

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

Aspen Building, Sarah Winnemucca Hall
Western Nevada College

2201 West College Parkway, Carson City

Thursday, March 10, 2011, 9:00 a.m.

Friday, March 11, 2011, 8:30 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. James Dean Leavitt, Chairman
Dr. Jason Geddes, Vice Chairman
Mr. Mark Alden *{via telephone}*
Dr. Andrea Anderson
Mr. Robert Blakely
Mr. William G. Cobb
Mr. Cedric Crear
Dr. Mark W. Doubrava
Mr. Ron Knecht
Mr. Kevin C. Melcher
Mr. Kevin J. Page
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Others Present: Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich
Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, HSS, Maurizio Trevisan
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
Vice Chancellor, Administrative & Legal Affairs, Bart Patterson
Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mark Stevens
Vice Chancellor, HSS, Marcia Turner
CEO & Special Counsel to the Board, Scott Wasserman
President Michael D. Richards, CSN
President Stephen G. Wells, DRI
President Carl Diekhans, GBC
President Lesley Di Mare, NSC
President Maria C. Sheehan, TMCC
President Neal J. Smatresk, UNLV
President Milton D. Glick, UNR
President Carol A. Lucey, WNC

Also present were faculty senate chairs Mr. Bill Kerney, CSN; Ms. Laura Edwards, DRI; Ms. Sarah Negrete, GBC; Ms. Robin Herlands, NSC; Mr. Fred Egenberger, NSHE Dr. Cecilia Maldonado, UNLV; Dr. Eric Herzik, UNR; Mr. Scott Huber, TMCC; and Mr. Jim Strange, WNC. Student government leaders present included Mr. J.T. Creedon, ASCSN President, CSN; Mr. Steve Gronstal; GRAD President, DRI; Ms. Paulette Batayola, SGA President, GBC; Mr. Sebring Frehner, NSSA President, NSC; Mr. David Rapoport, CSUN President, UNLV; Mr. Kyle George, GPSA President, UNLV; Mr. Charlie Jose, ASUN President, UNR; Mr. Matthew J. Smith, GSA President, UNR; Mr. Cesar Benitez, ASTM Board Chair, TMCC; and Mr. Jason McGill, ASWN President, WNC.

Chairman Leavitt called the meeting to order on Thursday, March 10, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. with all members present except for Regent Schofield.

Regent Crear led the pledge of allegiance.

1. Administered - Oath of Office (Agenda Item #1) - Nevada Supreme Court Chief Justice Michael L. Douglas administered the oath of office to the newly elected and re-elected Regents:

- Dr. Andrea Anderson
- Dr. Mark W. Doubrava
- Dr. Jason Geddes
- Mr. James Dean Leavitt
- Mr. Kevin C. Melcher
- Mr. Kevin J. Page
- Mr. Michael B. Wixom

The meeting recessed at 9:10 a.m. and reconvened at 9:16 a.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2011, with all members present.

2. Information Only - Introductions and Campus Updates (Agenda Item #2) –President Sheehan introduced TMCC’s new Executive Director of Institutional Advancement, Ms. Paula Lee Hobson.

President Richards related that CSN and NV Energy have begun the second phase of the solar panel project.

President Smatresk introduced incoming UNLV Faculty Senate Chair, Ms. Sally Miller.

Meeting recessed at 9:20 a.m. for committee meetings and reconvened at 2:07 p.m. with all members present.

3. Information Only - Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations (Agenda Item #3) - President Lucey introduced Dr. Marilee Swirczek, Professor of English, WNC. Dr. Swirczek has taught English at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu and California State University, Sacramento, before coming to WNC in 1989. She served as English Department chair for six years and founded Lone Mountain Writers in 1991. Her teaching awards include Instructor of the Year, 1991; University & Community College System of Nevada Outstanding Faculty, 1996 and 1998; and Board of Regents’ Teaching Award, 2001.

Dr. Swirczek introduced retired Major Kevin Burns, adjunct faculty member at WNC since 2007, is retired from the U.S. Marine Corps and serves as faculty advisor for WNC’s newly established Student Veterans of Western Nevada College. Major Burns related that his mission was to develop a student veterans club to assist soldiers in the transition from military to civilian life.

3. Information Only - Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations (Agenda Item #3) – (Cont'd.)

Major Burns introduced Mr. Jason McLean, student and President of the Student Veterans of Western Nevada College. Mr. McLean is also a veteran of the U.S. Army and is currently pursuing a degree in mining and engineering at WNC. Mr. McLean related that there were currently over 250 veterans registered at WNC. The club was formed to assist newly separated veterans in their transition from military to the civilian and academic environment and to provide the necessary structure that is imperative for student veterans to succeed.

Dr. Swirczek related that WNC is the only community college in the nation with a national touring exhibit that began as a creative writing class project. In May of 2009, the exhibit “Always Lost: A Meditation on War” opened containing photographs and names of more than 5,800 casualties from both the Iraqi and Afghanistan wars, including a former WNC student. Student volunteers spent more than 1,000 hours researching and downloading the photographs.

Dr. Swirczek related that prior to the opening of the original exhibit a mother contacted her about her son Noah who had taken his own life after serving two terms in Iraq. She had discovered poems that he had written about his experiences in Iraq and offered to have her son’s writings as part of the exhibit. Since the opening of the original exhibit, Noah’s writings have been featured in an HBO documentary entitled “War Torn: 1861 – 2010.” In addition, Dr. Swirczek just received notice that Noah’s poems will be featured in over 100,000 copies of the next Pearson Education textbook to be published.

Dr. Swirczek continued that the first venue of the exhibit’s national tour was at the University of Wisconsin Marinette, where it was honored with a military honor guard, 21 guard salute and taps. Through word of mouth, the story of “All is Lost” began to travel across the country. Currently the tour is booked through the spring of 2013 and the student volunteers are working hard to keep the exhibit current. A letter had also been received from Senator Harry Reid and Representative Dean Heller in support of the exhibit and requesting that the exhibit visit Washington D.C. in the near future (*letter on file in the Board office*).

Ms. Star Anderson, General Manager of the Carson City Nugget, announced that their company would be gifting a substantial amount of money to keep the “Always Lost: A Meditation on War” exhibit going. She felt that this was an opportunity to support the community and the Carson City Nugget’s mission is to support the local community. She related that although they are proud and thankful to be a part of this exhibit, it is also personal for her as her son returned from Iraq two and a half years ago.

4. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #6) – The Board of Regents approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of consent agenda item #7 Tenure, which was considered separately (Consent Agenda on file in the Board office).

4. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont’d.)
- (1.) Approved with Changes - Minutes (Consent Agenda #1) – The Board of Regents approved the minutes from the following meetings:

- December 3, 2010, annual Foundation Reports:
 - ✓ CSN (Ref. C-1a on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ DRI Research (Ref. C-1b on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ DRI Research Parks, LTD. (Ref. C-1c on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ GBC (Ref. C-1d on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ NSC (Ref. C-1e on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ TMCC (Ref. C-1f on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ WNC (Ref. C-1g on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ UNLV (Ref. C-1h on file in the Board office)
 - ✓ UNR (Ref. C-1i on file in the Board office)

Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, CEO and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, stated that the UNLV Foundation minutes (Ref. C-1h) would be corrected to reflect the accurate spelling of Ms. Nancy Strouse.

- (2.) Approved - Handbook Revision, Refund Policies for Veterans (Consent Agenda #2)- The Board of Regents approved a revision to Board policy regarding institutional refund policies (Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 15). Specifically, the proposed revision provides that for the purpose of educational benefits for veterans, NSHE institutions shall comply with the refund and other applicable policies of federal law pertinent to education benefits for veterans under Title 38, Part 21 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office).
- (3.) Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer Term Salary Schedules (Consent Agenda #3)- The Board of Regents approved summer term salary schedules for 2011 as submitted by each institution. In accordance with *Procedure and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 3, Section 5*, annual approval is required by the Board of Regents. However, no changes were proposed (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office).
- (4.) Approved - Allocation of Grants-In-Aid, 2011-2012 (Consent Agenda #4) - The Board of Regents approved the recommended Grants-in-Aid allocations for the 2011-12 academic year. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 396.540 provides for tuition waivers for students from other states and foreign countries based on 3 percent of each institution’s fall headcount enrollment. In all cases, funding is not sufficient to support the maximum allowable number of grants-in-aid:

	<u>IN-STATE</u>	<u>OUT-OF-STATE</u>
UNR	525	525
UNLV	832	832
NSC	90	90
CSN	1,323	1,323
GBC	111	111
TMCC	394	394
WNC	170	170

4. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)
- (5.) Approved - Appointment to WestEd Board of Directors (Consent Agenda #5) - The Board of Regents approved re-appointment for an additional three-year term (*June 1, 2011, to May 31, 2014*) to the WestEd Board of Directors for Dr. William Speer, UNLV, and Ms. Bonnie Hofland, GBC. WestEd is a nonprofit research, development and service agency that enhances and increases education and human development within schools, families and communities (*Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office*).
- (6.) Approved - New Endowment, TMCC (Consent Agenda #6) - The Board of Regents approved the investment and management of TMCC's acceptance of a \$6,000.00 donation from various donors to establish the new International Student Scholarship Endowment Account. The new endowment account will benefit international students at Truckee Meadows Community College through scholarships. The donors have expressly requested for this endowment account to be invested in and managed by the NSHE Endowment pool (*Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Knecht moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of consent agenda item #7 Tenure. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried.

The Following Consent Agenda Item Was Considered Separately:

- (7.) Approved - Tenure (Consent Agenda #7) - The Board of Regents approved tenure for the following faculty members. Each applicant meets the standards for tenure in the NSHE Code and has been positively recommended by his or her institution following a peer review process.

CSN – (*Ref. C-7a on file in the Board office*)

Ms. Simone Brito	Ms. Shirley Marie Johnston
Ms. Patricia Charlton	Dr. Peter Denham Lanagan
Dr. Charles Deitrich	Dr. Maria Moya
Mr. Ronald Gonzalez	Dr. Vasile Munteanu
Ms. Susan Gregg	Mr. William H. Neff
Ms. Mary Hackie	Ms. Karen L. Shaw
Ms. Karen Hyman	Dr. Cynthia Shroba
Ms. Lee Hyun Mi	

GBC – (*Ref. C-7b on file in the Board office*)

Ms. Amber Donnelly	Mr. Thomas Reagan
Ms. Tamara Gailey	Ms. Sharon Sutherland

NSC – (*Ref. C-7c on file in the Board office*)

Dr. Andrew Kuniyuki	Dr. Sandip Thanki
Dr. Anthony Scinta	Dr. Kebrete Kebede

The Following Consent Agenda Item Was Considered Separately:

4. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont’d.)

(7.) Approved - Tenure (Consent Agenda # 7) - (Cont’d.)

TMCC – (Ref. C-7d on file in the Board office)

Ms. Angela Adlish	Dr. Thomas Kies
Ms. Deborah Bader	Dr. Bronwen Own Haugland
Dr. Judith Frederickson	Dr. Melanie Purdy
Ms. Erin Frock	Mr. Brian Wells

UNLV – (Ref. C-7e on file in the Board office)

Dr. Sajjad Ahmad	Dr. Dong-Chan Lee
Dr. Michael Ian Borer	Dr. Nancy Nivison Menzel
Dr. Eugenie I. Burkett	Dr. Kentaro Nagamine
Dr. John J. Curry	Dr. Anita Tijerina Revilla
Dr. Robert Dorgan	Ms. Judith A. Ryerson
Dr. Mehmet Erdem	Dr. Erin Sahlstein
Dr. David Forman	Dr. Deborah Koetzle Shaffer
Ms. Lateka Grays	Dr. Adam Charles Simon
Dr. Andrew Hardin	Dr. Naoko Takemaru
Dr. David F. Holland	Dr. Sheng Wang
Mr. Peter J. Jakubowski	Dr. Helen J. Wing
Dr. Margaret Alexis Kennedy	

UNR – (Ref. C-7f on file in the Board office)

Dr. Linda Anngela-Cole	Ms. Amy Meier
Dr. William Arnott	Dr. Sankar Mukhopadhyay
Mr. Christopher Coake	Dr. John Muntean
Dr. Holly Gatzke	Dr. Louis Niebur
Dr. Michelle Granner	Dr. Robert Ostergard, Jr.
Dr. Jill Heaton	Dr. Clayton Peoples
Dr. Ramona Houmanfar	Dr. Yashuhiko Sentoku
Dr. Mar Inestrillas	Ms. Kerry Seymour
Dr. Derek Kauneckis	Dr. Pavel Solin
Dr. Jennifer Mahon	Dr. Tamzen Stringham
Dr. James Mardock	Dr. Lynda Walsh
Dr. Marjorie Matocq	Dr. Carolyn White
Dr. Frances McKee-Ryan	

WNC – (Ref. C-7g on file in the Board office)

Ms. Holly O’Toole

The Following Consent Agenda Item Was Considered Separately:

4. Approved - Consent Agenda (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)
- (7.) Approved - Tenure (Consent Agenda # 7) - (Cont'd.)

Regent Alden requested that this agenda item be tabled until the June 16-17, 2011, agenda due to the number of unknown aspects of the proposed biennial budget. He clarified that he was in support of the individuals but felt that it would be better to hold consideration until the June meeting.

Regent Alden moved to table consideration of consent agenda item #7 Tenure until the June 16-17, 2011, Board of Regents' meeting. Regent Page seconded.

Regent Geddes stated that he would not support Regent Alden's motion. He realized the difficult financial situation that the System was currently in. However, the institutions have set goals and the recommended faculty members have achieved those goals. He felt it was the Board's obligation to award the tenure requests. He added that if the circumstances were to change, tenure could be addressed at that time.

Regent Anderson expressed her agreement with Regent Geddes.

Regent Knecht felt that it would be unfair to delay tenure until June and also expressed his opposition to Regent Alden's motion.

Regent Crear asked to hear from the presidents. President Smatresk related that the awarding of tenure was perhaps the most significant achievement in a faculty person's life. To defer that award at this time would add needless anxiety and he strongly urged the Board to move forward with its consideration of the agenda item.

President Glick agreed with President Smatresk, adding that the Board's support of these recommendations would show that it respects the institution of tenure and its process.

President Di Mare concurred with Presidents Smatresk and Glick, adding that not only have the faculty achieved the tenure, they have done so under extreme circumstances. She strongly encouraged support for these recommendations and expressed her appreciation for those Regents that were in support.

Regent Alden voted yes. Regents Anderson, Blakely, Cobb, Crear, Doubrava, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Melcher, Page, Schofield and Wixom voted no. Motion Failed.

Regent Page moved to approve consent agenda item #7 Tenure as recommended. Regent Wixom seconded. Regent Alden voted no. Motion carried.

5. Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #7) - Mr. Tom Baker, Chairman of the Advisory Committee for the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, related that he had met with President Glick earlier that week in regard to why a 72 percent cut in the Cooperative Extension budget would be necessary. The Advisory Committee then expressed their concerns and disagreement with President Glick in light of the Governor's proposed 33 percent cut. In addition, Mr. Baker also expressed concern for the failure to discuss the \$11 million in funds contributed by the counties to Cooperative Extension by Nevada Revised Statute (NRS). Mr. Baker related that the currently proposed reduction plan would eliminate 50 percent to 70 percent of Cooperative Extension's 100 programs statewide, including substantial reduction to the 4-H program and the loss of an estimated 70 positions statewide. He indicated that although none of the 46 specialist positions scheduled for potential elimination had been specifically identified, only one specialist in each area would be retained. Mr. Baker hoped that the Regents would understand why the Advisory Committee chose to support the Governor's proposed budget plan, adding that although the Advisory Committee was willing to share in the pain of the budget reductions, a 72 percent cut in addition to the 21 percent cut that has already occurred over the last three years would substantially eliminate the voice of Nevada's rural communities. Mr. Baker concluded by stating that current decisions will determine the future. Nevada must keep the future in mind so as not to emerge at the end of the current challenges only to find that there is nothing left of value.

