

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

Third Floor Rotunda  
Frank H. Rogers Science & Technology Building  
Desert Research Institute  
755 E. Flamingo Road, Las Vegas  
April 8, 2011

Members Present: Mr. James Dean Leavitt, Chairman  
Dr. Jason Geddes, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Mark Alden  
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, Information Technology, Steven Zink  
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. Sally Miller, UNLV; and Mr. Jim Strange, WNC. Mr. Brad Summerhill sat in for Mr. Scott Huber. Student government leaders present included Mr. J.T. Creedon, ASCSN President, CSN; Mr. Steve Gronstal; GRAD President, DRI; Mr. Sebring Frehner, NSSA President, NSC; , 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 Friday, April 8, 2011, at 9:05 a.m. with all members present except for Regent Knecht.

Regent Schofield led the pledge of allegiance.

1. Approved - Minutes (Agenda Item #1) – The Board of Regents approved the minutes from the December 2-3, 2010, regular Board of Regents’ meeting (*Ref. BOR-1 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the December 2-3, 2010, minutes. Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried. (*Regent Knecht was absent.*)

Regent Knecht entered the meeting.

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) -

Mr. Irwin Molaskey stated he had been in Las Vegas since 1951 and has been involved with UNLV since the beginning, also serving as the original foundation chairman. UNLV is critical to the southern economy and serves the community in countless ways. Governor Sandoval has a huge task ahead of him, but he believes he is dead wrong to not fund education. He was proud to be a partner in helping UNLV grow over the years and he did not want to see it go backwards. From a business perspective it does not make sense to raise the cost of education and then not give those funds back to the institution. Let UNLV keep the funds that they raise. The Board has a daunting task in front of them, but please do the right thing.

Ms. Robin Herlands, NSC Faculty Senate Chair, thanked the Board for their time in taking this public comment. One thing that has been discussed over the campus is the process by which decisions are being made and she felt that the immediacy of the budget crisis has led to quick action across the campuses. Shared governance is taken very seriously at NSC. The accreditation team recently shared that they had not seen such incredible affection and respect and commitment to mission across an administration and faculty. It has been a difficult time across the campus, but the level of advocacy for the campus as a whole is special. NSC is a model for how shared governance should work.

Senator Majority Leader Steven Horsford, District 4, thanked the Board for their time. He believed it was important to have a frank and open discussion about the direction of the NSHE given where they are in considering the state budget for the next biennium. He personally thanked the Chancellor for responding to the request for detail of the full extent of cuts that would have to be made if the proposed budget took effect. He has described in real human terms what these cuts would mean to the quality of Higher Education in Nevada. The Chancellor’s memo to the Board, Legislature and the Governor raises bottom line policy questions - do we really want to cap enrollments, when our economic future relies on our ability to produce the college graduates we need to rebuild Nevada’s economy? Do we really want to tell 20,000 students there is no room for them at our community colleges and universities, and then watch many of them go out of state for their educations, not to return to Nevada when they complete their degrees?

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Do we really want to deny university admission to Nevada high school students who have worked hard to earn entrance into our colleges? Do we really want to tell students who cannot afford to start their education at the universities that studied diligently at the community colleges that they now cannot transfer to the universities, after getting their associate degrees? These are the realities if the proposed budget itself becomes a reality. As the Senate Majority Leader and Chair of the Finance committee, he will continue to press for a balanced solution to the budget crisis that does not gut K-12 and Higher education. Both are too important to the citizens and the state's future. We are partners in this and must stand together. He asked the Board to help find alternatives that will not set education back by decades as this budget does. As a part of this, he urged the Board to reconsider their action that took campus closures off the table. One of the realities that they must face in light of new information, on the full extent of the Governor's cuts, is that if the cuts are accepted, campuses would have to close, or program cuts at all campuses would have to be so deep that Higher Education in Nevada would be in name only. These are not just hard choices, they are unacceptable. He urged the Board to take a formal position that more revenue is needed to responsibly balance the state budget and avoid the proposed dismantling of Higher Education at the cost of the children and our state's future.

Ms. Laura Edwards, DRI Faculty Senate Chair, provided a document prepared by the DRI faculty and students voicing their concerns over the budget. (*Document on file in the Board Office.*)

Mr. Gregory Robinson, Former NSC Faculty Senate Chair, thanked the Board of Regents for their continued communication and support. There are two NSC plans before the Board. The first was presented to the Board at the last meeting and was done properly using the principles of shared governance. It hurts but it maintains the second tier and allows NSC to continue the mission. Furthermore, this option saves as much as any consolidation does. There is now another plan before the Board. That plan, which the Regents previously rejected, destroys the entire second tier and turns away several underrepresented groups. Visitors to NSC including the recent accreditation team are always amazed with how NSC can do so much even in difficult budget times. Following the first option saves more than any other consolidation plan and avoids all the logistical problems that come with consolidation and closure. It lets them keep fighting for the students, Nevada faculty and the state.

Mr. John Filler, immediate Past Chair of the UNLV Faculty Senate and the immediate Past Chair of the NSHE Council of Faculty Senate Chairs, reported that he was here to tell the Board that UNLV is hemorrhaging faculty at a rate that will soon be impossible to survive. UNLV's best and brightest are leaving in incredible numbers and the rest will go as well. In the last two weeks only, just from the College of Education, a tenured associate professor who last year was named UNLV Researcher of the Year, has left for an untenured position at the University of Florida. They have also lost a full Professor to the University of Southern California, Assistant Professor to a University in Israel and a fourth Assistant Professor who brought in nearly one million in competitive federal dollars to the Department of Special Education. No university can survive without

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

faculty, for without faculty, there are no students, and with no faculty and students there is no need for an administration or a basketball team. He pled with the Board to save the universities. UNLV is losing the core of their being.

Ms. Velonie Williams, an alumna of NSC and a first generation student, reported that in high school she suffered from a severe illness which kept her from attending school for two years. She returned during her junior year and worked very hard to complete requirements that would allow her to graduate with her class. Unfortunately, she still did not meet UNLV's GPA requirements. Still determined, she needed little more one on one attention and discovered NSC where she felt immediately at home. The staff members were helpful and the faculty exceeded her expectations. At NSC the instructors are very good at pinpointing the best possible way to teach students. First generation students are very unfamiliar with academia, and she felt they needed to be in a place that would provide the guidance they need. She reported that at NSC she has completed two research projects that will help in her PhD program. She noted that she never could have completed without NSC, her peers and the faculty.

Mr. Peter LaChapelle, Associate Professor at NSC, thanked the Board for their time. One of the things he wanted to point out in all of this is that the plan for consolidation is causing infighting. He has treasured his relationships with others throughout the state's institutions. Consolidation means the whole scale elimination of the middle tier of our System. There is a demand for the middle tiered institutions in Nevada. He was proud of the faculty that he works with and the work they have accomplished.

Mr. Kebret Kebede, Associate Professor at NSC, thanked the Board for their leadership in these troubled times in Nevada. He also wanted to thank them for their very brave and thoughtful vote that ended the vote for campus closures and consolidations. The Board clearly understood what closures and consolidations would do. It was clear that the Board knew they needed to serve all the students in NSHE and not just some. The faculty and students at NSC deeply appreciated this commitment. They are facing unprecedented financial strain. There have been many layoffs of talented faculty and colleagues. NSC has weathered the past budget cuts. NSC has an extraordinary commitment to shared governance. NSC students must be served and NSC must give better results with fewer resources. NSC has grown by 40% FTE in the past two years despite losing 20% of full time faculty. NSC understands the budget cut is based on data provided by governor, but have crafted a plan that cuts four million from the budget, but yet serves the core mission. NSC has the most ethnically and racially diverse faculty, with an unwavering commitment to equal opportunity. Many NSC students are first generation, low income minority students, students with the fewest options to improve their lives and futures. He thanked the Board for their support while they try to weather the cuts.

Mr. Mark Nichols, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) and a graduating student at the UNLV School of Social Work stated that NASW strongly opposes the budget cuts being proposed by the Governor, including those in Higher Education. He urged the Board to join NASW in lobbying against the Governor's budget and his misguided priorities and to help Nevada find a balanced solution. He

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

expressed his appreciation and that of Nevada's social work community, including the clients, for UNR's decision to retain its two schools of social work and more recently, to UNLV for reinstating the social work program. However, any recommendation to eliminate any social work education program is viewed by NASW as a threat to the profession and to the well being of the clients served. When making these critical and difficult budget cuts, he believed that the needs of the state were not being adequately emphasized. When making this difficult decision it was important to recognize that Nevada has the nation's most extreme shortage of social workers. (*Prepared comments on file in the Board Office.*)

Ms. Debra Martin, Chair of Anthropology Department at UNLV, stressed that her department was already small, with only 13 faculty, 142 majors and 44 graduate students. Many of the graduate students come from the Nevada population. The department stands to lose three faculty members and this is in addition to already losing three faculty to retirement. This department is one of the few of its size that continues to offer the full complement of anthropological approaches to studying human kind past and present. They integrate human biology, the role of culture and language and archeology into the whole discipline. For a small department they have high tech, state of the art research labs with research grade instruments that even undergraduates get to use in their classes. They have a very large collection of research materials. Despite their small size they have brought in over \$800,000 in external funding in the past few years and over \$1.5 million in the last 10 years. The youngest, most vulnerable faculty have been incredibly productive at getting funding into the university system. One of the slated faculty members to be cut received a National Geographic award to investigate sustainability in desert environments. Another faculty member was awarded a Department of Defense \$600,000 grant, along with his former mentor, to study post traumatic stress disease and violence in Nevada.

