fee increase should be approved with the caveat that it be reviewed upon implementation of the project.

25. Approved - Technology Committee *(Agenda Item #25)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chair Wixom added that the Committee unanimously recommended approval of the fee increase. However, it was important to the members of the Committee that the full Board understood that use of the fee will be reported on an annual basis. Regent Crear clarified that use of the fee would be reviewed on an annual basis but review of the fee itself would occur upon completion of the implementation portion of the project.

Ms. Render related that full implementation of the project is not scheduled to occur until the end of fiscal year 2012. Chair Wixom asked Ms. Render to update the Board on the status of the implementation project. Ms. Render related that the two pilot institutions *(UNLV and TMCC)* were preparing to go-live with the first phase between September and October 2009. Then, subsequently between January and the spring of 2010, the remaining four components of the implementation will occur for those two institutions. Parallel to that, the other institutions are also preparing for their implementations.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reported that the project is currently on time and on or under budget. He thanked Ms. Render for her outstanding work on this project.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the proposed technology fee increase with the caveat that the revenue and expenditure of the fees be reviewed annually and that the fee itself be reviewed upon completion of the implementation of the iNtegrate project. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

26. Approved – Investment Committee *(Agenda Item #26)* - Chair James Dean Leavitt reported that the Investment Committee met on March 27, 2009, and heard the following reports:

- Cambridge Associates presented a report on asset allocation and preliminary investment returns for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds as of 02/28/09.
- The Committee heard a report on the activities and the most current balance of the reserve account of the operating pool fund.
- The Committee heard a report from UNLV regarding the Pre-Development Agreement on the UNLV Hospitality Campus Project.
- The Committee was presented UNLV's 2009 Real Property Report.

26. Approved – Investment Committee *(Agenda Item #26)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Action Items:
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Investment Committee:

- The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the January 30, 2009, meeting.
- The Committee recommended approval of Nevada State College's modification to its lease with the City of Henderson in order to install an elevator in the Dawson Building. The Committee also recommended that a "thank-you" be forwarded to the City of Henderson for reducing the design cost from $300,000 to $150,000.
- The Committee recommended approval of UNR's request to purchase the Reno Orthopaedic Sports Medicine Complex from University Investors.
- The Committee approved System Office staff's recommendation of a revision to Board policy *(Section 23 of Title 4, Chapter 10)*, intended to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance projects and preserve the useful life and functionality of existing facilities.

Regent Leavitt moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Knecht seconded.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reported that through a part purchase, part donation from the University Investor doctors, UNR was able to acquire the 8,700 square foot state of the art ROC Sports Medical Facility located within the University of Nevada Reno campus for a bargain purchase price of $737,500. This price is approximately $2,100,000 below the current market value based on the attached appraisal report from William G. Kimmel & Associates dated March 11, 2009, reflecting an appraised value of $2,900,000. This reduced purchase price for the University was only made possible by the willingness of the University investors to donate the $2,100,000 difference in market value as a "charitable donation" to the University. The doctors of the Reno Orthopeadic Clinic and University Investors have always been strong financial supporters of the University and in light of the current budget constraints, wanted to make it possible for the University of Nevada and the UNR School of Medicine to expand its sports medicine program to include wellness training and to expand coverage of both men's and women's athletic events in addition to the medical care and physical therapy already provided. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that the original and current owners of University Investors responsible for this significant gift included Drs. Richard Blakey, Patrick Herz, James Greenwald, Timothy Bray, Robert J. Parlasca, James L. Christensen and Lex A. Simpson.

Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent. Regent Page abstained.

27. Approved - Board Development Committee *(Agenda Item #27)* - Chair James Dean Leavitt reported that the Board Development Committee met on March 27, 2009, and heard the following reports.

- The Committee discussed the continued interaction of former Regents with the Nevada System of Higher Education. The Committee agreed that former Regents deserve our continued appreciation and respect for their service to the community. Upon a review of major events held by System institutions, staff recommended that all living former Regents be extended an invitation to attend Distinguished Nevadan events, annual Nevada Medal dinners, annual foundation dinners, ground breaking ceremonies and building dedications, with the cost to attend those events initially being paid by Board host account funds.

  The Committee recommended that staff send a letter to all living former Regents whose contact information is known expressing their value to the System and informing them they will be invited to those events as guests of the System. If approved, the Board office will monitor how often the invitations to former Regents are taken advantage of and the associated costs.

- The Committee discussed the upcoming Board of Regents workshop with Rich Novak, Senior Vice President of the Ingram Center for Public Trusteeship and Governance at AGB. Mr. Novak recommended the Regents plan for a focused one-day workshop with a social dinner the evening before. Prior to the workshop, the Regents will be asked to complete a survey instrument relevant to issues facing Nevada. AGB will present aggregate data to the Board, identify areas of agreement and disagreement and areas for discussion at the workshop.