Ms. Sarah Adler, President of the Carson City Advisory Board, empathized with the untenable position that the Regents were in. However, she stated that although she had been horrified by the Governor's proposed 33 percent budget cut, she had been outraged by President Glick's recommended 72 percent reduction with regard to the Cooperative Extension. She indicated that NRS 549.050 dictates that the Cooperative Extension will receive a direct appropriation from the Governor's budget and took issue that a reduction to that program's budget was within the authority of UNR's President. Ms. Adler related that Cooperative Extension works in six core mission areas. By creating hundreds of thousands of contacts within the programs' six core mission areas, including economic development, human and family development, and natural resource protection as well as in agriculture, Cooperative Extension was preventing the need for the state to expend funds in those areas. Ms. Adler felt that Cooperative Extension is a statewide funnel between Nevada's children and its higher education institutions. She stated that she would support the Governor's 33 percent, adding that 72 percent is just too harmful.

Ms. Hailey Etchison, News Editor for the UNLV Rebel Yell stated that she was there to address the Board on behalf of the Rebel Yell's Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor. The newspaper is hoping to increase its coverage of the NSHE and asked the Regents to engage with the Rebel Yell reporters whenever possible.

Mr. Jason McGill, ASWN President, WNC, addressed the Board in terms of how a decision to close WNC would affect the staff, students and faculty on a non-financial level. He felt that it was important to look at the personal aspect of the lives of the future leaders of this state and perhaps the country. Mr. McGill related that 300 individual stories have been collected from the students at WNC. He indicated that if WNC were to close or merge with another institution, it would be tragic for some of the students. He asked the Board to keep in mind that financial numbers should not be the only component in determining the education of Nevadans.

5. Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Robert Metz, CEO and Founder of American Sports Academy, related that he has addressed the Board at previous meetings and had been assured that he would be contacted to begin potential negotiations on a business transaction involving land owned by the University of Nevada, Reno. However, he stated that he has not received a response. Chairman Leavitt stated that Mr. Metz has met with the Chancellor.

Mr. Austin Jones, Student, WNC, indicated that although he understood that budget cuts need to be made, he did not feel that the closure or merging of WNC should be one of them. He felt that WNC was an integral part of the Carson City community by providing a trained educated workforce for a growing international workplace. He felt that WNC makes Nevada students capable of performing jobs in the bigger world. He related that he has been able to fulfill all of his undergraduate courses for a Bachelor's in International Affairs before transferring to UNR. These courses would have been impossible for him to take at TMCC due to transportation. He related that he is also a recently discharged disabled veteran and WNC played an important role in helping him integrate back into society. He stated that if WNC were to close or be consolidated, it would be unable to fulfill the mission of the Board of Regents which includes the retention of students. He felt that the profit margin for such a consolidation would be minimal compared to the impact on the future of Nevada's economy through lost potential profit from jobs never being created due to a sub-par workforce.

Ms. Suzanne Kelly Gilpin, Student in WNC's ASL program, stated that although she holds seven degrees, she has been dropped from jobs. WNC has given her a new lease on life and the ASL program has provided her hope. She felt that to eliminate a program of this magnitude would be exceptionally sad.

Mr. Ed Schober, Student in WNC's ASL program, related that due to a medical condition, he will be considered deaf in five to ten years. He indicated that the elimination of the ALS program would be similar to taking his life away and would also negatively impact children that are hearing impaired and parents that need to learn this language to help their hearing impaired children. He stated that this program will hopefully help him to find a job, adding that if the program was cut, it would send services for the hearing impaired back to the 1950s.

Ms. Caitlin Mattice, Student at WNC, related that as a hearing-impaired citizen, she had experienced difficulties as a child without the interpreters or resources that should have been available to her. Participating in WNC's ASL program has opened her mind to American Sign Language. She expressed concern that if the program is eliminated, children such as her will not receive the help that they need and their futures will be negatively impacted with those resources.

Ms. Loni Friedmann expressed how much the WNC ASL program has meant and asked the Board not to eliminate such an important program.

Chairman Leavitt requested that an audio CD of the public comment testimony be provided to the Governor and all members of the Legislature.

5. Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Ms. Molly McGregor, Student at WNC, related that her dreams include becoming a sign language interpreter and an expressive arts therapist. Like many of the students that attend WNC, she works to support herself and would not be able to afford to attend another institution. She stated that education was not something she wanted, but rather something she needed in order to live life. She felt that the proposed budget cuts would be impossible to overcome for people that have a dream to make something of their lives.

Mr. Eric Franklin, Student at WNC, stated that he had been shocked to find out that the closure of WNC was an option. He related that his experience at WNC is just a stepping stone to furthering his career. The closure of WNC would limit Nevadans from their future and would drive businesses and people out of this state. He indicated that WNC's mission is to help and improve the Carson City community. He asked how Nevadans could be possibly be helped by limiting access to education and thereby the future.

Ms. Ashlee McGarity, Student at WNC and Vice President of the Student Council – Fallon Campus, related that she is a first generation college degree earner in her family. After earning her first degree in 2008, she returned to become an interpreter for the deaf. She stated that only WNC offered the ASL interpreter program and in order to pursue her educational dreams she would have to go outside of Nevada. She shared a personal experience about what WNC has offered to her personally, adding that the people and staff at WNC showed her compassion and gave her hope and support to continue her education and not to quit.

Mr. Sheldon Phelps, Student at WNC and Senator for the ASWN Carson Campus, felt obligated to denounce the damage that could be inflicted on his education by the proposed cuts to education. He felt that the impact of the budget cuts would do more harm than good. He understood the importance of saving money but also expressed concern that taking away jobs will also take away the ability of citizens to provide for their families. He stated that WNC is the only institution that provides education in rural areas of northern Nevada such as Lovelock, Hawthorne, Fallon, Yerington, Smith Valley, Fernley and Silver Springs. He did not understand why WNC had to be punished for doing well as an educational institution. He felt that closing the institutions would take away educational opportunities from students throughout Nevada.

Mr. Jason McLean, Student and President of the Student Veterans of WNC, related that beginning with World War II veterans, the nation established the GI Bill which provided the opportunity for veterans to attend college. However, he asked what good is the GI Bill without the opportunity to use it. He asked the Board to keep the promise of an opportunity to receive an education to Nevada's veterans that return home from war.

Ms. Bethany Roach, Student in WNC's ASL program, related that there are currently three certified interpreters in the state of Nevada and that more were needed. She felt that Nevada's children deserved better. She asked the Board not to close WNC.

5. Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Ms. Chrislyn Friestad, Student in WNC's ASL program, related that as a child she was diagnosed with a learning disability and told that she would never achieve her dream of becoming a teacher. She stated that with the help of WNC's ASL program and its teachers, she will be graduating in the spring with two degrees. She asked the Board not to close the ASL program at WNC.

Mr. Cesar Benitez, SGA President, TMCC, related that TMCC is the only open access college in Washoe County. The colleges throughout the state are different because the needs of the students and the employers throughout the state are different. He asked the Board not to merge northern community colleges so that unique communities would continue to be served.

Ms. Margaret Craig, Part-time instructor for WNC's ASL program shared with the Board that WNC provided her with an affordable opportunity to return to school and achieve her degree in deaf studies. She added that WNC was the only resource for ASL support in northern Nevada. Qualified interpreters are needed in order to provide equal access to the deaf community. She stated that this program was necessary for the future of deaf citizens in Nevada.

Mr. Chase Fuller, Student in WNC's ASL program, shared with the Board that as a child he was placed with a foster family that had a deaf child in their home and that had no way of communicating. He taught himself how to communicate with that child. After his mother told him that he should use his talents to help other children he began studying for a career in deaf studies. He asked the Board not to close WNC's ASL program so that he could continue to achieve his education and have a productive future helping the deaf.

Ms. Sandra Garrison, current student and WNC Alumni (2010), Summa Cum Laude, related that without WNC, she would not have been able to achieve that status. She is also one of the student volunteers for the Always Lost: A Meditation on War project. Ms. Garrison stated that WNC has more to offer the Carson City community than just teaching the children, it is about who the community is and asked how a price could be placed on that.

Ms. Ruby Kennison-Fox, WNC Alumni related WNC provided her the opportunity to become the first female in her family to earn a college degree. Without the close proximity of the WNC Fallon campus to the Indian reservation where she lives, she would not have achieved her degree and be standing before the Board that day. She stated that it was important that WNC remain as it is.

Mr. David Hillis, member of the Carson City community, related that he had attained three Associate degrees at WNC before transferring to UNR to earn a Master's degree. Mr. Hillis is also an instructor at WNC and addressed the Board from a long history of relationship with WNC. He understood that the Board is faced with very difficult decisions and some of those decisions were not necessarily choices. He stated that the citizens need to stand up and tell their legislators that funding needed to be found elsewhere besides being taken from education.

5. Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Dave Cook, Vice President of the Nevada State Board of Education, also identified himself as a tenured faculty member of WNC. He related that full spectrum of education in Nevada has never been fully funded and felt that was a travesty. When the state Board of Education representatives speak of the need for funding, they also speak to needs of the higher education system. If high school graduates want to have a future in Nevada, they will need a place that will provide them with the necessary services to succeed in a Nevada economy. He asked how the proposed NSTAR concept could become successful without institutions of higher education. Mr. Cook related that the state Board of Education had serious concerns for para-professionals such as counselors, social workers, nurses and ASL interpreters. As a representative of the state Board of Education, he expressed serious concern for the elimination of programs that serve the state's schools. He stated that in order to serve some of Nevada's most at-need students, northern Nevada could not be without an ASL program. He emphasized that there must be an ASL program in the immediate area, adding that program should be expanded to a baccalaureate program in order meet federal criteria for licensure. He empathized with the tough decisions that the Board will need to make. He felt that if anything could pull Nevada out of its difficult situation, it will be a strong educational system.

Chancellor Klaich stated that there would be a rally for higher education at the Legislative Building on March 21, 2011, and urged those that had participated under public comment that day to attend and to please write to their legislators and Governor.

For the record, Mr. Wasserman stated that the Board office has received letters from Ms. Constance Kosuda and Ms. Patricia Martinelli-Price and a second letter from Ms. Julie Hareford who had each asked that their communications be made available to the Board and become a permanent part of the minutes (*letters on file in the Board office*).

Meeting recessed at 3:32 p.m. and reconvened at 3:51 p.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2011, with all members present.

6. Approved - Regents' Awards (Agenda Item #8) - The Board of Regents approved the 2011 Distinguished Nevadan and Regents' Scholar recipients as presented:

- A. Distinguished Nevadans (Agenda Item #8A) - Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 14 and Procedures & Guidelines Manual Chapter 8, Section 1.1. (Ref. BOR-8a on file in the Board office)
- Mr. Theron H. and Mrs. Naomi D. Goynes, Las Vegas. - *Nominated by Regent Crear. (Ref. BOR-8b on file in the Board office)*
 - Ms. Anna Lou Call Peterson, Las Vegas. - *Nominated by Regent Blakely on behalf of Regent Wixom. (Ref. BOR-8c on file in the Board office)*
 - Mr. Edward C. Reed, Jr., Reno. - *Nominated by Regent Cobb. (Ref. BOR-8d on file in the Board office)*
 - Ms. Gene Segerblom, Boulder City. - *Nominated by Regent Anderson. (Ref. BOR-8e on file in the Board office)*

6. Approved - Regents' Awards (Agenda Item #8) - (Cont'd.)

Mr. Wasserman stated that the Distinguished Nevada award is awarded to recognize prominent individuals who are present or former residents of the state for their significant achievements contributing to the cultural, economic, scientific or social advancement of Nevada and its people or for exceptional service to the state or nation that has influenced constructively the wellbeing of humankind.

Regent Alden motioned to approve the 2011 Distinguished Nevadan recipients as presented. Regent Wixom seconded.

Mr. Wasserman related that the awards will be given out at the respective commencement ceremonies, at which time the nominating regents will make a presentation to the awardees.

Motion carried.

B. Regents' Scholars (Agenda Item #8B) - Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15 and Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 2.5: (Ref. BOR-8f on file in the Board office)

- Mr. Kristopher Del Campo, CSN. (Ref. BOR-8g on file in the Board office)
- Ms. Roger Quijada, GBC. (Ref. BOR-8h on file in the Board office)
- Mr. Eric Mason, NSC. (Ref. BOR-8i on file in the Board office)
- Ms. Farah Rashdan, TMCC. (Ref. BOR-8j on file in the Board office)
- Ms. Shipra De, UNLV Undergraduate. (Ref. BOR-8k on file in the Board office)
- Mr. Kris Gunawan, UNLV Graduate. (Ref. BOR-8l on file in the Board office)
- Ms. Kristina Yeskie, UNR Undergraduate. (Ref. BOR-8m on file in the Board office)
- Mr. Patrick Barber, UNR Graduate. (Ref. BOR-8n on file in the Board office)
- Mr. Curtiss Elliott, WNC. (Ref. BOR-8o on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden moved to approve the 2011 Distinguished Nevadan recipients as presented. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried.

7. Approved - Honorary Degrees (Agenda Item #9) - The Board will render a decision on the 2011 Honorary Degree recipients (*Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 14, and Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 1.2*): (Ref. BOR-9a on file in the Board office)
 - A. Honorary Doctorate Degrees (Agenda Item #9A):
 - Ms. Dorothy S. Gallagher, UNR. (Ref. BOR-9b on file in the Board office)
 - Mr. Kagemasa Kozuki, UNLV. (Ref. BOR-9c on file in the Board office)
 - Mr. William J. Raggio, UNR. (Ref. BOR-9d on file in the Board office)
 - B. Honorary Baccalaureate Degrees (Agenda Item #9B):
 - Mr. John C. Carpenter, GBC. (Ref. BOR-9e on file in the Board office)
 - C. Honorary Associate Degrees (Agenda Item #9C):
 - Mr. Locke and Mrs. Betty Ray Lesch, WNC. (Ref. BOR-9f on file in the Board office)
 - Mr. Bart Masi, CSN. (Ref. BOR-9g on file in the Board office)
 - Mr. Tony F. Sanchez, III, CSN. (Ref. BOR-9h on file in the Board office)
 - Mr. Michael Thomas, WNC. (Ref. BOR-9i on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden moved to approve the 2011 Honorary Degree recipients as presented. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried.

8. Approved - Emeritus Status, Former Chancellor, NSHE (Agenda Item #10) – The Board of Regents approved the granting of emeritus status to former NSHE Chancellor Dr. Neill Humphrey. Pursuant to Board Policy (*Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 29*), chancellors that choose to retire after at least five years of service are eligible for emeritus status. Emeritus status for chancellors must be recommended by the Chairman of the Board of Regents and approved by the Board. (Ref. BOR-10 on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved to approve the granting of emeritus status for Dr. Neil Humphrey. Regent Crear seconded.

Chancellor Klaich stated that this was an opportunity for the Board to take an action that is long overdue. Dr. Humphrey served with grace and vision. Dr. Humphrey came to Nevada 50 years ago in April. He stated that the Board would be honoring Dr. Humphrey for his service, adding that Dr. Humphrey is one of the great human beings of all time and has been a mentor to so many.

Regent Melcher related that he would abstain from the voting on this item due to his relationship with Dr. Humphrey, being his father-in-law. He expressed his honor to be his son-in-law.

Regent Alden related that Dr. Humphrey richly deserved this honor.

8. Approved - Emeritus Status, Former Chancellor, NSHE (Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)

Motion carried. Regent Melcher abstained.

Dr. Humphrey related that he had come to the University of Nevada 50 years ago when the System consisted of the university in Reno, a small branch in Las Vegas and a newly created DRI. When he left the System, it had accommodated itself to include a new university in Las Vegas, an expanded DRI, four community colleges and a Medical School that was maturing. He stated that he was very pleased with this honor.