Dr. Daniel Bengshek, Associate Professor at UNLV, thanked the Board for allowing him to speak. Research has been alive and well and blossomed at the University for the 10 years since his arrival. Given the proposed cuts, especially through the best and brightest junior faculty, he could only hope that the research mission survives. His research focuses on Type II diabetes among Native Americans and other risk populations. His research interests have always been the center of his work. Currently he is an investigator on a two year, \$300,000 national institute of health funded study, investigating the special challenges associated with the successful implementation of diabetes prevention programs. The research includes several graduate students and colleagues from other departments, as well as, community outreach partnerships with non-profit organizations. All of the work that he briefly outlined was conducted on the UNLV campus. UNLV is a major research institution in the state. He hoped the Board and the state as a whole sees the value of the research component of the universities mission and is committed to seeing that mission survive.

Mr. John Crandell, a graduate student in the UNLV Anthropology Department, shared that one year ago he finished his Bachelors at Syracuse in upstate New York. He remembered nervously awaiting letters of acceptance to a number of well known

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

graduate programs. When the letters arrived and he had been accepted to many, he chose to attend UNLV. He does not regret this choice. His first introduction to the department had nothing to do with the classroom; it had to do with research. He arrived and his first experience happened in a lab, with the Chair and his advisor hugging him and showcasing the labs. Within a week he identified his master's thesis and applied for an NSF fellowship for over \$100,000, which received an honorable mention this week. The only honorable mention that he was aware of that UNLV graduate students have ever received. He is now presenting his research at over five conferences this year partially funded through the UNLV GPSA. All of these accomplishments cannot happen without faculty. All the junior faculty slated to be cut have read drafts of his grants, drafts of his fellowship applications and two publications that were accepted without any edits. This department represents the best of UNLV and he simply could not imagine being anywhere else.

Ms. Lindy Schumaker, Lincy Foundation, noted what brought them to UNLV was the students and faculty. They created the Lincy Foundation and gave \$15 million. This is an incredible investment and pays the community back every day. She noted that she grew up in Nevada and her children are third generation natives. But as she reads and gathers data there are things that strike her as profound. For every dollar UNLV gives to the state they get \$1.46 back. For every dollar UNR gives, they get \$2.57 back. The business community in Las Vegas is fed up. They will be watching the next legislative session to see how they act and vote. The south has been supplementing the north the entire history of Nevada. If UNLV is to create an educated workforce, then they cannot continue to supplement the north. There is only so much they can do, while the north continues to take from the south.

Mr. Ted Quirk, UNLV Foundation, stated that UNLV is his adopted alma mater, because he wants to live in a great city, and he does not believe it can be great without a great university at its core. He was chair of the UNLV Foundation for the recent capital campaign and every donor was sent the message that their money would not be used for basic education services because that is the responsibility of the state. They were told their money would be used to create pockets of excellence, so they could build a great research university. They listened and they gave. A great research university takes decades to build and many different people to build it. The truth is that other institutions such as community colleges and state universities can be built very quickly. It is like a reputation that takes a lifetime to build, can be lost in a moment and it takes years again to rebuild. They are at a crossroads, where difficult decisions need to be made. There will be anecdotal times of pain and suffering across the board. The truth is to try and inflict pain equally across the board may be a better satisfactory political solution, but it is not a good long term policy. A good long term policy is the need to protect the best that you have and that is UNLV. He noted he has great respect for the Board and he knows there are painful decisions to be made, but protect the best that you have, and UNLV will take care of the rest. UNLV has not been funded equally for a long time. Please fund UNLV fully and do not allow them to endure all the cuts.

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Mr. Mark Fine, Chairman of the UNLV Foundation, realized early in the game that the educational infrastructure is what builds a great community. The quality of the community is dictated by the quality of the institution. This institution has made fantastic strides over the last 30 years. There has been great leadership, from great presidents. The UNLV Foundation is made up of 40 business leaders, and an advisory board is just starting up with 40 people. When they are asked to participate they immediately want to be involved. UNLV has become the place to be involved with. People are proud of what is going on at UNLV. The business community sees the value of UNLV. To be competitive, the community must have 20% of the people with degrees. The continuity of funding and programming is the most important issue. The reality is that they must find a way to maintain the quality of what they are doing at UNLV and give them the opportunity to grow in a competitive way.

Chairman Leavitt publically thanked Mr. Quirk and Mr. Fine for their extraordinary contributions to southern Nevada and for what they continue to do to make this state a better place to live.

Ms. Hannah Brown indicated that she is a community representative and a product of the Clark County School District. Other than a small percentage of people, besides her teachers, there were very few degreed people in Las Vegas. At this point approximately 14% of Las Vegas population is degreed. She personally felt that to continue to cut the colleges and universities and remove opportunities for people to go to college is a gross error. She has raised thousands of dollars over the years to fund scholarships for young people. She did want another young person to be able to say that they were not able to attend college because there were no opportunities. She noted she is currently helping a young man go to college. His mom is from El Salvador and his dad died when he was eight years old. She met this young man two years ago and she challenged him to keep his grades up and he graduated with a 4.0 GPA. He received no scholarships, but she made sure that he got into college and continued to challenge him to keep his grades up. She stated she would continue to help this boy, but he is afraid that with everything happening that he will not get to finish college. She told him that he would graduate from college. But this was the only young person she could guarantee this to. There are many young people that want to go to college. She added that she did not understand how they were going to retain their presidents, educators and staff in all the doom in gloom in Nevada.

Ms. Sandra Phillips Johnson, UNLV Alumni Association, noted she returned to school in Nevada after a career to complete her undergraduate degree at UNLV. She loves this university and the quality of education that it provides. She appreciated the quality of staff and research so much that she stayed on for her master's degree. She is representing the alumni association and over 90,000 student graduates. She also represents the 60,000 student graduates that are still in Las Vegas. They oppose the severity of cuts for UNLV because they care that UNLV is the only institution within southern Nevada which offers a broad world class education to students within the community. The alums of UNLV represent a very diverse economic force, are employees from many different corporations, bring dollars to this community and contribute to the economic growth of

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

the community. This community needs an educated workforce, and because of this, along with all others, they do oppose the cuts and the higher tuitions that would be required as a result of these cuts. She urged the Board to seek alternative solutions to these severe budgets cuts that will have such a long term impact on the southern Nevada economy.

Ms. Ann McDonough, Dean of the Academic Success Center at UNLV, referred to the NSHE powerpoint slide that stated opportunity and accessible education for all. She urged that if the System is going to provide access, there needs to be opportunities for success. Those opportunities come in the form of tutoring.

Mr. Thomas Friedman stated at his recent visit to UNLV that if you are not going to provide successful opportunities for students to make it through college then they should build more prisons.

Mr. Sean Owens, a disabled veteran, knew that higher education was his way to be a contributing member of society again. He stated that after nine years, math and science were hard and he was glad he found the tutoring clinic. It has a comfortable environment and a very talented and motivated team of student tutors. He said that because of the tutoring center he had hope for his future.

Ms. Crestcencia Ortiz, Fine Arts Master Student, stated that after moving away from an abusive relationship she knew that she wanted to go to school. She started at UNLV, and was homeless at the time. Through all of this she was two months from graduating but could not pass her math class. Without the Academic Success Center she would not have been able to graduate. She is maintaining a 4.0 in her master's program, and is on an assistantship through the Department of Diversity and Inclusion. She did not know what would happen if the Academic Success Center was not around to help those students that are like her.

Mr. Mike Selenek, 30-year old returning student, returned to school and started in the most basic level courses. He has studied very hard to get where he is at, and has excelled because of the Academic Success Center. Without the help they have given he did not think he would be here today to talk. This center benefits all students.