- The Committee identified two possible dates for the dinner and workshop, with the final schedule to be determined by a majority vote of the Board. The Committee also determined that the workshop should be held in southern Nevada to reduce travel costs as much as possible, and directed staff to choose an appropriate location.

- The Committee briefly discussed the institutional mission statements and agreed to defer the full discussion until the April Board meeting so that all Presidents can take part in the discussion.

Action Items

Board action was requested for the following recommendations of the Board Development Committee:

- Approval of the minutes from the January 30, 2009, meeting.
- Approval of extending invitations to all living former Regents whose contact information is known to attend the following as guests of the System with the event cost to be paid by Board host account funds:
  - Distinguished Nevadan events
  - Annual Nevada Medal dinners
  - Annual foundation dinners/banquets/galas
  - Ground breaking ceremonies
  - Building dedications

27. Approved - Board Development Committee *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Leavitt moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations, except for Board action to consider the scheduling of a Board of Regents Workshop, which was considered separately. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

Board action was requested separately for the following recommendations of the Board Development Committee:

- Approval of a Board of Regents' dinner and workshop to be held either:
  - Thursday-Friday, July 9-10, 2009 **OR**
  - Friday-Saturday, July 10-11, 2009

Regent Geddes requested that it be made clear for the record that such a workshop was mandated as part of UNR's NWCCU accreditation process. Chair Wixom added that although the process was instigated by recommendation of the NWCCU, it is a process that the Board should participate in regularly.

Chair Wixom related that he would appreciate a Saturday meeting.

Regent Geddes indicated his support for a Saturday meeting as well.

Regent Gallagher asked where the meeting location would be. Regent Leavitt replied that due to budget and travel considerations, it was thought to be more economical that it be held in Las Vegas. He related that, at the request of Regent Rawson, the Springs Preserve was being considered as a potential meeting site.

Regent Rawson indicated that he would prefer a Saturday meeting but would accommodate the Board's decision.

Regent Cobb asked if these dates had previously been indicated on a calendar. Regent Leavitt related that these dates had been recommended by the Board Development Committee at its meeting on March 27, 2009, adding that this was the first time that the dates were being considered by the full Board.

Chair Wixom asked if there was an appetite by the Board to move the date.

Regent Leavitt related that there had been much thought and effort put into the date selection and asked the Board's assistance with voting on one of the two choices presented.

Regent Knecht moved approval to schedule a social dinner and the Board Workshop on Friday, July 10th and Saturday, July 11th. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

27. Approved - Board Development Committee *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Cobb suggested that events to be held on an annual basis, such as workshops, be scheduled and published with the annual meeting calendar for planning purposes.

28. Approved – Health Sciences System Committee *(Agenda Item #28)* - Chair Dorothy S. Gallagher reported that the Health Sciences System Committee met on March 26, 2009, and heard the following reports:

- Dr. Maurizio Trevisan, Executive Vice Chancellor and CEO, Health Sciences System, provided an overview of the Health Sciences System Action Plan which helps to guide the activities for the Health Sciences System over the next year and beyond. Among the initiatives he highlighted were the Nevada Nursing Summit, work on strategic planning, the development of the Shadow Lane Skills Lab and Simulation Center and the Institutional Review Board *(IRB)* related discussions for promoting inter-institutional research collaboration.
- Dr. Marcia Turner, Vice Chancellor for Operations, Health Sciences System, provided an overview of the five Capital Improvement Projects which are included in the Regents' Capital Improvement Projects budget request. She also provided an update on the status of construction of the Shadow Lane Clinical Skills and Simulation Center. Chair Gallagher asked that a tour of the Shadow Lane Campus be arranged for the Regents in conjunction with the next Regents' meeting in Las Vegas.
- Dr. Ole Thienhaus, Dean, University of Nevada School of Medicine, provided an update on the transfer of the Dental Residency Program from the UNSOM to the UNLV School of Dental Medicine. He reported that the process is under way and going smoothly.
- Dr. John McDonald, Vice President for Health Sciences, University of Nevada, Reno, provided an overview of UNR's efforts to review their Institutional Review Board *(IRB)* process. He provided an explanation of the process and some of the process improvements that were recommended.

Action items:
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Health Sciences System Committee:

- The Committee approved the minutes of the January 29, 2009, Regents' Health Sciences System Committee meeting.