9. Approved - Tenure upon Hire, School of Architecture, College of Fine Arts, UNLV (Agenda Item #11) – The Board of Regents approved the granting of tenure upon hire for Mr. Randall Stout, effective August 1, 2011. This agenda request is pursuant to Board of Regents policy which specifies that Board approval is necessary in circumstances where the faculty member is not tenured at another institution (Ref. BOR-11 on file in the Board office).

President Smatresk related that in addition to Dr. Stout's impeccable qualifications, including being an extraordinary architect, an endowed chair at the University of Arkansas School of Architecture, and having two books in the process of publication, he is more importantly a key hire in the area sustainable architecture where there is currently a merging of architectural, engineering and science programs around the issues of solar energy and sustainability. Dr. Stout is also one of five Fellows of the American Institute of Architects in the state of Nevada. The request for tenure upon hire is supported by Mr. Stout's support of academic diversification in the region and his ability to network and teach students in these critical areas which will expand the reputation of the Architecture program at UNLV.

Regent Page moved to approve tenure upon hire for Mr. Randall Stout, effective August 1, 2011.
Regent Crear seconded.

Regent Alden asked why the fiscal impact is indicated as none. President Smatresk related that because this position was previously vacant and because of the recently implemented differential tuition, this position's salary will not require the expansion of a budget line.

Regent Alden stated that although he feels that Mr. Stout would be a great hire, he remains concerned that contracts with tenure upon hire should not be extended until more is known about the budget.

Regent Geddes shared Regent Alden's concern, adding that this request was unlike the earlier item for Tenure where the recommended faculty members have met each institution's tenure requirements. He asked the System to explore options for expedited tenure processes at a future Board meeting.

Regent Knecht joined Regent Geddes in his concerns.

9. Approved - Tenure Upon Hire, School of Architecture, College of Fine Arts, UNLV (Agenda Item #11) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Wixom related that he would support this item as presented although he shared the same concerns as expressed by Regent Geddes. He asked if Regent Geddes request was for the Board to have a future discussion regarding tenure alternatives. Regent Geddes confirmed that he would bring such a request to the Board's attention during New Business.

Chairman Leavitt felt that a request for tenure upon hire was appropriate in certain circumstances.

Upon a roll call vote Regents Anderson, Blakely, Cobb, Crear, Doubrava, Leavitt, Melcher, Page, Schofield and Wixom voted yes. Regents Alden, Geddes and Knecht voted no. Motion carried.

10. Discussion Tabled - Employment Contract, Head Volleyball Coach, UNLV (Agenda Item #12) – The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the June 16-17, 2011, Board of Regents' meeting (Ref. BOR-12 on file in the Board office).

11. Discussion Tabled - Amendment to Employment Contract, Head Football Coach, UNR (Agenda Item #13) – The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the June 16-17, 2011, Board of Regents' meeting (Ref. BOR-13 on file in the Board office).

12. Approved - Board Meeting Dates Calendar Year 2012 (Agenda Item #14) - The Board of Regents approved the meeting dates and venues for calendar year 2012 as follows.

- March 1-2, 2012, CSN
- May 31 and June 1, 2012, UNR
- September 6-7, 2012, TMCC
- November 29-30, 2012, UNLV

Regent Knecht moved to approve the Board of Regents meeting dates and venues for calendar year 2012 as presented. Regent Doubrava seconded.

Regent Alden felt that since three-quarters of the population was in Clark County, that three out of four of the meetings should also be held in Clark County.

Regent Melcher requested that the Board of Regents hold one meeting at least every other year in Elko.

Regent Schofield agreed with Regent Melcher.

12. Approved - Board Meeting Dates Calendar Year 2012 (Agenda Item #14) – (Cont'd.)

At Chairman Leavitt's request, Mr. Wasserman explained that since the Board implemented the quarterly meeting schedule, there is an equal amount of weeks between meetings so that the campuses do not have to wait longer than necessary to address items to the Board. He related that factors that are taken into consideration are legislative sessions, campus availability, commencement dates and all holidays. He noted that due to the change to the quarterly meeting schedule, the Board is scheduled to meet at GBC (*Elko*) in 2013.

Regent Cobb agreed that the Board should meet in Elko. He also expressed concern that the four meetings per year may not be working out as efficiently as originally hoped. He felt it appeared to create several special meetings and requested that a focus group be established to consider going back to six meetings per year.

Regent Wixom suggested that an alternative scenario could be the scheduling of interim special meetings at regular intervals between the regularly scheduled Board meetings. He felt that would be a good compromise between Regent Alden's and Regent Cobb's meeting preferences.

Mr. Wasserman related that the number of special meetings did not increase as a result of the quarterly meeting schedule. More to the point was that, during legislative sessions, there were more special meetings in addition to the more frequent regular meetings. He indicated that he would be happy to work with the Chairman to reserve special meeting dates at regular intervals between the regular Board meetings.

Regent Page also indicated his support of having Board meetings in Elko and requested that meetings at Nevada State College also be considered.

Regent Anderson requested that special meetings be made available by video conference.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Cobb voted no.

13. Approved - Appointment, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology, NSHE (Agenda Item #15) – The Board of Regents approved the appointment of the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology.

Chancellor Klaich related that approximately 45 individuals had initially applied for the position. The candidate pool was narrowed to somewhere between five and seven individuals. Phone interviews were then conducted to reduce that number to the top three candidates.

Chancellor Klaich related that all three candidates were brought in and interviewed by the search committee as well as by himself. He felt that the best candidate was Dr. Steven D. Zink, the current Vice President of Information Technology at UNR.

Chancellor Klaich stated that this position is absolutely critical to the System at this time. As the System moves forward with constrained resources, it is important to have

13. Approved - Appointment, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology, NSHE (Agenda Item #15) – (Cont'd.)

someone who can participate in the conversation and sees the vision on how information technology can change the way that the System conducts business.

Chancellor Klaich stated that the proposed standard contract terms include an annual salary of \$229,000 (*handouts on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved to approve appointment of Dr. Steven D. Zink as Vice Chancellor of Information Technology. Regent Knecht seconded.

Regent Crear asked how much knowledge Dr. Zink had of the iNtegrate project. Chancellor Klaich related that Dr. Zink has been involved with the project since the project's beginning.

Regent Knecht felt that Dr. Zink could see things in term of the big picture and expressed his support of the appointment.

Regent Page requested that reference material and other discussion information be made available to the Regents prior to Board meetings. Chancellor Klaich expressed his apologies and noted that Regent Page's comments were appropriate.

Motion carried.

14. Discussion Tabled - Course Redesign (Agenda Item #16) – Due to weather conditions, the presenter of this item was unable to attend the meeting. The Board of Regents tabled the discussion of this agenda item until the June 16-17, 2011, Board meeting (BOR-16 on file in the Board office).

15. Information Only - Discussion of Board Policy Regarding Institutional Athletic Programs (Agenda Item #21) - The Board reviewed existing general and specific NSHE policies related to the governance of institutional athletic programs and discussed related policies utilized by other institutions/systems of higher education. (Ref. BOR-21a; BOR-21b; BOR-21c; and BOR-21d on file in the Board office).

Mr. Wasserman noted the reference materials were representative of policies of comparative systems. He requested the Board provide direction regarding the policies the Board would like developed for further discussion at a future meeting.

Regent Alden felt that it should be left to the Chancellor and presidents to determine conference realignment, adding that the Board's current policy was sufficient.

Regent Geddes related that his concern was not that the Board needed to have control of conference realignment, but rather that the current policy does not clearly state the Board's role. He felt that the Code should address this issue as it does have significant financial impact. He asked that the policies from other systems be considered and that the athletic directors at the community colleges and universities help craft a proposed policy.

15. Information Only - Discussion of Board Policy Regarding Institutional Athletic Programs (Agenda Item #21) – (Cont'd.)

Chairman Leavitt thanked Regent Geddes for bringing this discussion to the Board's attention, adding that although there were exciting developments over the last year, there had also been some uncertainty.

Regent Wixom related that the contractual implications for a change in conference were enormous. Although he was not criticizing what had occurred, he did not feel that ambiguity was a positive thing.

Chairman Leavitt stated that when considering a policy additions or changes, consideration needed to be given that there were times when decisions need to be made within short time frames and with enormous financial implications. Any proposed policy needs to reflect something that the Board can handle quickly.

Regent Wixom related that in regard to TCU and BYU, the proposition had to go back to their respective boards. He felt the fact that the decision needed to happen quickly did not mean that a mechanism should not exist to include the Board in the process.

Regent Schofield related that he had long held concern for this situation. He felt that these types of decisions needed to have the Board's input, particularly if the Regents were being held responsible.

Chairman Leavitt felt that it would not be fair for the Board to be obligated by large decisions without providing input. He felt that the presidents were hearing that the Board wanted involvement on significant decisions.

Mr. Wasserman stated that he would work with the Chancellor's office on the direction provided by the Board that day.

President Smatresk related that next year he will be president of the Mountain West Conference and encouraged Mr. Wasserman to work with the institutional presidents that were familiar with the processes involved.

Regent Alden requested that the policy be brought back to the Board at a future meeting.

16. Approved - Resolution in Honor of Mr. William J. Raggio (Agenda Item #17) – The Board of Regents approved a resolution in honor of former Nevada State Senate Majority Leader, Mr. William J. Raggio, for his dedication and service to the state of Nevada and his support of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

On behalf of the Chairman, Vice Chairman and members of the Board of Regents, Mr. Wasserman read the resolution for the record (*resolution on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved to approve a resolution in honor of former Nevada State Senate Majority Leader, Mr. William J. Raggio. Regent Geddes seconded.

16. Approved - Resolution in Honor of Mr. William J. Raggio (Agenda Item #17) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Alden stated that Senator Raggio was an icon in the state of Nevada whose service would never be forgotten.

Senator Raggio stated that this resolution was an honor and one he very much appreciated. Senator Raggio stated that it had been an honor and a privilege to serve as a Nevada Senator for over 38 years and he shared the Board's concern for the future of higher education in this state. He was hopeful that a way could be found to do what is appropriate for higher education, adding that it meant the future of the state of Nevada.

Senator Raggio acknowledged the efforts of the Board of Regents, adding that they are in a very thankless position and one that is not fully understood by the people of Nevada. He felt that there was not an understanding for what the current Board and its predecessors have done to bring higher education to its current level. He thanked the Regents for their willingness to work with him and his colleagues in the legislature over the years.

Regent Geddes related that he had entered politics in Nevada because of Senator Raggio and former Assemblymen Joe Dini and John Marvel. He emphasized that each gentleman was a citizen and statesman.

Regent Schofield related that in 1977 he had been chairman of the state Senate's Education Committee, where he had worked with Senator Raggio. He noted at that time that Senator Raggio had a mind of his own and he knew then that he would be very successful.

Regent Cobb related that the relationship of the Cobb and Raggio families in Nevada goes back in history. It gave him great honor to recognize Senator Raggio for his great service to the state of Nevada.

Regent Knecht related that Senator Raggio had been an inspiration and a friend.

Chairman Leavitt remembered clearly two years ago when he had appeared before the Senate regarding elected officials. It had been such a pleasure to be cross examined by Senator Raggio, although not an experience that he would want to be repeated often. He expressed his tremendous respect for Senator Raggio, adding that the Board of Regents would continue to need the Senator's help.

Motion carried.

The meeting recessed at 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2011, and reconvened at 10:47 a.m. on Friday, March 11, 2011, with all members present.

Regent Knecht felt that the previous day's presentation of "Always Lost: A Meditation on War" had not been appropriately acknowledged. He thanked Professor Swirczek, the WNC students, Ms. Star Anderson from the Carson City Nugget, President Lucey, the Gold Star parents that had been present and Mr. Don Carlson for providing the initial inspiration. He also thanked Congressman Heller and Senator Reid for their acknowledgement of the exhibit and their desire to see the exhibit in Washington D.C. soon.

17. Information Only - Chairman's Report (Agenda Item #4) - Chairman James Dean Leavitt related that he had a dream that tuition remains low enough in Nevada so that no one is deprived of access to that education in order to secure their dreams. He had a dream that the Legislature funds what it values and that it discusses what it values and how what they value will be funded. He had a dream that each institution remains intact and that merger or closure of the NSHE's institutions will not be necessary, and in fact that there will be discussion of expanding services, including the potential for a state college in northern Nevada that complements NSC in the south. He had a dream that legislators and Lieutenant Governor Brian Krolicki take the lead in funding what it is that is truly valued. Chairman Leavitt finished by stating that he had a dream that the Board honor its forbearers that had worked so hard in building the Nevada System of Higher Education.

18. Information Only - Chancellor's Report (Agenda Item #5) - Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich felt that the presidents had done too well of a job in absorbing the previous 20 percent cuts to the institution budgets. He felt that the net effect of that job well done is the virtual transparency of the effects of those cuts, adding that he perceived that to be part of the problem. He emphasized that the state of higher education and the state of Nevada are not okay and that the future is virtually at risk. Many of the members of the Board of Regents have spent their entire adult lives building this System and are now faced with tearing it apart piece by piece. He stated that it is unacceptable for those in positions of authority and responsibility to take a path that says to young people in this state "I've got mine [education], too bad for you." He stated that despite it being a moral imperative, it is a pocket book issue. He asked if Nevada would rather turn its young men and women out to be dependent on the corrections and social services system, or if it was going to tell two hundred thousand friends and neighbors that are desperately seeking work that the community colleges cannot help them.

Chancellor Klaich related that at the last special meeting of the Board, it recognized the magnitude of these cuts and the message heard by staff was that this situation was not, and should not be considered business as usual. The Board requested scenarios and facts that would allow it to assess how best to deal with the crippling cuts. He joined in the Chairman's comments that we are here to protect every student and institution in the System. He emphasized that the document being presented to the Board is incomplete and imperfect as a result of the short time available. He stated that staff was asking the Board for direction on how it wants the System staff and presidents to proceed.

Chancellor Klaich also indicated that there is an incredible amount of uncertainty surrounding this entire process. The recommendation before the Board that day may or may not be the best or worst possible scenario depending on the results of unknown variables such as property taxes and other decisions being made by the Legislature. He stated that he brings this document to the Board with no pleasure but with respect and with serious recommendation that it consider every option and use the scarce dollars available to best serve the citizens of the state of Nevada.

18. Information Only - Chancellor's Report (Agenda Item #5) – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Klaich stated that no one working for the System between now and the end of the legislative session will stop advocating that the System's budget be restored and that rhetoric be backed up with funding. He stated that the Legislature would be asked to fill the budget hole so that the dire consequences do not become reality, including lower access, smaller institutions, rural cities that will not have access to higher education, rural centers that may not be served, young men and women who deserve the same opportunities as those that came before that will be denied, low income families and a disproportionate minority community that will be denied access to higher education. Chancellor Klaich asked that those who do not believe these to be the results to listen carefully to the presidents.

Chancellor Klaich stated that the NSHE has been asked to be a full partner in economic development, yet its budgets are being stripped away. Without resources to assist at-risk communities, any gains will be lost perhaps for decades, including entire generations. He asked everyone to listen carefully to the presidents and to get off the sidelines and into the game so that the state of Nevada will put its money into education, the economy and moving this state forward.

Regent Schofield shared his dream that after hearing the previous day's public comment testimonies related to veterans, that the billions of dollars wasted on fighting a war in the Middle East could be used in America. He had a dream that Nevadans would finally fund education properly.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Mr. Kyle George, Chair of the Nevada Student Alliance (NSA) and GPSA President, UNLV, stated that the students have stood before the Board of Regents and have repeatedly sacrificed when shared sacrifice was called for. However, after three or four years of budget cuts and tuition increases, the NSA will no longer stand for increases in tuition or in cutting classes. He stated that the NSA will no longer stand by and idly watch the state attempt to balance its budget on higher education or by imposing what he felt were select taxes on the students in the form of tuition and fees. He felt that only half the problem was being addressed in the form of budget reductions and that left out the other half of the issue that needed resolution in the form of revenue.