Mr. David Wrobel, Chair of the UNLV History Department, stated he was a father of three young children about to enter the Clark County School District. As a parent he urged the Board to do everything in their power to convince the state legislators not to allow the future of young people in the state to be sacrificed. As Chair of the History Department, he wanted to highlight things that are done for the community. Locally the UNLV History Department is home to Preserve Nevada, the only statewide preservation organization in the state, which does vital work throughout Nevada. The department has completed histories of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Southern Nevada Water Authority and the City of Henderson. Beyond Clark County they recently completed the history of the Yosemite National Park. They are also one of two departments that collaborated on the Nevada Test Site Oral History Project. Both



2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

departments are in danger of losing brilliant, junior faculty if the levels of cuts to UNLV are not significantly reduced.

Ms. Leisl Childers, Nevada Test Site Oral History Project, stated that the project documented and preserved the memories of persons affiliated with and affected by the Nevada Test Site during the era of nuclear testing. Funded by \$1 million from the Department of Energy and Department of Education, the project interviewed more than 150 people, including scientists, engineers, miners, administrators, military personnel and protestors. They recorded more than 335 hours of interviews, published transcripts of the interviews, collected associated documents and photographs and created both a physical and on line presence for the archive. More than 40 graduate students participated in this large scale project; they contributed half the interviews in the collection and three students received funding for their graduate programs. She served as the Project Director from 2005-2008. The interviews that she conducted laid the foundation for her doctoral research in the Great Basin. Through interviewing ranchers who lived near the test site and radiation monitors that tracked radioactive fallout in the area out the Nevada Test Site, she developed a dissertation project that examined the historic impacts of federal land use programs on the region's rural populations. This project makes an important contribution to Nevada's history and will influence the future of public land management policy decisions. This is the kind of work being done at UNLV and the kind of work she hoped would be allowed to continue in the state.

Mr. Gregory Brown reported that in the past two years he has spent a lot of time on the topic of academic entrenchment for program review. He has the unfortunate responsibility to chair the UNLV program review committee, which recommended the elimination of five programs and the consolidation of several others. He voiced his concern that the past several meetings the discussion of terminating academic programs, including tenure earning faculty, through a second consecutive program review, has not been up to the level of responsibility that this board carries. He is deeply concerned that the idea of program review to eliminate faculty and staff has become misunderstood as an easy alternative to either considering financial exigency if it becomes necessary or to combining program cuts with other budget reduction options. He urged the Board to give more consideration to the consequences and liabilities for the System after a hasty program review. Secondly, he urged the Board to consider the program reviews that have been going on for over two years. By no means have these been satisfactory experiences for faculty, but they have been governed by the Board's mandate that the impact on students be minimized. They have worked as faculty, wherever possible, to consolidate administrative functions, merge degree programs and even whole departments. Both universities and their faculty are looking seriously at merging whole colleges, and the current proposals for closure. He could attest that consolidations and mergers on the university campus are never easy. Departments and colleges have distinct identities, and the deans and chairs command loyalty and pride of their faculties. The units have very different cultures, policies, curriculum and workloads. The faculty has been working dutifully in such consolidations, because they know it is the only way to mitigate the impact on students, faculty and staff. He urged the Board to study similar approaches at the System level. Nevada does not have a system wide entrenchment plan. Simply

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

giving each campus a cut target does nothing to assure the proportional balance across the system of instructional research versus administrative and support expenses. It does nothing to encourage or reward efficiency of academic administration, and he feared that it would force them into an excessively hasty program review that will cause eliminations, but not provide a curriculum foundation for the campuses.

Mr. Shawn Gerstenberger, Executive Associate Dean of the Community Health Sciences, wanted to take the opportunity to speak to the Board about an important revenue source that is being jeopardized by the proposed cuts. That revenue source is the extramural funding that is being secured by the faculty, staff and students at UNLV. A recent report circulated highlighted the amount of dollars that are brought in through extramural funding. Over \$100 million were brought in through UNLV during 2010. In addition, there are significant contributions by departments and schools. These have been consistent throughout the years and have brought in almost \$300 million in resources in the last three years. Those numbers are significant. Extramural funding means the ability to have facilities, to be competitive for extramural research, to have state of the art equipment that faculty, staff and students have access to and to provide opportunities that they would otherwise not have to advance science and technology. These grants represent integration into the community of the university, making it inseparable from the growth, success and economic prosperity of the community. He would continue to urge the Board to consider the cuts carefully.

Mr. Karl Kingsley, Associate Professor at the School of Dental Medicine, stated he was asked to talk about extramural funding. Many of the post graduate programs in pediatric dentistry and orthodontics are dependent upon research. In the last two years the dental school has brought in nearly \$4 million, which could be in jeopardy if we lose the schools accreditation.

Mr. Jason Wasden stated he has lived in rural and urban communities throughout his life. He is a husband, father, NSHE employee, and taxpayer and he does support additional taxation. His mother was born and raised in Las Vegas. She left the state and has never returned. His grandfather's accounting firm is still in Nevada. He is the first generation to return to Las Vegas. The American dream to him is for his children to be educated, civically engaged members of the community. He wanted all Nevada residents to have the opportunity to excel in their interests in a public Nevada institution of higher learning. He noted he was a product of higher education in Nevada. He urged the Board to maintain, create and inform other Nevada residents of the 2 plus 2 programs that transition students from community colleges to Nevada's best institutions so future students like himself can realize their educational goals. The NSHE access mission is essential to maintain. *(Prepared statement on file in the Board Office.)*

Mr. Michael Pravica, Associate Professor of Physics at UNLV, stated he came to UNLV seven years ago. He has found Nevada to be a vibrant, diverse state that has much more to do than gambling. It has wonderful people and tremendous resources. Democracy requires an educated populace to sustain it. He believes in the future of Nevada, but it can only be done via education. Education should be the last thing to be cut. There are many other ways to find revenue and increase efficiency.

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Mr. Bo Bernhard, Associate Professor of Sociology & Hotel Management, stated he was a product of the educational system in Nevada. It was at UNLV that he learned to be a researcher. Last year, he was invited to the Board to share his research and at that time he spoke at length about a dual project with Harvard Medical School and UNLV. That is a five year project, with three major grants. Some UNLV students from the grant were present and spoke to the educational benefit of research. He was sad to report, that a year later, that the academic and analytic engine of that program, is on the latest cut list. This project that we were so proud of certainly is now in danger. He urged the preservation of the research mission at UNLV.

Ms. Josie Gatti, UNLV Student, stated she came to UNLV to pursue her PhD. She was attracted here by the quality research being done by the faculty. She has worked extensively with various faculty members on issues in community and economic development policy. She is current completing her dissertation. Because of her extensive research experience, and the quality training she has received, she has been offered and accepted a position at Texas A&M. She is concerned that her peers will not have the same opportunity to pursue quality research to allow them to be competitive in the academic job market.

Mr. Larry Ashley stated that he was here to talk about human capital. He stated his clinic treats clients for mental health from across the state. They are also the counseling center for Great Basin College. They are one of the few programs that offers professional gambling problem treatment. They are in a crisis. Treatment programs are being cut. He cannot bring on new faculty and he cannot obtain grad students. He cannot provide what the community needs. His goal has always been to make UNLV a community partner and community treatment program. The goal is education. There is a moral obligation to help the state of Nevada, when no one else will.

Ms. Samantha Garr, Nursing Instructor at CSN, stated she moved to Nevada when offered the job. She has more than 20 years experience in nursing. In these economic times, they all still want to provide the best possible learning opportunities. The budget cuts they are facing give the presidents and their administrator's tremendous power over people's lives. She needed to know that they know that decisions need to be made on clear and partial standards across the board. Not doing so provides opportunities for retaliation and other forms of abuse. It is one thing to lose your job because of the economy, but it is another to lose your job because someone does not like you. Transparency is needed.

Ms. Lindsey Clark, UNLV Masters Student, stated her education in Las Vegas has been great. She has been in international field courses and internships across the country. The fact that these budget cuts will disable UNLV's ability to educate people further can only lead to the dismantling of the integrity of her degree, which is disappointing and discouraging to her.

Ms. Kelly Robertson, UNLV PhD Candidate, did not understand why a world class research institution such as UNLV would be funded less than others in the state that do not perform research.

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Mr. Dennis Bazylnski stated the one thing that had not yet been mentioned that day is the hidden benefit of research at universities. People know that research is linked to graduate and undergraduate education. If research faculty are looking for jobs, then the undergraduates will be hurt as well.

Mr. Brian Hedlund, Associate Professor in School of Life Sciences, stated that research allows them to give great opportunities to students. He currently funds three PhD's in his lab. He has brought in more than \$5 million in grants and greater than 90% of that money is competitive federal funding.

Mr. Martin Schiller, Associate Professor at UNLV, asked that the Board think about the longer term and not just the current cuts. If we delete massive programs at UNLV and wait for 15 years to build them back up, how is this going to impact society.