Regent Gallagher moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

28. Approved – Health Sciences System Committee *(Agenda Item #28) – (Cont'd.)*

At Regent Cobb's request Dr. Trevisan elaborated on the status of the Shadow Lane SIMS Lab and the steps taken to encourage cooperation between the northern and southern institutions. Dr. Trevisan related that the lab will combine the University of Nevada School of Medicine, UNLV School of Nursing and the NSC School of Nursing. These three institutions will share what is to become a state of the art facility in the training of nursing and physicians. It is hoped that upon completion of the program development stage, further opportunities for integration and collaboration will be pursued.

Regent Gallagher added that the Health Sciences System was based on the concept of collaboration. It is important for all to understand that the System is developing a medical school that is statewide and will provide more opportunity for the citizens of the state of Nevada to receive excellent health care.

Regent Cobb noted that one of the accomplishments of the School of Medicine is the placement of residents at the Mayo Clinic, University of Texas, University of Virginia, University of Arizona, Swedish Medical Center in Seattle and the University of Southern California. Unfortunately, only approximately18% of the School of Medicine graduates participate in a residency program at UNR or UNLV. He also felt it was very disappointing that only 25% of the residency specialties are offered in Nevada. Dr. Trevisan indicated that number was closer to approximately 30% to 35%. He felt that having so many successful matches was a tremendous testimony to the quality of the teaching provided by the School of Medicine. However, it would be beneficial to the state of Nevada to expand the available graduate medical education slots. That is a complicated mechanism requiring the assistance of the hospitals and the support of the community. Although it is being addressed, it will not be solved overnight.

President Glick agreed that there were not enough residency program slots, adding that there are fewer residency programs in this state than any other state with a medical school. Unfortunately, the number of residency slots that are supported by the federal government are determined by an arcane formula which disadvantages Nevada as a high-growth state.

Regent Page felt that the SIMS lab was a perfect example of coordination and collaboration between the institutions.

Dr. Trevisan added that the western states have begun to address lifting the residency program caps established by the federal government. Politically, it will be difficult to further those efforts as residents take care of the majority of indigent patients on the east coast. He felt health care reform could not occur without removing the resident program caps.

Regent Gallagher asked Dr. Turner to arrange a tour of the School of Medicine facilities, the SIMS lab and the School of Dental Medicine in Las Vegas. She urged the Regents to attend if their schedules allowed.

29. Approved - Research & Economic Development Committee *(Agenda Item #29)* - Chair Jack Lund Schofield reported that the Research and Economic Development Committee met on March 26, 2009, and heard a report from Ms. Karen Grillo providing an update on the Walker Basin project, including communications projects, status reports on research projects, meetings of the stakeholders committee, activities of the acquisitions team, and projects on other project tasks. The Committee also heard details on the upcoming report to the Basin and the International Desert Terminal Lakes Symposium.

The Report to the Basin is scheduled for June 24, 2009, at Yerington High School. The International Terminus Lakes Symposium is set for October 26-29 at the Joe Crowley Student Union Building at UNR.

Representatives from Ormat Technologies presented information regarding their company's work in the field of geothermal energy. Included in the report were suggestions for potential strategies to build better partnerships with NSHE institutions.

Staff provided an update to the *NSHE Renewable Energy Report*. Representatives from NSHE institutions responded to questions on academic and research programs related to renewable energy, as well as institutional practices currently in place. DRI President Stephen Wells alerted Committee members to new federal funding for Nevada's energy efforts.

Finally, Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols provided information to the Committee on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (*P.L. 111-5*) and the opportunities potentially available to NSHE institutions in relation to research, technology, and education, particularly workforce education.

Action Items:
Board action was requested to approve the minutes from the January 29, 2009, meeting of the Research and Economic Development Committee.

Regent Schofield moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

Meeting recessed at 11:42 a.m. and reconvened at 11:46 a.m. on Friday, April 3, 2009, with all members present except for Regent Alden.

30. Information Only – New Business *(Agenda Item #30)* – Regent Leavitt related that on the Thursday evening of the June Board meeting, a farewell reception will be held in Chancellor Rogers' honor.

Regent Cobb asked the Regents to contact him if they would be interested in a tour of Virginia City in connection with a future Board meeting. The event would be open to Regents, presidents and staff and there would be personal costs involved.

30. Information Only – New Business *(Agenda Item #30)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Vice Chancellor Nichols related that a document entitled "The 48 Ranked Best National Public and Private Universities in the 11 Western States" that had been distributed was still in draft form. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich related that Chancellor Rogers requested that the Regents receive the document. Chair Wixom added that the Chancellor felt it would be an interesting document for the Regents to have on a preliminary basis.

Mr. Crowell again thanked the Regents for their support during his years of service.

Mr. Waterhouse related that the last year as CSN's student government leader had been life changing for him and he thanked the Regents.

The meeting adjourned at 11:52 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 June 18-19, 2009, meeting.