Ms. Paulette Batayola, Vice Chair of the NSA and SGA President, GBC, related that although no clear data is available as to what the breaking point is to raising tuition and losing revenue, there is a correlation. With that being said, the students of Nevada have always agreed to tuition increases and shared sacrifice. However, the time has come for the System and the state of Nevada to step up and share the sacrifice. Tuition and fee increases are taxes on a very select group. She asked the Board to recognize that tuition and fee increases will no longer be supported by the student.

Mr. Jason McGill, ASWN President, WNC, indicated his support of the NSA's position to no longer support tuition increases and budget cuts. He stated that the students have taken the full brunt of the problem without it being solved. If anything happens as drastically outlined in the proposed documents, it would mean tragedy for the many

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

students in the state. At the March 21st event in Carson City, he will be one of many telling the Legislature that the students will no longer place their futures in the hands of the legislators because it does not want to face the revenue problems.

Mr. Sebring Frehner, NSSA President, NSC, stated that the students have time and again supported fee increases and cuts to the institutional budgets. He indicated that NSC is a good example of low-income and low-socioeconomic trajectory students in the state for which a higher education is the only means by which to raise them from poverty. To cut the rungs of that ladder is unjust. He stated that the students will take this straight to the Legislature and will fight until heard, even if it takes decades.

Mr. Cesar Benitez, SGA President, TMCC, echoed the comments made by his colleagues. He stated that the proposed reductions would mean that TMCC would serve 33 percent fewer students and would be losing valuable faculty.

Mr. J.T. Creedon, ASCSN President, CSN, felt that every year compromises are made, yet the economic situation does not change. He cautioned that financial aid is not always available. He related that he would be graduating this year and had decided to put the financial worries aside so that he could focus on his classes and completing his education. However, now he is one of those students that does not have a home and moves between the homes of his friends. He added that in the CSN ASCSN Senate there are three other students that are in the same position. He felt that was pathetic. He stated that it is time that everyone shares in the sacrifice.

Mr. Brandon Bishop, Speaker of the Senate of the ASUN, UNR, shared the same opinion as his student colleagues. The state of Nevada needs to look at revenue reform. Punishing the students and families and all those that try to make the future of Nevada a better place is not the answer. Firing state, county and municipal workers because we cannot afford government is not the answer. What is being sought is continued revenue and to move forward as a state for a good future. When the cuts were announced many students asked if they should start looking at education in another state. He honestly could not tell them that Nevada will be here for them, but nor could he say that other states would either. Although it takes a village to raise a child, it will take a village, the state and the community to push Nevada forward into the future.

Mr. Steve Gronstal, GRAD President, DRI, stated that the DRI graduate students' association very much opposes the closing of any NSHE institution. However, he specifically addressed the possible merging of DRI and the universities. Mr. Gronstal stated that although closely tied, the 75 graduate students at DRI are mostly supported through graduate research grant funding. DRI produced the first Ph.D. candidates in Nevada. The environment at DRI does not mesh well with that of UNR and UNLV in the sense that they have opposing business strategies. The research conducted through DRI is mostly funded with soft money, whereas at the universities, that is not the case. Merging DRI with the universities will cause the loss of many grants and the loss of DRI's reputation. He related that as a graduate student he works very closely with Baldwin Environmental. Much of that company's economic success depends on DRI. If DRI is closed, many economic ties with the community will be eliminated.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Dr. Jill Derby, former Regent, submitted a copy of an editorial opinion that she had written and that had been recently published (*handout on file on the Board office*). She stated that it has taken several decades to build the Nevada System of Higher System and she felt strongly that the System needed to be kept intact. She felt that it was important to point out the sense of shared identity and common experience that has evolved within each institution. In regard to mergers, she felt that any possible dollar savings would pale in comparison to the cost of the disruption. Not only would it damage the institution, it would not weave together well with the new institution, adding that is the intangible side of the conversation on mergers. Dr. Derby emphasized that each Regent's fiduciary responsibility is to the entire System no matter their individual political orientation. She indicated that it was critical to keep the System and its eight institutions intact as unique and distinct institutions. Each institution has already sustained budget reductions that cut its capacity to serve Nevadans. She felt that there was a grass roots fire that has been lit and that the citizens of Nevada will not let this happen. She expressed her appreciation for the Regents' service and the opportunity to address the Board that day.

Ms. Cecilia Maldonado, Faculty Senate Chair, UNLV, related that the documents released reflecting potential 60 percent reductions in budget were devastating. She related that UNLV President Smatresk has been open and has presented the potential impacts and an advisory committee is working to find ways that might minimize those impacts. She reported that the UNLV faculty is scared and disillusioned. Although broad-based consultation has not yet occurred due to the short time frame involved in creating the proposed budget, she expected the faculty and President Smatresk would continue to work collaboratively. Dr. Maldonado expressed her sincere gratitude for the work that the Regents do on behalf of higher education for the state of Nevada. Although it had been a difficult year, she indicated that it had been a pleasure to work with the administrators and the Board over the last year and indicated that Dr. Sally Miller would be her successor.

Chairman Leavitt related that an audio CD of the public comment testimony heard on both days of the meeting would be sent to the Legislature.

Ms. Laura Edwards, Faculty Senate Chair, DRI, related that DRI's 141 research faculty were concerned about the proposal to dismantle and merge DRI with UNR and UNLV. She appreciated the time that the Regents have spent reading, listening and responding to the questions of DRI's faculty and supporters. She addressed the Board on the career homelessness that merging will cause the 64 members of the associate track faculty. She explained that associate track faculty work much differently than the typical model of the traditional professorial track faculty. Associate track faculty enjoy the benefits and burdens of the professorial track faculty and are treated as peers among DRI's faculty. Associate track faculty run large research programs, work to secure funding, publish literature, mentor students and teach classes. There is not an equivalent position within the university structure that enables this opportunity without a Ph.D.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Ms. Edwards offered one example of an associate track faculty member, Ms. Jennie Chapman, who has worked at the DRI Las Vegas campus for nearly 25 years and manages a contract with the Department of Energy that has a current budget of \$42 million within a five year period. That contract involves over 15 DRI faculty with and without doctorates from both the Las Vegas and Reno campuses. That contract or versions of it have been in existence at DRI for decades to support research in environmental sciences, culture resources and national defense. Ms. Edwards provided other examples of the significant programs and contributions of DRI's associate track faculty. If DRI is merged with the universities, the structure of DRI that supports all of those programs would disappear. It would turn associate track faculty into support staff. It also allows DRI's revenue generating researchers to be poached by institutions outside of Nevada. Although every policy maker is looking to escape the trappings of bureaucracy and maximize return on investments, this is exactly what DRI and its uniquely capable faculty have to offer. For these reasons and many others, she hoped the Board understood the positive impact that DRI had on the state of Nevada. She urged the Board to remove the potential merging of DRI from the list of possible proposals.

Mr. Lawrence Lieberman, current Co-Vice Chair of the DRI Foundation Board of Trustees and businessman, related that when he was asked to join the DRI Foundation board, he conducted due diligence and found an exceptional institution that was an exception to the rule - specifically DRI's commitment to applied research in areas of air, land and water, directly related to renewable energy and green technology. Beyond reputation, he found that DRI had a unique business model where researchers secure their own funding. For every dollar of state appropriated funding that DRI receives it returns four to five dollars to the state. In the current appropriation year, DRI received \$8.2 million and turned that into approximately \$45 million in grant money that is spent inside Nevada to support jobs, schools and the economic infrastructure. Mr. Lieberman felt that uncertainty will cause people to start looking for alternatives. To the extent that a decision is delayed, there is a daily risk of losing the best and brightest researchers as well as the grant funding. He warned that the leveraged dollars will be gone and there will only be short term savings for long-term consequences.

Ms. Stephanie Tyler, President of AT&T Nevada, member of the DRI Foundation Board of Trustees and a graduate of the NSHE, related AT&T's commitment to DRI has been long-term, noting that they have been a very proud sponsor of the Nevada Medal dinner for 25 years. The small number of state dollars that DRI is able to leverage and that then ripples through Nevada's economy is literally unheard of. She shared that Ms. Judy Cho, faculty at DRI, started with a project budget of \$130,000 and has turned that into \$46 million. Those research dollars that were created have bought homes and generated tax dollars. Those are national and international dollars that would not have come to Nevada without the unique institution of DRI. DRI's researchers come from around the world and have options to work elsewhere. She stated that a clear message needed to be sent to those researchers that they have jobs and are valued by the state of Nevada.

Mr. Mike Benjamin, Nevada businessman and Chairman of the DRI Foundation Board of Trustees, related that DRI employs 570 people. However, only 55 are on the state NSHE payroll. That means over \$31 million of payroll comes from sources outside of

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

the state of Nevada. In addition, for every dollar that the state funds DRI (*approximately \$8.2 million*), it brings in 5 dollars (*\$45 million or a 5:1 return*). If consolidated, DRI's tax status will change and that will immediately cost \$4.2 million in grants which quickly negates the savings estimated in the report. Finally, DRI represents 1 percent of the NSHE budget, yet has a direct positive impact on the state of Nevada of over \$160 million per year. DRI is recognized in research on a global stage. DRI is and has been an economic diversification model personified.

Dr. Scott Huber, Faculty Senate Chair, TMCC, related that in regard to the option of consolidation of campuses, the faculty senate chairs are committed to the preservation of NSHE institutions. They acknowledge that each institution brings value in its distinction. They believe that the closing or consolidation of any institution would be damaging to the System as a whole. They stand together as colleagues to recommend to the Board the preservation of all eight institutions.

Mr. Huber related that the System has talented college presidents, faculty and staff. Collectively, the presidents, staff and faculty can solve many problems. However, he would like for the Board to keep in mind, that the presidents need autonomy and flexibility to solve problems on their own campuses. If that autonomy is diluted, the ability to keep the institutions intact will be greatly diminished. He would support as a guiding principle the granting of as much autonomy as possible to the presidents.

Mr. Rod Sanford, banker and past president and member of the TMCC Foundation Board of Trustees since 2001, related that as a business leader in the community since 1980, he has seen the very important role that TMCC plays in the Reno/Sparks community. He related that workforce development programs such as TMCC's Dental Hygienist program that ranks in the top three percent in the nation speaks to the heart of the issue. Nevada's community colleges create highly trained workers that are in high demand. TMCC served more than 20,000 students in academic and occupational degree programs in 2009. As a businessman and member of the TMCC Foundation Board, he does not support the merging of the colleges, feeling that would only deepen the economic situation. Community colleges are needed now more than ever. Mr. Sanford reported that the TMCC Foundation Board has and will continue to raise money but doing that under the cloud of merged colleges would be impossible. Donors only give to entities with a vision for the future and that are stable and moving forward aggressively. He related that the TMCC Foundation just completed a very successful feasibility study that reflected strong and broad based community support for an aggressive major gift campaign. To raise significant funds, the cloud of potential merger must be removed from TMCC.

Ms. Maxine Mietz, Chair of the Carson City Advisory Board of WNC, related that Carson City is unique within the System as it is a capital city with a large manufacturing and industrial base. WNC serves that need. She related that the legislature needs to understand that over the years, certain industries have benefited from laws, not constitutional amendments that have provided them with discounts in taxes or other business costs. The legislature needs to understand the importance of educating to employ. She felt that it was also important to close those loopholes to generate revenue, and not necessarily increase taxes, for a better education system.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Mr. John Lagada, Treasurer of the DRI Foundation Board of Trustees, stated that he hoped it becomes inconceivable that DRI will be merged out of existence. He expressed his concern using the metaphor of a time bomb, explaining that it needed to be voted upon that day because every day that there is indecision there was a risk of losing invaluable people.

Ms. Diamond King, Vice President of NSC Student Alliance, felt that being educated is not a short term commitment but rather a way of life. The students are not only burdened with trying to graduate, it is now necessary that they watch their backs to make sure the schools are not taken from underneath them. The education system that has been built may be falling. She wished that she could consider staying in Nevada. However, she has a young son and questioned what kind of mother she would be to remain in Nevada without the possibility of a quality education. She also related that she has two sisters, one in high school and one middle school. She did not want them to inherit the same worries as she is now confronting.

Dr. Eric McDonald, Research professor, DRI, related that he has spent the last 13 years of his career at DRI building a highly successful research program in military geosciences. His program has brought in more than \$22 million from the U.S. Department of Defense and employs 30 full time scientists as well as dozens of undergraduates and graduate students. The research involves providing the Department of Defense with a wide range of critical science based information in support of military objectives. Dr. McDonald stated that he is able to provide frequent briefings and expert testimony because of DRI's business model. The military demands efficient and rapid response because lives and millions of dollars rely on the results. DRI has developed an excellent reputation within the Department of Defense in part because it is not seen as a university but as a science business which is accountable and produces results. DRI's business model allows him to respond and travel quickly. The smallest disruption in the model will cause this program to disappear. He related that of the thirty researchers employed, eight are associate track faculty that would not have an existence in the university environment. Although a university's mission is important to the state, he could not have built his program within the university environment because of the significant differences in how the institutions develop new ideas and proposals, how those ideas are marketed and the emphasis on military and environmental issues. Likewise, he would not be able to continue or expand his program if DRI were to be merged with the university.

Ms. Ashley Cruz, Student at WNC, related that her life has changed drastically over the last year while attending WNC and without the college she would not be the stable person that she is that day. It is a rare thing to find people such as those at WNC, whether they be faculty, staff or administration. She felt that Dr. Lucey has worked extremely hard to build the college. Ms. Cruz stated that she does not support the closure or merging of WNC with another institution. As a student, she expressed to the Board how important education is to Nevada. Businesses will not come to Nevada or expand without educated people to run them. As important as it is to keep tuition low, she would rather pay higher tuition than have the colleges combined. Combining colleges would not be beneficial to any one campus. Closing the rural centers will make it more difficult to attend. Nevada is already ranked the lowest in education.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Ms. Ashley deRosa, Senator for the ASWNC, related that her experience at WNC has been beyond extraordinary. The staff and faculty genuinely care about the success of the students. She related that in order for her to attend college, she could not afford an Ivy League school and she is ineligible to receive federal funding. WNC gave her that opportunity to become a nurse. As a member of the student association, it is a duty to be the voice of their student body. The most common response that she has received is that if WNC was not there, the students would not be able to attend college, due to distance or money. She related that the students have been told that higher education is the key to a better life. The students at WNC have that opportunity to receive a higher education and fulfill their dreams. If that opportunity is taken away from Nevada's next generation of businessman, educators and healthcare providers, that would take away Nevada's future. She stated that the student body of WNC are diverse and widespread but stand together in support of furthering their education as well as WNC.

Ms. Lindsey Lepire, Secretary of the ASWNC, related that she had always known that higher education was in her future. WNC made it possible. WNC means more than just a school, it is her second home. Overall this is her home and where she has developed her knowledge for the last two years.

Mr. Nathen White, Senator of the ASWNC, felt that the closure or merging of WNC with any other institution would further put the community into a downfall. WNC is the heart of the Carson City community. It has provided much hope in the form of the programs it offers such as the nursing program, welding and ASL. He related that he drives over an hour to get to WNC daily and without the college, he was unsure what he would do. The people at WNC have given him hope through difficulties in his life. He felt that the staff and faculty want the students to succeed in everything that they do. This college means a great deal to the students and to the community.

Ms. Christina Hillis, Staff at WNC, related that she had received her Associates degree from WNC in 1998. Her husband received his Associates degree in engineering in 2005 and has continued his education at UNR. She related that her husband has also taught engineering courses part-time for WNC for the last five years. She added that their five year old daughter also attends the WNC Early Development Center. Ms. Hillis related that she has worked at WNC for over four years, and for the last year she has had the privilege of being the ASWN advisor. She related that the student government leaders consist of twelve Carson City campus and four Fallon campus students. They all have one thing in common, the desire to succeed and to attend college at WNC. Her absolute pride in them is a significant representation of how each faculty member feels about the students. She did not want the students to lose out on the opportunity to complete their college goals. She realized that more budget cuts were inevitable, but asked the Board of Regents not to close or consolidate WNC.