Mr. Kurt Regner, Assistant Professor at UNLV, asked that when considering the budget for both UNR and UNLV that it be kept in mind that research and education go hand in hand.

Mr. Dan Allen, Professor at UNLV, stated he came to UNLV in 1999 and took his first graduate students to a national conference that he attends regularly so they could present their research. Fast forward to 2011 he is on the ballot for president for that organization this year. He thought it was important to recognize that whatever your vision is for Las Vegas, the education that the students receive at UNLV and the research that happens shapes national perspectives of what the city is about and the value it has for the nation.

Mr. Adam Simon, Assistant Professor at UNLV, stated that seven years ago he applied for the job at UNLV. When he came out and interviewed he asked if the state of Nevada was committed to educating their citizens. He convinced his wife that they were. He now has four children. His children ask if they will be able to receive a higher education in Nevada and his answer to them is that he does not know, because money is taken from his institution and it is sent north.

Mr. Douglas Unger, Professor of English at UNLV, stated that as the Chair of the English Department he already administered a 15% cut in his department, eliminating four faculty and residents, not filling four other positions, and cutting 12 part time instructors. They have achieved 92% efficiency already in terms of classroom enrollment and they are still placing 52-60% of MA's and PhD's in full time jobs. They have already gone through this exercise and have done it well, with great pain and efficiency.

Mr. Dale Warby, Chair of the Education Department at CSN, reiterated concerns about the transfer agreements between the institutions.

Mr. Alfonso Ayala, UNLV Graduate Student, wanted to make sure that the Board cared about education in southern Nevada. There is inequity in the funding system. It is very easy to say that you will fund education, but not as easy to say that there needs to be equity in the funding structure.

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Mr. Brian Trinh stated that three years ago Clark County School District graduated 15 national merit scholars and he was the only one that stayed to go to UNLV. Three years later he has a 4.0 GPA, is doing undergraduate research and this summer he will represent UNLV at MIT. This can only happen because of the interdisciplinary education that he has received from UNLV. He pointed out that there is a lack of unity among the departments; instead they single one another out for the cuts. They should all embrace horizontal cuts and share the burden.

Ms. Jennifer Reed, Sociology PhD Student at UNLV, stated that as a sociologist she looks for patterns. What she sees is that UNLV's mission statement has a commitment to diversity, but she sees a loss of diversity in the cuts proposed. Women's studies are on the chopping block and many women professors stand to lose their jobs.

Ms. Taylor McCadrey stated they are worthy students and worthy of the investment and asked the Board to do the right thing.

Ms. Kathryn Damm, NSC, stated that at NSC they think that administrative restructuring is still a consolidation or closure, because they would lose the ability to carry out the college's mission. .

Ms. Jessica Cargill, Biology Student at NSC, stated that NSC is not going anywhere. They do what they do well.

Mr. Mark Ciavola, President of the UNLV College Republicans, stated he was here to oppose education cuts because students have suffered enough. Over the last 10 years, student fees have increased 800%. UNLV must be efficient if they are to be successful.

Ms. Dee Riley, Registered Nurse and Educator, stated that closing colleges and departments is not responsible.

Ms. Vicki Rosser, Professor of Higher Education at UNLV, stated she has enjoyed the collaboration with graduate students and the opportunity to inspire their research interest. Research keeps people abreast of the pertinent social issues. It provides challenge for thinking and writing and reminds us of the primary reason why people gather in academic communities; to grow and develop as students, scholars and persons. *(Prepared statement on file in the Board Office.)*

Ms. Brenda Tulley, Director of Performing Arts Center at CSN, stated they heard all the dedicated faculty and staff and the excellence that they strive for. All the proposed cuts are ridiculous. Nevada cannot be improved unless they invest in education. The cuts at CSN are even more difficult because of the inequity that already exists.

Mr. Bill Kerney, CSN Faculty Senate Chair, stated he would speak for the entire faculty at the Nevada System of Higher Education through their senate chairs. He read his prepared statement into the record:

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

For one hundred years, higher education has been a primary gateway to a better life for Americans. People with college degrees make more money, divorce less, live longer and secure a better future for their children than people without a degree. In fact, despite flaws, the American system of higher education is the envy of the world, attracting students from every corner of the globe.

And yet today, when the state of Nevada already has the fewest students who go on to college in the nation, it stands on the precipice of limiting access, reducing the quality, and narrowing the breadth of higher education for Nevadans. If the Governor's budget passes intact, consider the following:

- UNR will lose 2 colleges, including the teacher preparation function of the College of Education; 8 majors; and with reductions in the Department of Mathematics students will be unable to get classes needed for graduation and professional training.
- UNLV will lose 12 departments and 36 other degree programs, 325 positions including 135 faculty lines (102 occupied by tenure-earning faculty) and over 2000 currently enrolled students.
- NSC, who has lost 19% of its full-time faculty while growing 40% in student enrollment since 2008, will be forced to offer fewer sections of classes and increase class sizes by over 25%.
- DIR has suffered substantial faculty losses, with 23 departures since 1008. Without state funding to invest in recruitment, retention, and new research initiatives, this trend will continue, and will likely acceleration, into the coming years.
- CSN expects a reduction of enrollment by approximately 2,478 FTE in FY 2013 and an estimated loss of 9,275 headcount, for 12,336 seats on top of the estimated 5,000 students already turned away in Fall 2010.
- GBC faces the elimination of at least 120 more sections or approximately 3000 seats in 2012 and an additional 60 sections or another 1,500 seats in 2013. Over thirty positions will be eliminated.
- TMCC already has condensed five academic units into two and expects to serve 6,000 fewer students. From 2006 to 2011 TMCC has seen a reduction of staffing over 38%.
- WNC plans to close 7 satellite facilities, reduce the number of class sections offered and lose seven tenured faculty.
- NSHE is considering a 12-13% hike in student tuition and fees for both 1012 and 2013, a cumulative increase of nearly 30%-on top of the 20% increase that has occurred in the last 2 years.

This systematic dismantling of higher education is being done on the basis of false facts. Before this recession, Nevada already had the smallest state general fund in the country (when viewed as a share of the state economy), the fewest public employees in the nation, and the fewest working in higher education. Further Nevada state employees are not overpaid. In fact, when educational level and work experience are taken into account, they are slightly underpaid.

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Moreover, the budget shortfall we are experiencing today may be a large share of our small state budget, but it is only 1% of the state economy. The Governor asserts that state government spending is out of control; this is untrue given any comparative date. The Governor has not considered options providing a balance of cuts and revenues. In fact, his budget, by refusing to consider the so-called “Sunsetted Taxes”, removes revenues created to sustain the state through our unprecedented budget crisis. The problem we face is not too big to solve, provided the Governor will come to the table to find a balanced solution.

In the face of these facts, the Governor claims that increasing taxes is bad policy, especially during a recession. But again he is simply mistaken. Economic theory and all the evidence contradicts his premise. These spending cuts will hurt the economy much worse, in both the short and long run, than providing adequate funds for the universities, state college, and community colleges. Indeed, the fact that Nevada has suffered in this recession more than any other states has not been because we spent too much on education, but too little. Other states, even those Western states with severe housing bubbles, have recovered faster because they had a more educated population and were better able to adapt to new employment and investment opportunities.

Finally, these actions are rooted in the wrong values. The Governor’s budget is built on the notion that Nevadans are, and should be only out for themselves. It pits small business against government workers, parents against teachers, consumers against taxpayers, the old against the young. But if, as this budget promises, a few of us succeed at the expense of the rest, we will all have failed. Higher education is a public good. When one of us is educated, it benefits all of us. When one of us is denied this opportunity, we all lost.

Given these facts, we believe that the Governor’s proposed budget is not an effort to solve a crisis, but rather an effort to use a crisis of ideological purposes, to take advantage of this recession to force a significant scaling back of public education. We believe the advocates of this approach oppose the public university on principle.

We, the faculty of the NSHE, declare that what the Governor’s budget proposed to do with higher education is wrong. It is wrong on the facts. It furthers the wrong values. It charts the wrong course for Nevada’s future.

Regent Alden reported he had sent all the regents an explanation of the selection process of the UNLV basketball coach. (*Statement on file in the Board Office*). Regent Alden noted the Board of Regents is a group of trustees for higher education and they do not select coaches. Only the Athletic Director can make that decision and then he forwards it to the President. The Board either votes in favor or not. Institutional control is what the NCAA talks about everyday and the NSHE will have institutional control.

The meeting recessed at 11:06 a.m. and reconvened at 11:23 p.m. with all members present.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)- The Board rescinded its prior action taken at the March 10-11, 2011, meeting, whereby the Board approved the removal from consideration the closure, consolidation or merger of any of the institutions. The Board also approved a Resolution by the Board that the Governor and Legislature of the State of Nevada be encouraged to seek additional revenue sources to support NSHE institutions to allow them to fulfill their missions of education, research and public outreach.