Mr. Myron Burns, Faculty at NSC, related that he had come to NSC from the University of Miami where he also had a good publication record. He related that if he had wanted to be at an institution like that, he would have stayed. However, he wanted to be at a place that focused on learning as he knows the value of having that emphasis placed on teaching in the class room. Mr. Burns understood that the Regents have hard decisions before them but that they should remember the students that may get lost in the shuffle.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Mr. Chris Harris, Assistant Professor at NSC, stated that he held a deep understanding of the mission and impact that a state college has. While earning his Ph.D. he knew that he would want to work in a state college environment. When he met NSC President Di Mare and Interim Provost Erika Beck at a conference in Chicago, NSC's commitment to low-income and underrepresented students, the promotion of diversity and advocating innovative teaching experiences and active learning had been communicated to him. He decided that day that NSC was where he wanted to be and his experience to-date at NSC has been amazing. The NSC community of students, staff and faculty shares a profound sense of community purpose. They embrace the belief that their daily activities are serving to enrich lives as well as the betterment of Nevada through heavy focus of student mentorship and support and a variety of community initiatives. Among NSC's accomplishments is that it is the most diverse campus in the NSHE and has a retention rate 10 percent above the national average. In conclusion, Dr. Harris stated that NSC provides access to underrepresented young people and trains them to participate in the solutions to Nevada's issues. He asked the Board of Regents to allow NSC to continue its mission.

Mr. Glenn Christensen, Chairman of the NSC Foundation Board of Trustees, indicated that one aspect of the Board's job is to determine the best possible outcome given the funding available. This year, that is a more difficult decision than at any other time in the history of the state. Those members of the Board that came before had the wisdom to create a three tiered structure for a reason, which he felt was by far the best structure. He felt that the best way to climb out of poverty was to develop a skill. He is proud to say that many of NSC's students are not looking for a handout, but rather a hand up. The average income of a NSC student is less than \$19,000 per year. NSC is less expensive to operate, provides greater efficiency, and is executing the advancement of the research missions of UNLV and UNR. He did not want to compare the institutions as one more important than another, adding that each are critical within the NSHE structure. He hoped that the Board would come to a similar conclusion that maintaining a long term vision of a three tiered system of higher education is imperative to the state even in the face of the short term economic challenges that were faced that day.

Chairman Leavitt asked Mr. Christensen to speak as Chairman of the Nevada Development Authority regarding any progress or hope for economic development. Mr. Christensen stated it was important to place dollars where there is the highest return on investment and he believed with all his heart that was in education. He added that education and economic development are inextricably linked.

Mr. Neil Wolff, Director of Financial Aid, NSC, related that the culture that has been created at NSC is extremely rewarding. Approximately 75 percent of NSC's students are financially independent with an average income of \$19,000. Many of NSC's students would not have a place to better their lives without institutions such as NSC. He thanked the Regents for their leadership and wished them the best in making these difficult decisions.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Ms. Jessica Leman, Student at WNC, related that she began her career at WNC by attending the GED program. After receiving her test results, she received a phone call from the Director of the program telling her that she could continue to earn a college degree. She intends to achieve and use her Associates degree from WNC to find a job that she can then use to help pay for tuition to continue her education at UNR. However, if WNC is closed or merged and she is forced to attend classes in Reno, she will have to put her dreams away due to the cost of travel. Regarding the economy, she stated that even she can see that the future is being jeopardized to take care of the immediate situation. She asked the Board to keep their own children in mind when making decisions.

Mr. Richard Rios, Student at WNC, felt that cutting the budgets of the education institutions would directly affect the future of Nevada. He expressed his frustration with the continued downward spiral of funding to the schools. If the current situation is allowed to continue, he felt that Nevada would continue to fall behind the nation until it was a state of casinos and minimum-wage jobs.

Mr. Roy Edgington, Councilman, City of Fernley, addressed the Board in regard to WNC's Fernley campus. He related that the campus enrollment has doubled over the last year. He related that 75 percent of that campus budget is paid for by Lyon County. The City of Fernley is now the sixth largest community in the state. His constituents have all impressed upon him that jobs are important. However, the City of Fernley has everything it needs to promote jobs except for the continued access to education. Twenty-five percent of the working citizens of Fernley are employed in manufacturing companies. In conclusion, he stated that education is important to Fernley. He appreciated the position that the Board was in and hoped that they gave due consideration.

Ms. Cindy Godfrey, WNC Alumni (1999), related that after graduating from WNC she has continued her education at UNR and is currently working on her Master's degree. She stated that would not have been possible without WNC. She related that her daughter is also currently attending WNC. Ms. Godfrey felt that WNC needed to stay in Carson City.

Mr. Doug Barret, Adjunct Instructor, WNC, related that the without remote locations, students would not have the opportunity to take and pass core classes such as English 101. He emphasized the importance of an educated workforce for economic recovery in Nevada. He related that he had already heard reports of business declining to relocate here due to the lack of a sufficiently educated workforce. He felt that the proposed cuts to the education budget are almost a death spiral for the Nevada economy. He indicated that it has been said the key is to increase revenue, perhaps through closure of tax loopholes he would also support an increase in taxes. He felt that to balance the budget on the backs of education or the union is class warfare.

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

Mr. Ted Pleggemeyer, Dean of the School of Sciences, TMCC, addressed the Board from the perspective of having been on the faculty in another state where there had been two mergers in ten years. He related that through those mergers, faculty has to defend the existence of every program. Dr. Pleggemeyer related that TMCC is in the process of pursuing a number of grants to build a renewable energy program that could be an economic driver for the state of Nevada. However, through the potential merger process, those grants may be lost. Also, as the Dean of the Health Sciences, Dr. Pleggemeyer stated that if merger becomes a factor, TMCC's health sciences programs would have to be reaccredited due to major changes in the focus.

Mr. Shelby Phelps, ASWN Senator, WNC, related that as a first generation college student, he thought it was his duty to set the education standards for his family. He related that the first time he met President Lucey, she had introduced herself as Carol Lucey, not as WNC's President. The administration made him understand when the administrators referred to him as "boss." It is the students that determine their own education and their fate. He knew that on March 21st, all NSHE students would be well represented in Carson City, adding that it was a distinct fact that Nevada needs its students.

Mr. Eric Grimes, Executive Director of Churchill Economic Development Authority in Fallon, Nevada, a small business counselor for the Nevada Small Business Development Center and a certified training instructor for the entrepreneurship training course through Next Level, related that although the business climate in Nevada was difficult, it was an educated workforce that would be the way out of the economic downturn that Nevada is currently in. He stated that any business considering Nevada is highly interested in the education that the state has to offer. He related that just the previous week he had a site visit with a major defense contractor that was extremely pleased that WNC was a local campus. He felt that potential mergers or closures would have a very negative impact on the Carson City community.

Ms. Angela Brummel, State Secretary of the Nevada Faculty Alliance and Chapter President at NSC, addressed the Board stating that a budget is a plan but a balance statement is the truth of the current situation. She asked the Board that before her colleagues undergo the turmoil of curricular review or the process of exigency, that the System first has a discussion that involves the balance statements. She indicated that currently the faculty only has access to documents from June 30, 2010, and asked that there be disclosure of current information.

Ms. Deborah Alves, Staff at WNC, related after reviewing the Governor's proposed budget, she noted that the Governor mentioned the actions taken by other states. She wondered why the Governor was not looking at another state that is currently moving out of its recession and had recently dumped \$818 million in continuing education into public colleges and universities and only has 1.2 percent below the national unemployment rate. She stated that the governor of the state, Governor Patrick, has placed that budget on line. As a working single mother and student she would like to continue her education at WNC. She indicated that taxes are an investment for the future and the children. The people are the government and it is the responsibility of the people

5. Information Only - Public Comment – (Cont'd.):

to make sure that the government survives. She quoted Governor Patrick “We chose to invest in education, in health care and job creation because we all know that educating our kids, being able to count on quality, accessible health care and having a job is a path for a better future. We have invested in new ideas to get health care costs under control, to grow jobs, to continue to close the achievement gap in schools and to help in urban violence. By making these choices based on our guiding principles, we are building a better future for all of us, more jobs, stronger schools for all of our children, affordable and accessible health care and safer neighborhoods.” She stated that he has a budget that is working.

Mr. Austin Jones, Treasurer of the ASWN, WNC, stated that this budget is war. He indicated that everyone is accountable for what needs to be done. The event planned for March 21st is the first step, he asked that it not be the last, adding that history will remember how this state treats education.

Mr. Samuel White, ASWN, WNC, related that he was proud of WNC. He stated that there will be a battle in Carson City on March 21st.

The meeting recessed at 12:56 p.m. and reconvened at 1:18 p.m. on Friday, March 11, 2011, with all members present.

19. Action Taken - Personnel Session – WNC President Carol A. Lucey (Agenda Item #26) - The Board of Regents accepted the periodic presidential evaluation report of the President of Western Nevada College, Dr. Carol A. Lucey, as presented by consultant Dr. Rich Cummins, President of Columbia Basin College.

Chancellor Klaich thanked the Regents as well as community members, Ms. Collie Hunter and Ms. Pam Powell, as well as ASWN President, Mr. Jason McGill. He thanked and introduced consultant, Dr. Rich Cummins, President of Columbia Basin College.

Dr. Cummins reported that an evaluation of Dr. Lucey was conducted over a period of five days in which 73 interviews among the college and community constituent groups were conducted. Dr. Cummins stated that his role that day was to present the Board with the final report. In terms of background, Dr. Cummins related that he is president of Columbia Basin College, a community college in eastern Washington State that is experiencing some of the same financial stress as the institutions with the NSHE.

Dr. Cummins reported that he found WNC to be an institution that is stressed due to budgetary constraints. However, it was also an amazing place evidenced by the level of productivity that is way up and commended the faculty and staff. He found that staff morale was very high but felt that was at a tipping point. He felt that double effort needed to be applied going forward to ensure that morale remained high. He stated that he found data driven leadership by President Lucey. Within a leadership context, he found those structures strong. He found some sense of disenfranchisement and fear from the satellite campuses about centralization. However, he also found a very strong move from a continuing education mission to one of completion that is embracing student success.

19. Action Taken - Personnel Session – WNC President Carol A. Lucey (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

In terms of the budget, Dr. Cummins stated WNC has a zero-based budget plan going forward and felt that was a good strategic move. He indicated that President Lucey's foresight has saved the college mission up to this point in time. As the result of following a horizontal fashion of budget cuts that worked through attrition, the college has remained whole and morale is high. However, he did find that there was a concern that the full-time faculty membership had dropped from 82 to 61, and that some programs are instructed primarily by part-time faculty.

In regard to planning, Dr. Cummins related that WNC appears to be very inclusive with wide involvement in its government structure. The 2000 - 2006 strategic plan that focused on access appeared to have been successful. The plan for 2006 - 2012 is focused on student success and it has also showed signs of success. Dr. Cummins related that several of the students that he had met with called President Lucey a "student's president." Those students cited programs such as "Bridge to Success" that have increased easy transition from high school to college. The cohort groups are also helping to develop a culture of diversity and success.

In terms of personnel management, Dr. Cummins found that President Lucey's management style to be honest and forthright. He related that several interviewees had commented on President Lucey in terms of family or of coaching a large team. Initially he had found concerns of President Lucey being a micromanager. However, upon further investigation he found that those were largely historical concerns that were likely necessary when she first became president. Through the shared governance structures that she has created, he felt that those with concerns had the opportunity to participate in the governance of the college and be heard. However, Dr. Cummins indicated that a president will have to make decisions and that not all will be popular. Dr. Cummins stated that WNC is in a place where crisis fatigue is setting in and indicated that he would make some recommendations in the area of personnel management at the end of this report.

In regard to decision making and problem solving, Dr. Cummins related that the shared governance strategy is alive and well at WNC. President Lucey has engaged the community and has purposefully realigned goals to meet the 2006-2012 strategic plan. He felt that the 2006-2012 strategic plan was partly responsible for the decline in full-time faculty as it shifts more resources into student services for success. He felt that by and large, the faculty understands this.

In terms of external relations, Dr. Cummins found that President Lucey is well liked and respected by the community at large. In his report, he had proposed that there is a framework for fundraising that involves three phases that includes cultivation, asking and stewardship. He found that President Lucey is very good at cultivation and stewardship but could perhaps be more involved in the asking phase.

In terms of the Alumni Association, Dr. Cummins noted that developing an alumni association at an institution that is halfway to somewhere is a very difficult proposition.

19. Action Taken - Personnel Session – WNC President Carol A. Lucey (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Dr. Cummins reported that in regard to President Lucey's relationship with the Board of Regents, there was some concern expressed regarding a data reporting issue and discrepancies between numbers reported. He recommended that the Board and President Lucey talk about those reports and how to get the information to the Board in the format that it prefers. In terms of communication, there seems to be desire on the part of some Board members to have more direct communication with President Lucey.

In regard to a master plan, Dr. Cummins felt that WNC is a healthy college that is moving forward in the right ways with some serious challenges ahead. He added that the ability to cut horizontally may be drawing to a close.

In conclusion, Dr. Cummins related that he found President Lucey to be a generally well respected, strong, smart leader that is doing a fine job. He noted that there were a few opportunities for increased communication with the Board and WNC's staff. However, Dr. Cummins related that unfortunately communication for a college president is a job that is never finished and must be done repeatedly.

Chancellor Klaich related that normally there would be an additional agenda item to address discussion of an extension of President Lucey's contract. However, he explained that discussion has been tabled until June due to budgetary uncertainty. He did not want there to be any implication in that decision to defer that discussion to detract from President Lucey's evaluation.

Regent Cobb, Chairman of the WNC Periodic Presidential Evaluation Committee, echoed the comments made regarding Dr. Cummins and his cooperative attitude, diligence and performance review. He stated that he had nothing further to add other than he complimented President Lucey on her performance and her self evaluation.

Regent Cobb moved to accept Dr. Cummins report.
Regent Knecht seconded.

Regent Schofield expressed that it was his honor to serve on the Committee, adding that it had been one of the most pleasant evaluations he has had the privilege to be part of.

Regent Knecht thanked Dr. Cummins for his work. He emphasized that President Lucey has done a good job in managing the budget over the last few years and he was glad to see the report reflect that. Regent Knecht felt that President Lucey has grown while in office.

Regent Schofield thanked Regent Cobb for doing an outstanding job as Chairman of the Committee.

President Lucey stated she has been president of WNC for 12 years. She related that the first years were rough, but she has a wonderful team and they have blossomed. She loves WNC and its students and hoped that going forward she could persuade the Board not to take any immeasurable steps.

19. Action Taken - Personnel Session – WNC President Carol A. Lucey (Agenda Item #26) – (Cont'd.)

Chairman Leavitt added that in terms of the issue regarding communication with Regents, he felt that President Lucey should take it as a compliment as the Board wanted to have more contact with her. The Board members recognized that the president did not want to bother the Regents. However, Chairman Leavitt related that the Regents care about and want to know what is happening on the campuses.

Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report (Agenda Item #18) – Upon a roll call vote, the Board of Regents took action to remove from consideration the closure, consolidation or merger of any of the institutions in order to meet the requested reductions in the proposed 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget (Proposed budget reduction plans from each institution on file in the Board office).

President Lucey related that WNC's reduction translates into a 31.7 percent general fund reduction over two years. On July 1, 2011, WNC's general fund contribution will be reduced requiring \$3.5 million in cuts. The reference material provided outlines the proposed budget reduction plan for WNC and what each action represents in saved dollars. President Lucey stated that the first and most important step to be taken is absolute zero-based budgeting. All WNC budgets will be prepared with no operating budget and each program will have to defend what it cannot live without. That process would result in an approximate savings of \$400,000. With the exception of three academic faculty hired last year, all temporary positions will be reviewed and may not be renewed after July 1st. The budget line for those positions is currently \$819,000.

President Lucey stated that the rural centers in Fernley, Hawthorne, Lovelock and Smith Valley are causing her a great deal of concern. She referred to Fernley City Councilman Roy Edgington's earlier testimony, agreeing that there was no question that Fernley deserved a strong community college presence. President Lucey related that in April she will be visiting every school district, municipal district and county represented within WNC's Advisory Board structure, to ask for help in offsetting the costs of operating the rural centers. One idea is to donate an interactive video set up in each high school and to ask the high schools to provide the staff and services so that the enrollment program can be retained.

President Lucey stated that this year's reserve funds are being used to support a voluntary six-month buyout program for faculty that are at the end of their career. The deadline for that voluntary option was that day, March 11, 2011. President Lucey was confident that \$750,000 could be found from that buyout option.

President Lucey stated that in the second year, the Board will be asked to provide WNC with flexibility to redirect general and capital improvement funds to core institution functions such as student and technology services support. She related that the Douglas and Fallon campuses are slated for reduction in services. At present, WNC is in negotiation with a number of people to find potential ways to soften the blow to the rural communities.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

President Lucey stated that after all those actions have been taken WNC will still be short of the reduced budget and will be required to conduct a curricular and administrative review for the first time. She has now met with the staff and faculty and reinforced that WNC will conduct a support staff and administrative review. The curricular review will focus on student success, graduation rates, community and state service and economic development.

President Lucey asked the Board to withdraw the potential option for closure or merger. She related that potential option is tearing up at least four institutions to no good end because even if the System's estimated dollar savings are accurate and can be recouped the students are still going to need services. She asked the Board to please consider removing those potential actions from the discussion that day.

President Sheehan reported that TMCC had already sustained an 18.4 percent reduction (*\$75 million*) in the current biennium and is now looking at another \$10.3 million (*28.9 percent*) reduction in the next biennium. TMCC is expecting the impact of this cut to be the loss of 6,000 students, adding that calculation was based on the approximately 435 course sections that have already been reduced or that have now been identified for reduction. Those course reductions will impact 217 part-time faculty. In addition, 160 part-time faculty will be impacted by reductions in non-credit programs creating another 5,000 to 9,000 students that will also be impacted. Approximately 30 positions will be eliminated, a number of which were already vacant. TMCC's budget is based on a 13 percent increase of student fees in each year (*from \$207 to \$234 for a three unit course*). TMCC has not hired any tenured positions over the last three years, including one that is desperately needed for accreditation. TMCC will also be conducting a modified curricular review process. President Sheehan related that she has met with the President's Advisory Council and various faculty representatives to establish a timeline.

President Sheehan reported that for FY 2012-13, the actions to be taken include a student fee increase that anticipates a concurrent loss of enrollment and an anticipated reduction of \$1 million in each year of the operating budget. President Sheehan stated that potential consolidation is not an issue centered upon the benefits to students. The rural missions of WNC and GBC are critical and cannot be served by a centralized institution. She emphasized that the presidents welcome accountability in the areas of retention and graduation rates, adding that consolidation puts that all at risk. One of the factors that places success rates at risk is instability. She hoped that the Board will have an opportunity to make a decision quickly, adding that staff and faculty with opportunities will take themselves elsewhere and it will take years if not decades to recover from that loss.

President Diekhans related that GBC will need to reduce its budget by \$2.6 million in the first year of the biennium. He related that GBC is working to eliminate or restructure vacant positions or offer buyouts and resignations. He related that ten of the positions being evaluated are support positions that amount to approximately \$1.2 million. GBC's operating budget and equipment purchases will be reduced in the amount of \$1.1 million. Part-time positions will also be reduced to achieve a \$500,000 reduction. President Diekhans related that due to increased enrollments over the last two years, GBC had the

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

opportunity to keep and save approximately \$200,000 in additional revenue and fees as long as those funds would be spent for instructional purposes.

President Diekhans reported that in the second year of the biennium, GBC will continue to look at buyouts. He felt that GBC could enter FY2013 with ten positions identified for potential buyout resulting in approximately \$700,000 savings. However, approximately 16 positions in administrative services, academic support, distance education, operation and maintenance will need to be eliminated to find another approximately \$900,000. He stated it will be very difficult to do that and maintain services. In addition, President Diekhans related that GBC is investigating what can potentially be contracted out, such as for webmaster services. In terms of academic program reductions, President Diekhans related that up until this time, all other areas of the college had sustained disproportionate cuts in order to maintain academic programs. However, the reduction of an additional \$2.1 million in FY2013 cannot be attained without eliminating approximately six positions that will affect up to five academic program areas. He stated those reductions will seriously impact GBC's enrollments and services. President Diekhans related that he has decreased the amount expected from fees because although there is some elasticity, a 12-13 percent increase of tuition in each year of the biennium, enrollment and tuition and fees will be affected. President Diekhans related that all of the academic officers will be meeting to discuss course collaborations, which are difficult to implement but a reality in the current economic situation.

In conclusion, President Diekhans indicated that many of GBC services and programs were requested by the rural communities, particularly the baccalaureate programs in teaching and nursing. The workforce development programs in the rural communities are a main concern. President Diekhans asked the Board to allow the presidents to solve the problem, adding that he considers a merger or consolidation a failure on his part. He asked the Board to remove the option of closure or merger from its discussion.

President Richards reported that last year CSN laid out several scenarios that have since been considered more carefully. He called the Board's attention to page 36 of the reference material, noting that is the list of all of the sites and centers supported by CSN, of which the Henderson campus was listed first. He stated this information had been provided in response to the System's request. President Richards stated that the Henderson campus served approximately 6,500 students last year and is a full service campus. The Henderson campus also houses a number of key and specialized programs that would be difficult to relocate due to the uniqueness of space such as the Heating, Ventilation and Air Condition (HVAC) program. He felt he would derelict as president if he did not express the consternation of the citizens on that campus and in that community of the prospect of it being closed. He also pointed out the lack of higher education opportunities represented by the possible closure of the centers in Mesquite, Boulder City, North Las Vegas and Lincoln County. President Richards related that CSN will be recommending that its registration fees be brought up to the same level as the WICHE average and, in keeping with Board policy, it continue to carve out 10 percent for financial aid.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

President Richards related that CSN will need to reduce its budget by \$12 million in the first year of the biennium and by \$25 million in the second year. The proposed plan predominantly impacts and addresses the needs in the first year including closure of a site, reduction in contract services, cost reallocation and college operating reductions. In the second year, similar actions will be taken in addition to a major cut of \$8 million in college operating reductions. To help guide those decisions, there is a program review process and a non-instruction review process.

President Richards reported that the currently proposed plan calls for the potential reduction of 65 staff FTEs and 1,900 student FTEs which represents 3,800 individual students on top of the 5,300 students that were turned away in the fall semester. There will be complete communities without access or with reduced access to postsecondary educational opportunities including Mesquite and Overton. President Richards stated that the primary tool that community colleges have for a budget cut is to reduce sections. Last fall CSN offered over 5,000 class sections. However, under this plan, those sections will be reduced by up to 28 percent (*approximately 1,400*). CSN's six year graduation rate is currently 20 percent. However, under this plan, there will be a longer time to completion of degrees and certificates. Affordability will also be sharply diminished. He is particularly mindful of the diverse population served in Las Vegas, adding that opportunities for that particular population will be severely constricted. Without a concerted effort in financial aid it will be even more difficult for that population to reach its goals. With this level of reduction, President Richards felt that the state's aspiration for low tuition and fees comes to an end and will require a move toward the national model of tuition and fees at market prices with only some financial aid for support. President Richards cautioned that there will still be an \$8 million reduction in operating funds in the second year. Although he has found that the elasticity factor is generally neutral for CSN, President Richards was still very concerned of the impact of the reductions on diverse populations.

President Di Mare reported that for the upcoming biennium, NSC will experience a \$3.1 million reduction in the first year and a \$4.5 million reduction in the second year. The current organization will be restructured to drive efficiencies in cost savings. While the Committee had approximately three weeks to determine these recommendations, it will take an additional month or two to reconsider those 32 vacant and budgeted positions as some of those positions are extremely important to the campus. A 25 percent decrease in the operating budget will be attained through a zero based budgeting process. A 5 percent salary reduction has been requested. A 10 percent student fee increase will be requested in each year of the biennium. President Di Mare stated that those actions should allow NSC to meet the Governor's proposed budget. However, the implications of those actions include the elimination of 130 course sections as compared to the current year. That translates into approximately 2,500 students that will not be able to access needed classes and will consequently not graduate in a timely fashion. President Di Mare stated that NSC's 67 percent retention rate will be affected. Nursing, biology and math will be particularly affected as NSC will not be able to hire the necessary faculty. Online courses will be reduced. Most devastating will be advising and recruiting positions. Dual credit programs and endorsements will be evaluated as a result of the

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

decreased people power. Fewer grants will be submitted and will result in reduction of the current \$6 million that NSC utilizes to improve teaching, to offer student support services and to develop partnerships with community businesses. Advertising and marketing will be reduced to in-house services only. President Di Mare stated that will be devastating as NSC is a young campus that needs to continually remind the community that it is there. Faculty will continue to teach overload at part-time faculty costs. During the next biennium, NSC will have to reduce the part-time budget and even more sections will be reduced at that point. Finally, President Di Mare reported that class sizes will continue to increase.

President Wells reported that DRI's targeted reduction is 24.6 percent resulting in a net two year reduction of approximately \$2 million. That will reduce DRI's biennial budget from \$10.2 million to approximately \$6.2 million by the end of FY 2013 with all the cuts cumulative. DRI uses indirect cost money that it receives not only for its operations, but also to invest in its faculty.

President Wells reported that the actions that DRI will need to take include the return of the remaining portion of the Applied Research Initiative funds, monies used to leverage additional funds or to be able to come up with required matching funds. The reduction of state funding for research administration positions will result in tremendous strain on a very small and already efficient support staff that works to get the grants and products out on time. There will be a reduction to DRI's research library. The Truckee River Fund that has supported numerous students will also be turned back. He emphasized that these reductions will limit DRI's ability to grow as successfully as it has in the past.

President Wells related that a 30 percent loss of faculty will present problems that will create a loss of \$3.8 million. In regard to the potential merging of DRI with the universities, President Wells felt that there were numerous erroneous assumptions that all contracts and grants will transfer to the university. Some grants are nonrefundable and will need to be returned and renegotiated. As the Board heard in earlier testimony, DRI has a structure that works remarkably well for associate track researchers. He also expressed a concern for the assumption that Foundation funds could be transferred, noting that most of those funds were donated by individuals that are deceased. He urged the Board to stop the discussion of closure of any institutions, adding that if such discussion is allowed to continue, there is the real chance of losing talented researchers and the grants and contracts that they will take with them.

President Glick noted that for UNR a detailed plan for the second year of the biennium has not yet been provided. Plans include the assumption that there will be a 12 percent tuition increase with 15 percent to 20 percent set aside for need-based financial aid. UNR would be working over the next month or two to achieve \$42 million in program reductions including college and department restructuring that will dominantly include academic reductions. The academic programs that had been largely protected throughout the previous cuts will be so weakened by the next reduction that it will cause major impact. In regard to the reductions proposed for the Cooperative Extension program, only one person in every county will be retained to manage county and state portions, to

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

protect 4-H and match what the federal government requires. He stated that the Board has heard that is a 72 percent reduction in state funds and there has been question on how that could be done. The cuts were not meant to devalue the Cooperative Extension, it is simply what has to be done to protect students.

President Glick related that UNR has worked with UNLV to try and prevent any one program from being eliminated at both schools. There had been a mistake in communication regarding the social work program, which UNR has since taken off the list of eliminations. Services mandated by the state for mining will be absorbed by the Department of Geology. However, many mining services will be lost. Programs in dance and theatre will be eliminated, as well as the French degree program. He related that the special collections library will be maintained but will be closed to the public, adding that lack of access to these books will affect other institutions such as TMCC.

President Glick reported that the Governor's proposed budget requires a \$10 million reduction in the School of Medicine. The decisions that UNR is making allows for only \$3 million to be taken from the School of Medicine because UNR feels that School is so important to the quality of health and the future of Nevada. The proposed reduction plan will eliminate positions in Student Services, Information Technology, Athletics and the Assessment office. This proposal reduces the number of faculty and staff by 215, of which 150 are currently employed. The remaining 65 positions were vacant. If UNR must reduce its budget further, that will result in another loss of 200 to 300 jobs. The process will involve curricular review, reorganization and consolidation.

President Glick stated that the following is at stake - this year UNR had the highest freshman retention rate in its history with four students out of five returning for their sophomore year. This year, UNR graduated 66 percent more students than it did a decade ago. This is in a state that is 50th in the nation that a 19-year old will attend college. This year UNR had the highest demand for student loans and need-based aid. This year, UNR produced \$65 million in research and patents. This year, UNR had the highest graduation rate in its history and the largest and most diverse student body. He stated all of that is what is at stake to maintain and to complete College America goals and participate in a value-based economy that will ensure a new quality of life in Nevada.

President Smatresk indicated that although UNR and UNLV are not at risk of being closed that does not mean they are not at risk of tremendous loss. Faculty that has taken years to build up will be lost. Not only will access be reduced and programs eliminated, there will be a negative impact on the quality of the institutions. UNLV has proposed a total of \$32.6 million in reductions. That will include the eliminations of 315 faculty and staff positions, compared to the 407 positions and 1,200 class sections that have already been lost in the \$49.6 million reductions that have already occurred. UNLV is already struggling to provide access.

President Smatresk related that the accumulative impact of the cuts will mean that \$100 million in cuts will have been pushed in a five year period. UNLV will be replicating the cuts that took over four years to implement but will have eleven months to do it. That

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

will drive a very difficult discussion on how to achieve that goal. He related that at UNLV 125 faculty positions will be lost in the \$17.5 million in cuts to the main academic programs, which represents 60 percent of targeted cuts. The plan includes \$8.1 million in proposed reductions in the Law School; elimination of twelve departments some through condensation; and elimination of 33 degree programs including nuclear medicine, athletic training, economics, management, marketing, management information systems, health promotion, public health, higher education, leadership, construction management, art, senior theatre, gerontology, culinary management, gaming management, philosophy, women students, environmental geology, environmental studies and social work.

President Smatresk reported that UNLV's proposed budget was construction by first calculating revenue streams, adjusting for student losses and then cutting to target levels. For UNLV, the Governor's Executive Budget called for a \$47.5 million reduction in the budget. It is believed that UNLV will receive \$8 million in revenue depending on the Board's approval of a 12 percent increase in residential tuition per year which is consistent with UNR's request. He felt that there was no room to increase non-residential tuition or graduate student tuition as those were already over market price. When considering the cuts to be made, the largest cuts are proportionate for all UNLV's main funded academic support areas including finance and business, athletics, student affairs and so forth. Those areas have been cut very hard for four year but have begun to lose fundamental capacity to process grants, admit and support students and other activities that are critical for creating student success.

President Smatresk related that cuts to the academic areas is targeted at \$25 million, 60 percent of that target is approximately \$17.4 million. The reference material presented reflects how those cuts were managed including a mixture of vertical and horizontal cuts in just about every program. There are a number of programs and degrees that will be eliminated entirely. Adding the impact of those cuts affects over 2,000 students. The programs were picked to preserve as much of the core institution as possible. It is hoped that the affected students could move into other programs. However, when 120 faculty are eliminated, quality is impacted. From this set of cuts, it can predicted that UNLV will not only lose students in the eliminated majors, but there will continue to be limited access to upper division courses that will create even more delay in graduation rates.