Regent Doubrava noted that at the previous meeting held in Carson City, by a vote of 8-5, the Board voted to remove from consideration discussions about mergers, consolidations, and closures of campuses. He felt it was important, in light of the legislative subcommittee and their instructions to the Chancellor, that the decision be rescinded.

Regent Doubrava moved to rescind the Board's prior action at the March 10-11, 2011, meeting, whereby the Board approved the removal from consideration the closure, consolidation or merger of any of the institutions. Regent Crear seconded.

Regent Crear thought this was important to the extent that in order for the Board to save the institutions everything needed to be put back on the table. They heard from Senator Horsford today about this decision. In order save the institutions he felt this needed to be done today.

Regent Knecht wanted to present the case against the proposed rescission. He noted that he had a number of questions directed to Chancellor Klaich:

- Chancellor, have you, NSHE Administration, Presidents Council or anyone requested, or are you now proposing that the Board rescind the motion or put back on the table any of the others we have previously taken off?
  - Chancellor Klaich responded no.
- Is your view basically that the Board members should listen to the President's reports and consider the contingency plans they've brought forward; ask questions and express concerns, and then give them continued direction, guidance and support for continuing the process?
  - Chancellor Klaich stated that it was consistent with discussion that he had with Regent Knecht outside of this meeting on the basis of the Board's action on March 11, 2011. Chancellor Klaich stated they were present as staff. They will put information in front of the Board, to the fullest extent of their ability, to be good, hard, and reliable data. They will work as the Board has directed.
- Chancellor, have you, the Chairman or anyone received any express indication that any legislator, its staff, the Governor's administration, or the budget office, requesting us to alter or rescind our prior action, or to put back into active consideration, or implement the possible destructive options for the eight institutions?



3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Chancellor Klaich did not believe anything had been received in writing on this from the Legislature, Governor or the budget staff. He was well aware of the majority leader's concerns with the prior action.
- Book one and two that the Board received, contain the contingency plans by the eight institutions and the System and their plans to absorb their proportionate share of the cuts. The eight institutions and System cuts, by design, were meant to cover the \$162.4 million second year cuts that are expected under the Governor's budget?
  - Chancellor Klaich responded yes. He added that without reviewing the numbers, that it was the intent, that the numbers would be approximately that.
- In forwarding book one to the Legislature, which includes all of that material and answers to about 10 other extensive questions that they requested, there is a four page cover memo that accompanied the book. Is it fair to say that the cover memo was intended to outline all of the significant, deleterious effects, of the Governor's proposed cuts on the institutions, NSHE and higher education?
  - Chancellor Klaich felt it was fair to say that the memo expresses his opinion of the most deleterious effects. He attempted to hit the high point and to show the most severe negative impacts of the executive budget on the Nevada System of Higher Education.
- Are you recommending against the Governor's proposed budget cuts for NSHE.
  - Chancellor Klaich responded absolutely.
- In books one and two, after the review of the nine sets of institutional cuts, there are analyses of the three breakup merger, closure, consolidation options. The first is the consolidation of the three northern community colleges. Is it your understanding that the roughly \$3 million net savings per year, is an incremental figure over and above the savings that are detailed in the WNC, TMCC and GBC individual cuts.
  - Chancellor Klaich believed that was correct. If they are referring to book one as the LCB book and book two as the Regent's book, it is worth noting that the consolidation documents that are being referred to, appear in book one. With respect to the savings indicated in the documents, they are incremental savings, but he did not think it was impossible to believe that there could be some overlap. One or more of the presidents could have seen the savings and placed them into their plans. Because of the process that the Board has followed, it would have been one of the expected actions of the Board, to say take those figures back and sit down with the Presidents and hammer them out. That is not what occurred so he could not say with complete accuracy what the savings will be.
- Is the NSC \$4.3 million savings incremental?
  - Chancellor Klaich assumed that they were, but since those would be at the administrative level, he would expect that those would be savings in addition to the budget cuts that have been submitted to the Board.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Do we have numbers for DRI?
  - Chancellor Klaich responded no, but there is a good reason. In discussion with President Wells and Dr. McDaniel, by in large, there was an acceptance that the numbers are what they are and they add up to the amount, but they do not tell the story. These numbers are intended to essentially say what the result could be in a perfect case scenario.

Regent Knecht noted for the record that prior to resuming this meeting he handed the Chancellor a highlighted version of the cover memo, to reference while questions were being asked. Regent Knecht asked Chancellor Klaich if they had reviewed the cover memo together, with Chancellor Klaich responding no. Chancellor Klaich stated that for clarity that the cover memo is not based on any consolidation scenarios, rather based on the scenarios that the presidents reported and are contained in book two.

- Page one, paragraph two: “the proposed budget reductions will dramatically impact higher education and, in particular, access.” Is it true that on top of the proposed budget reductions by the Governor, if they were to embrace any of the closure, consolidation, etc. that they would do even more damage to our access institutions, state and community colleges.
  - Chancellor Klaich responded that it was true. If you close a door, someone cannot get in, and access is denied.
- Page two, paragraph one: “reduce access and opportunity to thousands of Nevadans either by limiting enrollment or pricing higher education out of reach.” Won’t cutting seats in our access institutions even further via closures, etc, reduce access and opportunity even further?
  - Chancellor Klaich responded that his answer would be the same. Higher Education should be about access. When he spoke in Carson City, he found it very difficult to say one student in a town is more valuable than another student in a different town. Certainly, any of these scenarios is going to reduce, in one way or another, access and the opportunity that goes along with it.
- Regent Knecht clarified that the analysis provided in book one, and that is being discussed in the cover memo, is an analysis based on the proportional cuts. If one of the community colleges is taken out or the state college is taken out, then there is an incremental impact on access by the proposal.
  - Chancellor Klaich pointed out that the analysis done, assumed that teaching functions would continue in a different administrative setting. Whether or not that is realistic is certainly up to discussion and debate among the Board. Nothing put in front of the Board has talked about closing, with the possible exception of DRI, which would have disappeared in a merger.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Regent Knecht stated that if he was positive that they were not talking about closing any of the institutions, he would have much less stress about this motion and the process they are going through. He says he has heard serious people in responsible positions having said things that disturb him.
- Page two, paragraph three: “We must be particularly mindful of low income and first generation students who are disproportionately students of color.” According to this, the destructive options would affect low-income people, first-generation college attendees and students of color most.
  - Chancellor Klaich responded certainly and NSC would make that argument with a great deal of strength. He thinks that this is one of the things that the Board should be most careful about.
- Page two, paragraph four: “We can no longer pretend that any student who is qualified to be accepted by our institutions will have access to classes, support services, financial aid or a degree.” Isn’t it true that these classes, support services, financial aid and degree completion problems are made worse by putting the destructive options in play?
  - Chancellor Klaich stated his answer would be the same. This comment is based on his perception, and his perception is that there is a bias in here. The bias is that there is still a critical need to produce more graduates in this state, regardless of what the funding is. We must undertake these kinds of policies that will produce those kinds of graduates, more quickly and through the pipeline. For this Board there are significant policy implications that are choices to be made. The necessity, under extraordinary circumstances, for us to make the kinds of choices to focus on how they can get the most students to succeed with a high quality education with very limited resources.
- Page two, paragraph five: “We can no longer guarantee admission...to the state college to any Nevada student who meets the minimum qualifications...students will be turned away due to limited resources.” Isn’t it correct that more students will be turned away by these closures?
  - Chancellor Klaich responded that certainly the same results would obtain.
- Page two, paragraph six: “We can no longer guarantee enrollment at our community colleges for all who come to our door. The access mission of our community colleges will no longer be a priority for the state.” Regent Knecht asked if that was especially true when they close any of the community colleges or the state college.
  - Chancellor Klaich stated this is where it gets particularly insidious at the access institutions. When people like Mike Richards come to you, year after year, and tell you that he is funded to teach and guide 16,000 young men and women through his institution, and would do a heck of a job doing it except for the fact that he has 23,000 students a semester. The System has been pushed by the budget reductions to a point where they can no longer get along.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Page three, paragraph one: “We no longer guarantee that every student who qualifies to transfer from our community colleges to the universities or to the state college will be able to do so.” If they don’t have a community college to begin with, the transfer is moot. If they have one crippled by the destructive options, it’s made more difficult.
  - Chancellor Klaich stated that if there are no students to transfer, they cannot transfer. We will be creating a major disconnect in the three tier system.
- Page three, paragraph one: “Such policies may have a very negative impact on students, particularly those who cannot afford to begin their studies full time at one of our universities.” Isn’t it true that transfer prospects, as well as other aspects of access, will be even more damaged by the cannibalizing options?
  - Chancellor Klaich noted they are not destroying money, and presumably if the Board was to do something like this in its wisdom, they would supplement other offerings in the System to offset the negative effects.
- Page three, paragraph two: “We will offer classes at fewer locations. In particular, our rural locations will suffer as the NSHE focuses limited resources on serving the greatest number of students.” So the most underserved areas with the greatest access problems will be even more underserved?
  - Chancellor Klaich stated he did not know where the most underserved places are, because some people would say that it is in the Las Vegas valley. But certainly there will be various communities and people that are not served, that have a great need.
- Page three, paragraph three: “Worthy students, many working and supporting families as they improve their skills ...will be impacted as restricted resources require tighter enrollment management and planning.” If we close some of these institutions, via consolidation or merger, will it not be a matter of restricted resources for the least or less privileged in order to make sure that we give resources to those most privileged to be students in our universities.
- Page three, paragraph four: “We anticipate a drop in enrollment in excess of 15% over the biennium, based on program elimination, site closures, and fewer numbers of classes offered, increased fees, and inadequate tutoring and support services.” The least fortunate, those who most need access to higher education, will be the first denied any access to all, and those few who do get in will face higher costs, poorer service and greater difficulty than ever.
  - Chancellor Klaich hoped they would work to avoid that, but it could happen.
- Page three, paragraph five: “We cannot guarantee adequate financial aid for students based on need, but will work hard to provide such aid for as many students as possible.” Insufficient financial aid problems will also be exacerbated by closing our access and community institutions.
  - Chancellor Klaich did not know, because financial aid is home based and financial aid is administratively located.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Page three, paragraph six: “Research and workforce grants in the state will in all likelihood decline as resources for matching funds dry up and as our best and most entrepreneurial faculty are ‘cherry picked’ by other institutions across the nation.” Isn’t it true that resources constraints, that other states also face, present great challenges to bringing in grants and retaining our best and most entrepreneurial faculty, but some folks apparently want to just shut the door to grants by pushing out of the state those faculty by butchering DRI?
  - Chancellor Klaich noted that is certainly what has been heard from President Wells and the DRI faculty.
- Page four, paragraph one: “While we continue to do our best to protect our core missions, let me be clear that our institutions are at risk and now under siege, slowly being dismantled.” Apparently, budget constraints putting our institutions at risk and under siege and being slowly dismantled is not enough for some folks. They want to bring forward unnecessarily for consideration options that would hugely increase the risk, intensify the siege and dismantle our educational institutions immediately. Forget core missions of access, transfer, student success and economic development. Forget turmoil, angst and panic among students, faculty and staff, leading to low morale and productivity, as well as discouraging donors. Forget all that, some politicians have got a political battle to fight with the Governor and minority-party legislators, and apparently that fight is much more important to them. If we cut some institutions, the money does not evaporate, it gets reprogrammed somewhere else.
- Do the proposals make any sense at all? Leaving aside DRI for a moment, the proposals amount to the following: We would close or otherwise greatly damage our access and community institutions, the ones that have the highest student teacher ratios and the lowest cost faculty on average and with the highest faculty instructional loads. If we go to closure, consolidation, merger in some form at the community colleges or Nevada State, we would be closing or damaging access. Aren’t the community colleges and Nevada State having the highest student teacher ratios, the lowest cost faculty on average and the highest faculty instructional loads on average?
  - Chancellor Klaich reported that those institutions certainly have a higher instructional load than the universities. They have a lower cost structure for faculty in general, with respect to average teaching loads.
- They are the lower cost institutions?
  - Chancellor Klaich stated they are certainly lower costs to students and probably to the state.
- These are also the institutions that reach out to our most challenged students, making higher education and a better life a reality for them to the extent that the universities cannot.
  - Chancellor Klaich stated he would not agree, because it undersells the universities and what they are trying to do.
  - Regent Knecht clarified that if someone from Lovelock is using the WNC satellite campus that gives them access to higher education that they may not be able to reach at UNR. Chancellor Klaich agreed.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