President Smatresk related that UNLV has more students currently on financial withdraw than ever before in the history of the institution. Every time tuition is raised, students take fewer classes, which results in a longer time to degree completion and will sometimes prevent students accessing education altogether.

In terms of losing faculty, President Smatresk related that the UNLV College of Education just lost a marvelous faculty member to the University of Southern California. The impact of these cuts puts UNLV back somewhere between 20 and 25 years in terms of offerings and reputation. He did not feel this was a great move for Nevada. UNLV is actively producing degrees for this region, of which we need more, not less. When those higher degree levels are achieved, those levels have a monstrous impact on state expenditures and increased revenue. He does not understand the business model that allows profit centers to be cut.

The meeting recessed at 3:06 p.m. and reconvened at 3:17 p.m. on Friday, March 11, 2011, with all members present.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report (Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

In terms of shattered dreams, Chairman Leavitt felt that the impact of the budget cuts on higher education in Nevada was equivalent to the Killing Fields.

Regent Wixom hoped that those who took the opportunity to testify under public comment at this meeting would also be present at the rally at the Legislature on March 21, 2011. He stated that it is one thing to address concerns to the Board of Regents. However, it is the Legislature and the Governor that decide how many dollars are allocated to the System's budget. This is an enormously troubling and difficult task. The only real point that he can take any level of comfort from is the strength of the current Board. He also took faith in the strength of the institution presidents and greatly appreciated their observations and input.

Regent Wixom stated that the Board has no reason to apologize for the System's budgets. He stated that dollars follow demand, adding that over the last 10 to 20 years, enrollments in the Nevada System of Higher Education have increased dramatically. He felt that the number of dollars in the state budget followed that demand and have served the state well. Although he acknowledged that those dollars could serve the state more effectively, he did not feel that any apologies were necessary.

Regent Wixom emphasized that the requested budget cuts have very real consequences and, to some degree, he is afraid that the policymakers lose sight of those consequences and that their decisions affect the students.

Regent Wixom stated that the Board still has no idea what the final outcome is going to be or what the final recommendation will be, adding that it could be more, or perhaps less. He related that business and private institutions will go through a budget process that is primarily in private and then announce a decision. This Board does not have that option and is obligated by law, including the open meeting law, to go through that process openly. He acknowledged that it creates problems on the campuses. However, the Board is subject to the legal process and obligated to follow it.

Finally, Regent Wixom noted that the Board is being asked to implement budget cuts that it has by and large opposed vigorously and that they do not want to implement. That is not a choice. The Board is primarily tasked with the most difficult part of the process. He stated that the Board did not choose these times, all it can do is choose how to respond. His training and background tells him that he cannot make decisions without information. He was not sure how decisions could be made while removing options from the table. By the same token, he still does not know what the final budget number will be or other critical information from which to make decisions. He hoped going forward that the process could be telescoped and expedited as much as possible.

Regent Geddes echoed Regent Wixom's comments. He expressed his faith in the Chancellor in bringing the System to a resolution. He echoed Regent Wixom's comments that this is a process, and more data is needed. He asked that the Chancellor

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

continue to work with the presidents to refine the data that is currently available. The Board did not want to make decisions that caused irreparable harm to the System. He also expressed concern for what the final budget number would be and noted that the \$121 million currently being withheld from the counties could cause further impact.

Regent Geddes commented on the following information contained in the institutions' proposed budget reduction documents that he would like to see further refined.

- He noted that the UNLV Law School is proposing all tuition and no budget cuts and requested a better explanation of that philosophy at the next Board meeting.
- In regard to the UNLV Philosophy Department, he struggled with that department's closure because he felt the purpose of economic development and training is not so much on individual degrees but in being a system that retrains as jobs change. He expressed concern for how that would continue without the department.
- Regent Geddes requested a better explanation for why the College of Extended Studies at UNR is taking the brunt of budget cuts at that institution.
- He expressed concern for WNC's plan for using CIP funds for operating funds and requested clarification of that proposal.
- In regard to TMCC, he noted that TMCC's proposal is 100 percent fee-based for developmental courses and questioned if that model could be applied to all the colleges and requested further details.
- Finally, he requested to see cost models for tuition and fee increases of 10 percent for each year of the biennium, and then 15 percent for each year of the biennium, for all institutions across all division levels.

Regent Knecht joined Regent Geddes in recognizing that the System needed to plan for the Governor's budget up to and including the end of FY 2013. He stated that he continues to hold to that position although it is not a cut he embraced or supports. He recognized that there are possibilities that it could be worse than that, while there are serious possibilities that it could be better. The exact ultimate contingency for which the System has to plan is not yet an absolute certainty but he was comfortable in saying that it should be something that is planned for and worked toward. With that said, Regent Knecht heard very clearly the worry and even panic among faculty, staff and students. He wanted to minimize that kind of worry although he acknowledged that the Board would not be able to eliminate those worries. He saluted the presidents for providing a good starting point from which to work, although it is not perfect. By doing that, the presidents have contributed to narrowing the range of uncertainty and to helping faculty, staff and students deal with the issues. Although the Board could not take all the contingencies off the table, he felt strongly that the most destructive ones could be removed. He indicated that some contingencies have already been removed, noting that the options do not include closure of either of the universities. He related that not only has he listened diligently to the presidents reports that day, he has gone through the materials provided and continues to work through the materials with the System's personnel to feel comfortable enough that the Board does not need to discuss closure, merger, or breakup of DRI, the community colleges or the state college. He recognized that there were uncertainties yet to deal with.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht moved to remove from consideration the closure, consolidation or merger of any of the institutions. Regent Schofield seconded.

Regent Knecht clarified that his motion did not intend to eliminate the option of closure of some satellite operations, although he does not embrace that action. He wanted his message to be that DRI, NSC and the three northern community colleges will continue to be there and that the students and donors can continue to expect a future from each institution.

Regent Blakely expressed his support of Regent Knecht's motion. He noted that the Board had addressed the possibility of 10 percent fee increases, that the break-up of DRI would be taken off the table from further discussion, and that CSN's Henderson campus would not be closed. Chairman Leavitt stated that Regent Knecht's motion did not include removing satellite campuses from the options discussed, and CSN's Henderson campus is defined as a satellite campus.

Regent Knecht confirmed that was correct although he did not intend to telegraph that he was in support of closing that campus. However, there remains much uncertainty.

Regent Blakely asked the Chancellor to consider the possibility of including the CSN Henderson campus as part of NSC, citing its proximity to the NSC campus.

Regent Melcher asked for the motion to be reread.

Chairman Leavitt restated the motion as being that the Board is voting to decide that there will be no closure, consolidation or merger of any of the institutions.

Regent Cobb complimented the presidents for the materials that were submitted, particularly given the short time and circumstances involved. He also extended his compliments to the Chancellor and his staff for their efforts.

Regent Cobb expressed concern regarding the true extent of the cuts under the executive budget. He indicated that he would oppose Regent Knecht's motion because the currently proposed \$162 million budget reduction is predicated upon the successful transfer of \$100 million in property taxes from the counties to the state. If that initiative is not successful the budget cut becomes a \$262 million deficit. He could envision a scenario where the legislature may propose a budget that includes additional revenues that the Governor would veto and that is returned to the legislature where the veto is not overridden. Given that scenario, he is concerned for where the System stands with a budget come July 1st. He emphasized that the public needed to know the dire consequences of what is happening to higher education.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report (Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Cobb felt that although many of the business people that stood in support against merging DRI into UNR and UNLV, he wondered if those same business people would support a tax increase. He felt that the Board needed to get the business community behind the notion that the higher education system in Nevada cannot survive under the current scenario without additional revenue. In that same discussion, it boggled his mind that the current Governor would reduce the budget of DRI, the same institution that generates so much in revenue for the state. He felt that when \$162 million is taken out of the economy, with approximately 80 percent of the budget being for personnel, it will make the state's economic situation worse, not better.

Regent Cobb asked that the Governor receives an invitation to the next Board meeting so that he can personally hear the consequences that his budget will have on higher education. To that end, Regent Cobb asked the Chancellor's office to prepare a one page summary including five top bullet points of the consequences for each of the institutions.

Regent Crear reiterated what President Smatresk had indicated earlier, that the institutions are losing great faculty and staff. He also agreed that if the institutions have shown that they can somehow absorb these cuts, he felt they should be given the opportunity to do so without creating more turmoil on the campuses by continuing to allow discussion for consolidation or closure. He expressed his support of Regent Knecht's motion.

Regent Page indicated his agreement with Regent Cobb that any option cannot be taken off the table. The problem is that the final numbers are still unknown and it would be irresponsible not to be able to have all options available. Regent Page stated that he was not as excited about the presidents' reduction plans feeling that they contained too many broad numbers and needed much more detail in terms of numbers.

Regent Anderson understood the concern that options should not be taken off the table. However, she felt that some of the institutions would suffer if that direction remained open for discussion. She noted that four institutions, WNC, GBC, NSC and DRI would suffer the most due to the rumors. She felt that it was important to take the option of closure, consolidation or merger off the table for now and hope that it does not get worse. In terms of upcoming political races, specifically for Mayor of Las Vegas, she felt it was important to make it known that there is the potential for the loss of 1,000 jobs and that economic development is impossible when access to higher education is cut or limited. She expressed her support of the motion although she acknowledged that she still held concerns.

Regent Schofield related that he has watched the growth of Nevada over the years and had also watched the creation of NSC. He stated that the pragmatism that Regent Cobb has is impeccable. However, Regent Schofield reminded the Board that if it does not take action to retain everything that it has worked so hard to accomplish, it will be difficult to get it back in the future.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Melcher thanked the presidents and staff in the Chancellor's office for their hard work. He also thanked his fellow Regents for their different opinions which were all valid. He related that in addition to knowing that more revenue was needed or that the System needed to work harder to become more efficient, it was important to support and provide more information to the legislators to assist them in making those decisions. He wanted the legislators to know that individuals within the local communities were in support of funding higher education at sufficient levels. He felt that would help legislators to more willingly stand up in the face of political pressure. If we allow the cuts to continue, he felt it was basically acknowledging that the last four or five decades of investment by private donors, businesses and foundations will be thrown away. The System has investments that it needs to protect and if those investments are not protected he felt that would also be irresponsible. He felt that Nevada needed the universities to function as universities, needed the research institute to continue being the institute that it has become and the state college and community colleges to continue to follow their respective missions. If the community colleges are consolidated, there will no longer be colleges to respond to individual community needs. He also stated that the satellite campuses were just as important as the main campuses. He felt that one of his jobs as Regent was not only to support the System, but also the presidents.

Regent Alden felt that taking mergers, consolidation or closure of institutions off the table was wise. However, it was also important for the Board to think outside the box to allow the System to grow. He indicated that there may be opportunities to allow GBC in Elko to become a state college campus and provide four year programs. He felt that may possibly attract people from Idaho and Utah. He also felt that DRI's business model needed to be considered for use at the universities. He indicated his support of Regent Knecht's motion.

Chairman Leavitt related that in six years on the Board, he was not sure that he ever felt this strongly about opposing a motion before. The Board of Regents has first and foremost a legal and fiduciary responsibility to each institution. In light of the proposed budget by Governor Sandoval, the lack of appetite for a revenue package, and the Governor's repeated statements regarding this budget, Chairman Leavitt felt that for the Board to remove the discussion to make financial decisions based upon the best information available would be abdicating its responsibility. He did not feel that anyone was suggesting closure or merger that day. He felt that removing that option from the table would be a free speech issue as well as an abdication of the Board's responsibility. He related that he has spoken loudly and clearly that the goal of the Board is the preservation of all eight institutions. He has even advocated that the state college system be expanded into Reno as the need and the population grows. However, he asked what is being said with this motion. He emphasized that this is the endorsed budget, not just a potential budget. He felt that the Board would be violating its constitutional duty by removing its ability to plan and prepare. He felt that it would be a façade to ignore the present realities or without having all of the information available. He asked the members of the Board that have spoken in support of the motion to reconsider, noting the amount of angst it will cause when the final numbers are made known in the near future and these discussion must take place.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report
(Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht related that as he pointed out previously, some things have already been taken off the table such as merger or consolidation of the universities. He did not feel there was a free speech issue and discussion could continue. Based on the information before the Board, he felt that a way could be found without having to resort to closure, merger or consolidation. In terms of what the political parties have said, he felt that there was a one-sided account being reported. He felt that that the System could meet the Governor's budget without closing campuses. He stated that the Assembly Republican Caucus has already suggested that continuation of the sun-setting taxes is already in play, so there are some possibilities on the horizon for new revenues relative to what the Governor's budget is based on. At the end of the day, he felt it came down to judgments. In the meantime, his motion will limit the turmoil being created within the institutions right now. It is his judgment that those measures could be removed from the table and a business plan could move forward, that, although very painful and full of uncertainty, is better than leaving it open for discussion. He did not feel that real people, faculty, staff and students should be the pawn in the political game. He indicated that he was as strong now as he ever had been in favor of his motion.

Regent Wixom stated that he took profound and strong exception to what Regent Knecht stated. He does not view this as a political ploy but as a responsibility as a Regent. He does not know what the future will hold and took his responsibility most seriously. He did not question anyone's judgment or motive and alternatively would not question anyone's position on the motion. He felt it was important for all of the Regents to take its fiduciary responsibility as critically important. Moving forward, the future is unknown. He did not feel it was appropriate to take options off the table. He understood the desire to save the institutions, but asked the Regents to not assume that this vote would make any difference with respect to revenue. This motion would not solve the problem. Although it may make some people feel better in the short term, it may need to be reversed.

With all due respect, Regent Melcher felt that all of the Regents understood the situation. He stated that Nevada only has eight institutions of higher education and he could not imagine it with fewer. All of the institutions were established for good reasons. He related that his support of Regent Knecht's motion reflected his desire to better support the presidents and the decisions that have to be made. If the motion was made in error, he was willing to accept the risks.

Regent Leavitt stated that in February of the current year, the Board had just voted to discuss the very thing that the Board is now saying it should not discuss. He was troubled. The Board just told the presidents in late February to come back with this information. Much time has been spent over the last month discussing these issues and collecting the information. He did not understand why the Board was reversing course that day when the budget numbers had not changed.

Regent Blakely related that the Board received the information requested and felt that the Board was now making a stance of support for the presidents and institutions.

20. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report (Agenda Item #18) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Page stated that he did not want the perception to be that some Regents did not support the institutions. However, the fact remains that not all of the information is yet known.

Regent Alden expressed his concern for opposing Regents Leavitt and Wixom. He stated that per NRS, the Board of Regents were not destroyers of higher education, but rather trustees. He hoped the motion passes. He felt that it would be a grave mistake if it did not, adding that it would send the wrong message.

Mr. Wasserman restated the motion to remove from consideration closure, consolidation or merger of any of the institutions.

Upon a roll call vote, Regents Alden, Anderson, Blakely, Crear, Doubrava, Knecht, Melcher and Schofield voted yes. Regents Cobb, Geddes, Leavitt, Page and Wixom voted no. Motion carried.

Regent Cobb expressed his disappointment in the audience applause because none of the Regents want to close any of the campuses or merge them. The issue is whether the Board will consider addressing these issues. He felt that this motion would be communicating to the Legislature that the System could absorb the cuts, which he stated was exactly what could not be done.

21. Discussion Tabled - Update on the Regents' Efficiency and Effectiveness Initiative for The Nevada System of Higher Education (Agenda Item #19) - The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the April 8, 2011, Board of Regents special meeting.

22. Discussion Tabled - Chancellor's Task Force to Review PEBP Recommendations and Reform (Agenda Item #20) - The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the April 8, 2011, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-20a and BOR-20b on file in the Board office*).

23. Tabled - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Differential Program Fee Proposals (Agenda Item #22) - The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the April 8, 2011, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-22 on file in the Board office*).

24. Tabled - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees (Agenda Item #23) - The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the April 8, 2011, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-23 on file in the Board office*).

25. Tabled - Institutional Strategic Plan, DRI (Agenda Item #24) - The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the April 8, 2011, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-24a and BOR-24b on file in the Board office*).
26. Tabled - Update on Redistricting and Reapportionment (Agenda Item #25) - The Board of Regents tabled discussion of this agenda item until the April 8, 2011, Board of Regents special meeting.
27. Approved - Audit Committee (Agenda Item #27) - Chair Mark Alden reported that the Audit Committee met on March 10, 2011, and heard the following:

The Committee met on Thursday, March 10, 2011, and received follow-up responses for seventeen internal audit reports that were presented to the Audit Committee at our June, September and December meetings. Updates were provided for the Grant Thornton Management Letters for NSHE and the UNSOM Practice Plans.

The Committee requested follow-up reports on the UNSOM Practice Plans and the CSN Automotive Department for the March meeting. A report on the recommendations from the efficiencies committee was requested.

Action Items:

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

- The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the December 2, 2010, meeting (*Ref. A-1 on file in the Board office*).
- Engagement Letters, External Audit – The Committee recommended approval of the annual engagement letters related to the external audit for the year ended June 30, 2011.
 - ✓ NSHE financial statements and OMB Circular A-133. Grant Thornton will reduce their fee by \$17,500 at the request of the Committee (*Ref. A-2a on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ UNSOM Practice Plan (*Ref. A-2b on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ UNR and UNLV NCAA agreed upon procedures (*Ref. A-2c on file in the Board office*).
- Change in Scope, External Audit – The Committee recommended approval of a request from Grant Thornton LLP, for additional costs of \$31,000, plus out of pocket expenses of \$2,500, for a change in scope of the external audit for the year ended June 30, 2011 (*Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office*).
- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended approval of the following internal audit reports:
 - ✓ Department of Police Services Follow-up Audit, UNLV (*Ref. A-8 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Risk Management/Worker’s Compensation, UNLV (*Ref. A-9 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Hosting, DRI (*Ref. A-10 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Grants and Contracts, DRI (*Ref. A-11 on file in the Board office*).

27. Approved - Audit Committee (Agenda Item #27) – (Cont'd.)

- Audit Exception Report – The Committee recommended approval of a report of the audit findings of the Committee for the six months ended December 31, 2010 (*Ref. A-27 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Page moved to approve the Committee report and recommendations. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried.

28. Approved - Investment & Facilities Committee (Agenda Item #28) - Chair Michael B. Wixom reported that the Investment & Facilities Committee met on March 10, 2011, and heard the following:

Mr. David Breiner from Cambridge Associates reported on asset allocation and investment returns for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds for the quarter ending December 31, 2010.

Ms. Ruby Camposano reported that the account balance of the operating pool's reserve account was a positive \$23 million as of close of business, Wednesday, March 9, 2011.

UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk provided an update on activities related to the preliminary assessment agreement with Majestic Realty Company approved by the Board of Regents at its February 11, 2011, meeting for the development of a proposal for a mixed use development primarily on the southwest quadrant of the UNLV Maryland Parkway campus, to include a stadium with related services and amenities.

Action Items:

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

- The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the December 2, 2010, meeting (*Ref. IF-1 on file in the Board office*).
- The Committee approved Cambridge Associates' recommendation to redeem \$1.5 million from the Vanguard Institutional Index Endowment account to fund the quarterly distribution to the institutions and management fees for the quarter ending March 31, 2010.
- Approved University of Nevada, Reno's transfer of 57.48 acre of water rights from the University's holdings with the State of Nevada Division of Water Resources to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority for exclusive use of the University (*Ref. IF-4 on file in the Board office*).
- Approved the use of \$3.2 million in Capital Improvement Fee (CIF) bridge funding for UNLV Student Recreation and Wellness Center Seismic Retrofit. UNLV will continue to seek recovery of funds relative to this design error/omission from AECOM, the original design firm for this facility, and the design firm who provided the seismic retrofit design. The CIF funds allocated for this project would be repaid in full when settlement with AECOM is finalized (*Ref. IF-6 on file in the Board office*).

28. Approved - Investment & Facilities Committee (Agenda Item #28) – (Cont'd.)

- Approved University of Nevada, Las Vegas' request to purchase a 0.75 acre parcel of land located at 4570 S. Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas. Funds to acquire the property will be provided from the campus land acquisition account (*Ref. IF-7 on file in the Board office*).
- Approved the construction of a 200-250 kilowatt solar array on the Western Nevada College Carson City campus. The property is located adjacent to the Aspen Building. The Committee requested that an annual report be provided on the annual costs and savings of the project (*Ref. IF-8 on file in the Board office*).
- Approved *Handbook* Revision to amend Board Policy (*Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 5 (F) (5)*) to establish a market fluctuation account (*Ref. IF-9 on file in the Board office*).
- Approved the request to grant authority to the Chancellor, on an ongoing basis, to negotiate the amount and terms of any Letters of Credit (*LOCs*) necessary for the administration of NSHE insurance programs in an amount not to exceed an aggregate of \$3 million in combined *LOCs* at the current rate of 70 basis points (*Ref. IF-10 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Wixom moved to approve the Committee report and recommendations. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Page abstained.

29. Approved - Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee (Agenda Item #29) - Chair William G. Cobb reported that the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met on March 10, 2011, and heard the following:

Lieutenant Governor Brian Krolicki and Michael Skaggs, Executive Director of the Nevada Commission on Economic Development, reported to the Committee on the various plans that have been proposed to promote research and technology based economic development in Nevada. They emphasized the importance of higher education and its role in economic development and discussed bill drafts that will come forward during the 2011 Session of the Nevada State Legislature intended to promote and support economic development.

Associate Vice Chancellor Crystal Abba presented to the Committee the 2010 NSHE *Remedial Report* that includes information on the percent of recent Nevada high school graduates who were enrolled in remedial mathematics or English in summer or fall 2010 across the System.

The discussion of the general education survey, *What Will They Learn? A Survey of Core Requirements at our Nation's Colleges and Universities* completed by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni was deferred to the June meeting due to a lack of time.

Action Items:

Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Academic, Research, and Student Affairs Committee:

- The committee recommended approval of the minutes of the December 2, 2010, meeting of the Academic, Research, and Student Affairs Committee (*Ref. ARSA-1 on file in the Board office*).

29. Approved - Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee (Agenda Item #29) – (Cont'd.)

Action Items: - (Cont'd.)

- The committee recommended elimination of the following academic programs at UNR:
 - ✓ Geochemistry, MS and Ph.D. (Ref. ARSA-2a on file in the Board office); and
 - ✓ Master of Arts for the Teaching of English (MATE) (Ref. ARSA-2b on file in the Board office).
- The committee recommended elimination of the Department of Professional Studies within the School of Dental Medicine at UNLV (Ref. ARSA-3a on file in the Board office.)
- The committee recommended elimination of the following academic programs at UNLV:
 - ✓ Physical Education, BS.Ed, MS and M.Ed. (Ref. ARSA-3b and ARSA-3c on file in the Board office.)
 - ✓ Workforce Education, BS.Ed; and (Ref. ARSA-3d on file in the Board office.)
 - ✓ Special Education, MS, Ed.S and Ed.D. (Ref. ARSA-3e on file in the Board office.)
- The committee recommended approval of the Bachelor of Science in Metallurgical Engineering at UNR (Ref. ARSA-4 on file in the Board office).
- The committee recommended approval of the Workforce Development and Organizational Leadership, Ph.D, at UNLV (Ref. ARSA-7 on file in the Board office).
- The committee recommended approval of the Executive Master of Business Administration, UNR (Ref. ARSA-5 on file in the Board office).
- The committee recommended approval of the candidates to receive the following Regents' Awards (Ref. ARSA-11 on file in the Board office):
 - ✓ Mr. David Loeb, UNLV, Creative Activities Award
 - ✓ Mr. Dennis Soukup, CSN, Community College Teaching Award
 - ✓ Dr. Eric Rasmussen, UNR, University, State College and DRI Teaching Award
 - ✓ Ms. Deborah Case, WNC; Ms. Jennifer O'Neil, UNR undergraduate; and Dr. Andrew Bell, UNLV graduate; Academic Advisor Awards
 - ✓ Dr. Iain Buxton, UNR, Researcher Award
 - ✓ Dr. Rina Schumer, DRI; Dr. Monica Miller, UNR; and Dr. Liam Frink, UNLV; Rising Researcher Awards

Regent Cobb moved to approve the Committee report and recommendations. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried.

30. Approved - Business & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #30) - Chair Ron Knecht reported that the Business & Finance Committee met on March 10, 2011, and heard the following:

- Calendar year 2010 Self-Supporting Summer School and Calendar Year Budgets, Budget to Actual Comparisons, for each university and college of the NSHE.
- All Funds revenues and expenses of the NSHE for the second quarter of fiscal year 2010-2011.
- NSHE Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets and the status of state appropriations for the second quarter of fiscal year 2010-2011.

30. Approved - Business & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #30) – (Cont'd.)

- Budget transfers of state appropriated funds between functions for the second quarter of fiscal year 2010-2011.
- Summary of the School of Medicine's Graduate Medical Education funding process as it relates to Medicare and the University Medical Center.
- Budget and spending review of the last decade for the NSHE compared to other state agencies and outlook for tax, budget, and spending matters in the coming Legislative session.

Action Items:

Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Business and Finance Committee:

- The committee recommended approval of the minutes from the December 2, 2010, Business & Finance Committee meeting (*Ref. BF-1 on file in the Board office*).
- The Committee recommended approval of the NSHE Mid-Year fiscal year 2010-2011 Self-Supporting Budgets and the Summer School and Calendar Year Self-Supporting Budgets for calendar year 2011 (*Ref. BF-3a and Ref. BF-3b on file in the Board office*).

Regent Knecht moved to approve the Committee report and recommendations. Regent Crear seconded. Motion carried.

31. Approved - Cultural Diversity Committee (Agenda Item #31) - Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Cultural Diversity Committee met on March 11, 2011, and heard the following:

Dr. Estela Mara Bensimon, Professor of Higher Education and Co-Director of the Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California (USC), Rossier School of Education, reported on the equity and policy partnership between NSHE, USC and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Through this partnership and using the Benchmarking Equity and Student Success Tool (BESST), data are used to examine student success across the NSHE that may be used in policy-making and changing practices.

Vice Chancellor Bart Patterson reported on the progress to date on the implementation of the NSHE supply chain inclusion program previously approved by the Committee, and the proactive steps taken at the System-level to implement appropriate policies to support the program. In addition, Tom Akers, Business Innovations Plus Software, Inc. discussed how the software developed by his company can integrate with existing software utilized by NSHE institutions in implementing supply chain protocols.

Dr. Barbara Wright-Sanders, Dean of External Funding and Grants, and Estela Gutierrez, Interim Dean of Student Services, reported on the initiatives of Truckee Meadows Community College to promote pathways to student success particularly for students from diverse backgrounds. John Kinkella, Dean of Student Services, members from his staff and student representatives, presented a similar report for Western Nevada College, again focusing on efforts to recruit, retain and graduate minority students.

31. Approved - Cultural Diversity Committee (Agenda Item #31) – (Cont'd.)

Dr. Edith Fernandez, Director of the NSHE College Access Programs, provided an overview of the College Access Challenge Grant. The presentation included information presented by Jake Chapin, a graduate specialist at Silver Stage High School, on the Navigation 101 program, a comprehensive program designed to increase college and career readiness for 9th thru 12th grade students.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Magdalena Martinez reported on the recent activities of the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Council, including its work with the BESST model and projects related to targeted interventions to ensure the success of minority students

Due to insufficient time, presentation of the 2009-2010 NSHE *Diversity Report* was postponed to the June meeting.

Action Items:

Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Cultural Diversity Committee:

- The committee recommended approval of the minutes of the December 3, 2010, meeting of the Cultural Diversity Committee (*Ref. CD-1 on file in the Board office*).
- The committee recommended acceptance of the report on the equity and policy partnership presented by Dr. Bensimon.
- The committee recommended approval of the additions to the *Procedures and Guidelines Manual*, Chapter 5, Section 2, concerning purchasing and related procedures (*previously approved by the Chancellor*) (*Ref. CD-3 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Crear moved to approve the Committee report and recommendations. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried.

32. Approved - Health Sciences System Committee (Agenda Item #32) - Chair Michael B. Wixom reported that the Health Sciences System Committee met on March 11, 2011, and heard the following

Chairman Wixom provided an overview of his assessment of the status of the recent efforts between NSHE and the University Medical Center of Southern Nevada (UMC) to develop a more robust Academic Health Center relationship. He mentioned his review of the FTI consulting report and conversations he has had with FTI staff to understand their assessment. He also mentioned his interaction with Clark County and the past and future County meetings he will be attending regarding the ongoing discussion about our partnership. He noted the discussion the County is having regarding the alternative governance structures for UMC and how those discussions relate to the Academic Health Center Discussion.

Executive Vice Chancellor Trevisan provided an overview of the NSHE involvement in the efforts to develop a stronger partnership with UMC. He reminded the Committee that the FTI study made recommendations in three general areas: 1. Recommendations

32. Approved - Health Sciences System Committee (Agenda Item #32) – (Cont'd.)

on how UMC can improve its general operations to improve revenue collection and reduce losses; 2. Recommendations regarding how to move towards a more robust Academic Health Center; and 3. Recommendations regarding alternative governance models for UMC, in particular the dynamics surrounding transitioning UMC into a 501(c)(3) business model. The Committee spent some time discussing the 501(c)(3) model and the County's process for evaluating the way in which it will determine if it will change its governance model and to what. Vice Chancellor Turner provided information about a bill put forth by Clark County to provide an additional governance model option for potential consideration. The Committee also discussed the funding sources for UMC and if the local governments could contribute in addition to Clark County to help fund UMC. Regent Doubrava concurred with Regent Wixom's assessment of the status of the interaction between the Regents/NSHE and UMC/County. He asked Dean Hug-English to add her assessment of the UMC/NSHE efforts. Dean Hug-English noted that a great deal of effort has been put forth to promote the development of the relationship between UNSOM/UMC and that the development efforts related to the Academic Health Center are very positive.

Executive Vice Chancellor Trevisan provided information regarding a new board established by former Governor Gibbons to help develop workforce opportunities in Nevada. This board is called the Workforce Investment Board, and within this board there is a Health Care Sector Board, in which Dr. Trevisan is participating and helping to take the lead in the generation of a federal grant proposal to help support health care workforce development. Chairman Wixom asked for an update at the next meeting on this effort.

Regent Alden requested that at the next meeting the Committee entertain a discussion regarding the medical business models available, including the Oregon Health Center model, and the efforts to collaborate with UMC to help enhance the academic health sciences.

Regent Cobb asked about the recent audit that was conducted of the UNSOM practice plan and requested that an update on these efforts be provided at the next meeting.

Regent Page suggested that we have a standing item to get updates on the progress of the UNSOM practice plan in implementing the recommendations of this audit.

Action items:

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

- The Committee voted to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2011, meeting (*Ref. HSS-1 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Wixom moved to approve the Committee report and recommendations. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried.

33. Information Only - New Business (Agenda Item #33) – Regent Geddes requested that an item be placed on a future agenda regarding a process for the rapid granting of tenure versus tenure upon hire.

Regent Cobb emphasized that the beginning time of the meeting currently scheduled for April 8, 2011, be reconsidered. Chairman Leavitt stated that the meeting time has been changed to 9:00 a.m. and may potentially be a full day meeting.

Regent Knecht reminded the Board that the Nevada State Board of Education has extended an invitation to the Board for an exchange member that he hoped would be addressed on a future agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

Prepared by: Jessica C. McMullen
Administrative Assistant IV

Submitted by: Scott G. Wasserman
CEO and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents

Approved by the Board of Regents at the June 16-17, 2011, meeting.