Regent Knecht stated that putting back into play these unnecessary destructive options, would take resources from the institutions that are by far the most efficient and accessible to the least fortunate people and that serve them with the lowest cost faculty and staff, and we would give those resources to the highest costs and least accessible institutions that service our most fortunate and privileged students with our highest paid faculty and staff. Some people believe this would improve instruction and opportunity and promote economic growth. He believed it would mean fewer total students, fewer total faculty and poor access and public service by NSHE to great parts of the state, so that the privileged few at the universities can be held harmless at the expense of the more needy students and faculty.

At the same time, these unnecessary proposals also involve taking the crown jewel of our research institutions, DRI, and butchering it, thereby driving out a great number of our most talented folks, especially the ones who contribute to economic development, so that it can be merged into some large cumbersome bureaucracies, destroying what is not driven out in the first instance.

Regent Knecht added that in the very near term, mere consideration, that is, the passing of this motion for rescission, of these ridiculous options, will cause turmoil, angst and panic and thus scuttle the morale and productivity of faculty, staff and students and will drive away donors fast and far.

Regent Knecht continued that the main reason we would be following this craven path is so that legislative majority party politicians can use NSHE and its students, faculty, staff and donors, as cannon fodder in their battles against some other politicians. Yet, the politicians that want to use us this way are the ones who consistently favored by a large margin the two largest budget sectors, the sectors that have made out best over the last decade, compared to others, the economy and higher education. Regent Knecht stated it was difficult to decide which is more depressing, the fact that we would abandon our duty to education and its people by letting the Board of Regents and NSHE sink to such a tawdry political game, or that fact that some folks think that it might actually buy us anything, despite the history and what we know about those battles.

Regent Knecht opposed the motion. We have reviewed the data on the institutional cuts, and for good cause we said these were things we did not want to do, but we can find a way through this without the unnecessary destructive options. Now despite all of the damage that we have just heard chronicled, we are only looking at a few bucks.

Regent Knecht noted the speculation was that the consolidation would yield about \$3 million for the northern community colleges and \$4.3 million for NSC. Chancellor Klaich recalled that the first analysis showed the consolidations at the top end of \$15 million. The institutions showed the figure to be significantly less. Regent Knecht believed that the \$7.9 million figure to be flawed and unreliable. Chancellor Klaich stated that was the position of TMCC, GBC and WNC. Regent Knecht stated they would be doing all of this additional damage for maybe an additional \$8 million. Regent Knecht asked the Chancellor if they had considered the transition costs of consolidations,

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

closures, or mergers. Chancellor Klaich responded they had not, but if the Board wants to pursue these options, there definitely would be a breakdown of the savings and costs associated. Regent Knecht could not see why we would consider these options, given the little amount they may generate, how much damage they would do to the core mission and especially the damage they would do to the morale and productivity in the coming months.

Regent Anderson agreed with what has been said and she was opposed to any consolidations or closures because of the damage it would cause. However, she did not think it was a good idea to make the Legislative leadership mad at the System. They are the only ones that can give the System more money. We are not being asked to do the closures, we are being asked to talk about them. She thought they wanted it back on the table to see what the worst case scenario was. Regent Anderson stated she would be in favor, just to talk about the options.

Regent Geddes would support the motion. As a person of facts, he just wanted to gather all the data. He thought it was premature to make decisions in March and even now. He also thinks it is premature to take anything off the table at this point. A lot of the examples that Regent Knecht referenced to as closures and access are in these plans that they received without closure and consolidation. He did not think they ever talked about closing, but instead consolidating administrative functions to redirect more dollars to education. Regent Geddes disagreed with Regent Knecht as he did not feel that the universities were a place of privilege. As a first generation college student, he worked two jobs and took out loans to make it through college. It was not a place of privilege, but a choice and sacrifice that he made. Whatever decisions are made on this budget they will be limiting access to all.

Regent Wixom asked Chancellor Klaich why he brought the proposals forward in March. Chancellor Klaich stated the Board directed him to do so. Regent Wixom asked if he made any specific proposal for closure of any institution. Chancellor Klaich responded that he did not. Chancellor Klaich agreed with Regent Wixom's statement that all the discussions were preliminary and they did not have complete information.

Regent Wixom believed there were some unfortunate references and he has great respect for Regent Knecht and his due diligence, but he believed it was profoundly premature to say that the Board is doing anything unnecessary. Regent Wixom noted that by definition what they are doing is destructive but it is certainly not by the Board's choice. He did not want to play political games. He was there to do his duty as a Regent, and that is a function of information. The information presented at the March meeting was incomplete and they understood that at the time. The Board did not propose anything at the last meeting, except for the opportunity to understand. The Board has been accused of rejecting the notion of reform. As a fiduciary he cannot make decisions without the information. He respectfully requested that they be given the opportunity to make informed decisions. In a private organization much of this process would be in private, but under the obligation of the Open Meeting Law they must do this process in the

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

public. It is a destructive process. He would like to get the information in such a way that it did not hurt people and damage morale.

Regent Alden clarified that this proposal was not talking about shutting down NSC or consolidating DRI. Chancellor Klaich stated that the motion, if passed, would lead to additional information being put on the table so the Board can consider all options in meeting the budget reductions.

Regent Leavitt clarified that this motion is allowing the discussion of any and all options. It included no recommendation or implementation, just a discussion.

Regent Alden understood that within the budget is a 5% salary reduction for everyone except part time and classified. Chancellor Klaich disagreed and stated that the 5% reduction was for everybody and was built into the Governor's recommendation. Regent Alden stated the Board's job was student access to education. We are going to have to take some hits. His concern is that they have not done enough in salaries. Excluding classified and part time there should be a reduction in salary when the salary is above \$150,000. Chancellor Klaich clarified that each one percentage point reduction in salary system wide would save the System \$5.3 million. Chancellor Klaich asked if this pertained to a percentage on top of the 5% already called for. If it is on top of the 5% then it would save money. Chancellor Klaich stated they had to be careful that other than passing through legislatively mandated salary reductions, the Board would be in a position to declare financial exigency to implement the plan. Regent Alden stated he would vote for this motion, but he wanted the Board to know that he was looking for additional salary reductions above the 5% on salaries, except for classified and part time.

Regent Schofield disagreed with eliminating core value programs in the state of Nevada. He is not in favor of destroying anything that has been built in the past 78 years. Nevada has worked hard. Regent Schofield stated he would vote against the motion, because he believed the message needed to be sent loud and clear.

Regent Blakely offered a friendly amendment that the six scenarios are discussed individually instead of collectively.

Regent Doubrava clarified that the motion was to rescind the prior action at the March meeting.

Regent Doubrava declined the friendly amendment.

Regent Blakely asked the Chairman that the six scenarios be discussed individually and not collectively.

Regent Melcher felt that closures, mergers, and consolidations are dismantling in his view. The System has worked hard to build the higher education system in a way that supports education throughout Nevada and now there are considerations to dismantle



3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

those things they have worked so hard to build up. He felt that the Board needed to be very careful in the political stance that they take as a Board. He fully appreciated Senator Horsford's support for education and has agreed with most things he has done. The legislature has their job to do and the Board has theirs. The System has provided the information that was requested, so they can make their informed decisions. That information is also available to the Board for future decisions as well. He believed he was doing what was best for higher education access throughout Nevada service areas. He thought they needed to be extremely careful what political message they send and how they align with various political groups. He stated he would not give the appearance that they feel closures are an appropriate option. Regent Melcher stated that one of his main goals when becoming a Regent was to be supportive of all education institutions in Nevada and he is going to do what is best for all of Nevada. In the discussions there are geographic, budget and political divides and he thought they needed to work hard to tear those divides down. The Board members need to be the leadership to tear those divides down. Regent Melcher stated he would not support the motion, but he appreciated the stance of those who are in favor.

Regent Cobb appreciated Regent Melcher's comments. They are members of the Nevada System of Higher Education and they should not forget that when discussing all the institutions and students of the state, when completing their fiduciary obligation. Regent Cobb stated at the last meeting, Chairman Leavitt brought up that some of the Regents seemed to forget what was voted on in February. Regent Cobb noted that at the February meeting they voted to do exactly what would occur today with the rescission of the motion, which is the investigation of the options.

Regent Knecht appreciated the point made about information, but added that there are two sides to the point. There is never enough perfect information and you always hope that you have enough information. They have to be mindful that there is damage being done by the consideration of the options. Regent Knecht noted he had looked at the information that they had received and he was secure with the decision that he did not want to extend the damage.

Regent Knecht explained to Regent Geddes about his comment about those at the universities being privileged. He noted he also was a first generation college graduate. He went to a large mid-western state university and had at least two jobs, while going to school. When he hears about people talking about being first generation low income students he understands that personally and first hand. He guaranteed that he felt privileged relative to his high school classmates that were going to junior colleges at the time. He was privileged to have the opportunity and he felt that all going to UNR or UNLV should feel the same way. They are subsidized in their instructional costs by 70% of the cost of their instruction. When he talks about privilege, he does think they are privileged, but he not mean to demean their efforts in any way.

Regent Knecht stated that in regard to Regent Anderson's comment about alienating the Legislature, he appreciated the thought. Over the period of FY00-FY10, state funding for K-12 education rose 128%, while state funding for Higher Education rose by 85%. All

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

along the strategy has been to go along and not offend K-12, but this has got higher education 2/3 of what they have received. Maybe a new strategy is needed.

Regent Knecht reiterated that Senator Horsford stated they were all partners in this and we all need to stand together. He believed that was true and he thought it was inconsistent to say therefore lets jump enthusiastically and aggressively at favoring some regions over others. He thought that what the Chancellor and the Presidents brought forward on March 11, 2011, and the information added now, should give the Board a good basis to do the least destructive thing. That is why he will not support the motion.

The motion to rescind the prior action at the March 11, 2011, meeting carried via a roll call vote. Regents Alden, Anderson, Blakely, Cobb, Crear, Doubrava, Geddes, Leavitt, Page and Wixom voted yes. Regents Knecht, Melcher and Schofield voted no.

The meeting recessed at 12:42 p.m. and reconvened at 1:02 p.m. with all members present.

Regent Leavitt stated they would begin with the presidents who are going to summarize the development of their budget reduction plans.

Regent Cobb took a moment of personal privilege. He stated he has been a trial attorney during his career. For most trial attorneys, one of the ultimate rewards is to be considered for the judiciary and in particular the federal judiciary. This last week he was honored by the United States District Court and appointed as the next U.S. Magistrate Judge. He stated he has thoroughly enjoyed working with the members of the Board, chancellor's staff, presidents, their staff, the faculty senate's and most particularly the students. It has been a rewarding experience, but unfortunately when he assumes the bench he will have to resign his position on the Board.

President Diekhans reported the plan was produced with a collegial and cooperative working relationship with the Budget Task Force Committee. The Committee did pass on and recommend these budget reductions to the amount of \$7.3 million over the next biennium. Since 2008 GBC has had budget reductions, but instructional was not effected until 2011. The reductions have been disproportionate outside instruction. GBC has strived to provide access for students. They have struggled to maintain quality by preserving the 60/40 ratio of full time to part time faculty. They also have not and will not cut into the student access funds. Going forward they are trying to protect access and instruction. In FY 12 they will lose 16 positions; 9 administrative and 7 teaching faculty. In FY 13 there will be 18 additional positions; 14 administrative and 4 teaching faculty. They have comprised a Curricular Review Committee that has already passed on the current recommendations. They are also looking at other programs and using this opportunity to review the validity of the programs they have at the college. In administrative services they had four professionals but in FY 12 they will only go forward with two of those professionals which will be a savings of \$250,000. In the operations and maintenance area they have three professionals and in FY 12 they will go

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

forward with only two of those positions intact and in FY 13 there will be additional classified reductions. This will save a half million dollars. Under the academic support area they will lose a dean and extended off campus positions. They have eliminated a center manager off campus and will be eliminating a center director in FY 13. These budget cuts will affect the entire service area because of GBC's extensive interactive video. With the proposed budget cuts in FY 12 and FY 13 services to students will be impacted with a reduction in staffing in the library and further possible reductions in the labs and success center. Students will also see more reductions in the advising and student life center.

President Smatresk stated they took the full amount of cuts last time and will just detail the additional cuts to accommodate the shortfall. With the 13% tuition adjustment and the rest of the assumptions, compared to the last cuts they would have to cut \$3 million more. In general they were achieved through subprograms at the universities and the reorganization efforts. These will result in a much leaner administrative structure, so they can spare faculty positions. The basic principles they applied to the first cut continue with this set of cuts. UNLV has attempted to minimize academic cuts, but many of the cuts still roll over to the academic area. The materials presented are self-explanatory (*on file in the Board office*). He thought that the release of this statement and the actual impact on the campus has been stunning. Releasing these figures, detailing the pain of the executive budget, has produced a new level of low morale and anxiety. At the end of April they expect to have plans that they will review and then make available for full consultation. At that time the cuts will be real. If you take a look at the cumulative impact of these cuts they total 333 positions cut, of those, there are approximately 136 faculty positions now cut and approximately 100 of those are currently filled. When you consider the impact of the additional cuts, they anticipate they will lose approximately 20,000 upper division seats. In addition approximately 2200 students will be directly impacted because of the loss of their major. When you lose tenured faculty, you lose upper division seats, which results in not graduating students in a timely fashion and will ultimately have to restrict transfer enrollment.

President Glick stated this is a horrible day. Yesterday the Dean of the Reynolds School of Journalism announced he was moving to Louisiana State University and Dr. Misra, one of UNR's leading entrepreneurs, is going to Utah. When you walk campus, you will find few faculty members that are not questioning their future and the future of the university. They have tried to stay true to the priorities - to protect students and research. At the last meeting they detailed things that are very painful to cut. Cooperative Extension will be downsized significantly, but they will retain the basic infrastructure covering the federal match, keeping the county extension educators and keeping 4-H. They also said they were closing departments in Theatre, Dance, French, and Special Collections. They have now added close to \$14 million in proposed reductions. Highlights of the closures include the Department of Nutrition, elimination of the administrative part of the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources and move the remaining departments into the School of Agriculture in the College of Science. They will close almost all of the graduate programs in the College of Education. That would leave a school that prepares at the first licensure level, elementary teachers,

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

secondary teachers, counselors and principals, in a state that already has one of the worst high school graduation rates in the country. They will downsize the Department of Mathematic and Statistics and reduce substantially the advanced teaching. They would take state money out of the Basque Studies Center and reduce outreach services at the School of Medicine. They will take \$1.5 million from intercollegiate athletics and do their best to maintain Division I status. He reminded the Board that there are no choices between bad and good just choices between bad and worst. There are no more good choices left. UNR has protected the quality of the programs that are left. The University is already substantially reduced in scope and these cuts come at a time when institutional breathe and expertise are more greatly needed. The people in the state of Nevada deserve more education, not less. They need more discovering, innovation, creativity and more outreach from its colleges and universities. The infrastructure of the university already has over \$300 million of deferred maintenance and that number will grow, because of the reduction in support staff. President Glick stated that after over half a decade in higher education he is responsible for a 137 year old land grant university that may no longer offer degrees in Philosophy, will only offer a degree in one single language and may no longer offer higher degrees in Education and Math. There is only one word for that and it is “incomprehensible.”

President Wells reported that from FY 08 to FY 11 DRI has lost \$2.6 million of its operating budget and the next proposed round of cuts will be an additional \$2 million, which results in a 40% reduction in their operational cost. There are no changes to the information previously proposed, just clarification in the FTE. There will be about 17 headcount lost in this next round of cuts, which is 30% of the state funded positions that DRI has for its research support and administration. This will have significant and negative impact on DRI’s ability to innovate and conduct the kind of research that they need to do. DRI will be forced to backfill some of the positions, which sets off a chain reaction of jobs lost by other people and the loss of the ability to innovate new projects that allow DRI to grow. DRI has grown significantly over the past decade and that will come to a halt. In addition, DRI will be giving back the rest of their applied research funds and will lose that opportunity. DRI has had the privilege to run one of the longest environmental monitoring programs in the state, but the state funding for this program will be terminated. President Wells stated this is a travesty and they must find a way out of this.

President DiMare provided background for FY 08 to FY 11. NSC eliminated seven administrative positions and reallocated \$900,000 to instruction. To meet the current reductions for FY 12 and FY 13 they have used a shared governance process and approach. She emphasized that what the Executive Budget Committee put forward is just one possible scenario and they will be working with the Executive Senate to look at curricular revisions, restructuring and efficiency. Because of contractual obligations and compressed time frames, a two tier approach is being utilized to address the budget reductions. The first year proposes that the reduction occur through a freeze of vacant positions. Specifically the NSC Executive Budget Committee is evaluating all possible scenarios through a zero based budgeting approach. The Faculty Senate is currently leading a curricular review process. They are going to meet these cuts through a fee

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

surcharge of 13% for each year of the biennium, salary and benefit reductions of 5%, and position reductions. Thirty-two positions will be impacted across the biennium, which is 25% of NSC's faculty and staff. Of those 32 positions, five employees have received a letter of non-reappointment, 12 that were filled temporarily will end June 30, 2011, and 15 positions are and will remain vacant. NSC is moving some of the staff off of state dollars. Part time instructor expenditures will be maintained due to a reduction in full time faculty. There are contractual obligations of leases and they are in the process of renegotiating those. NSC also has a 3% reserve built into the budget.

President Richards stated that since 2007-08 a reduction of 33% in general fund support will have been lost and at the same time CSN has seen a 20% increase of full time enrollment. In hind sight, perhaps that 20% growth should not have happened. Community colleges are committed to open access. The plan is predicated on an increase in registration fees by 13% per year, with a 15% carve out for financial aid. The current plan eliminates a total of 86.65 state supported positions, 83 FTE part time faculty and 54 of the positions currently are staffed. With positions previously eliminated and those targeted in the current plan CSN will have reduced the state supported operating budget by 205 full time positions or 17% of the state supported staff. The major difference in this plan from the one presented in March is the impact on enrollment. CSN is projecting a loss of 1,500 FTE and 5,300 headcount in the first fiscal year of the biennium. By the end of the biennium they will have lost nearly 9,300 students. This is on top of the 5,300 students who walked away in the fall of 2010. This is the loss of 12,300 seats. There will be a reduction of sections of approximately 514 or 10% per semester. CSN will eliminate the nursery operations and elemental horticultural, close the massage therapy program, and sharply reduce apprenticeships. In the area of institutional support and operations and maintenance, they will eliminate three police positions, cut back on third party contracts for information technology services, reduce the diversity and general counsel staff and eliminate vacant positions in facilities. They will most likely come back in May and request Board approval to utilize up to \$500,000 in capital improvement fees to address deferred maintenance needs.

Ms. Delores Sanford stated that from the beginning TMCC efforts were to keep the cuts as far from the students and classrooms as possible. TMCC will continue this effort and as they have in the past, and will look to maintain a quality education throughout this process. TMCC has had in place several processes that have led up to the current cuts. TMCC has a Budget Committee and a program and administrative review process. Through these annual evaluations, TMCC has achieved efficiencies. With this budget reduction of 28.9% for the biennium, the cuts have resulted in the elimination of most vacant positions. They are eliminating 32 full time positions, with the exception of 10 that are vacant positions. Thirteen are classified positions, 8 are professional administrative positions, an estimated six full time positions are faculty and five full time positions are yet to be determined. During this last process, a curricular review process was instituted. They are following the curricular review as outlined in the NFA Union agreement. The cuts that are in front of the Board have gone through committee. This committee will remain in place until they have a final budget for this biennium. In

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

addition, to the impact on staff and the students, they are seeing for the first time program elimination. They are eliminating a mental health technical substance abuse counselor and departmental disabilities technician. The process has worked as a shared governance process, but it certainly has not been easy and it is having a negative impact on both the students and staff.

President Lucey gave an overview of the WNC cuts. They began a freeze on positions in 2007. This year they were unable to avoid layoffs. In the context of curricular and support reviews, they have now presented to the college community the recommendations. A rural community college has three distinct missions - support access and graduation degree seeking students, support workforce and economic development, and quality of life enhancements. In going forward they had to keep these important factors in mind. WNC has determined they can no longer support the quality of life effort. WNC will continue to provide a route to college for rural high school students. All rural high schools have agreed to host interactive video equipment, which they will maintain in all the rural high schools. In many respects WNC will not be able to provide access to students that come in at Math or English 95 or lower. They are looking for ways to mitigate that. WNC has an application with the other community colleges for a Department of Labor grant, which they are hoping to use to help those students unprepared for college.

Chancellor Klaich presented the reductions in System Administration. Chancellor Klaich stated that SCS will absorb a very significant reduction of positions and the System Office will lose three individuals. One is a planned retirement, which will not be filled. The System will also assume the 5% pay reduction. He stated he has asked the Nevada Press to move more quickly toward a self-sustaining model, as well as the MAP program. He has frozen all out of state travel and all hiring and promotions, reduced in state travel, and requested the Regents to suspend the monetary stipends associated with the Regent awards and to reduce hosting accounts. The System Office in Las Vegas will have reduced rent beginning July 1, 2011. This will amount to \$.5 million in reduction in the first year and \$1.1 million in the second year. This will likely impact turnaround times, but they will continue to work hard in getting out requested information.

Chairman Leavitt thanked the System Presidents and Chancellor for the incredible job they are doing under unimaginable circumstances and times. He hoped the faculty senates will do everything in their power to support the Presidents. These are difficult times and processes. There are many that feel the Board was rushed by the request of the Legislature to detail these plans. There is going to be ample opportunity on campus for further development and consultation with all affected parties. Chairman Leavitt stated he would be remiss if he did not talk about how much time they needed to spend on advocacy and talking about needed revenue streams for each of the institutions.

Regent Cobb noted that at the last meeting there was approval to communicate to the Governor the Board's displeasure with the funding of Higher education. He believed the Board considered the budget cuts grossly excessive for Higher education and that under

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

the Governor's current proposal there is nowhere to take \$162 million and give it to Higher education. Therefore, and in furtherance of the request by the Senate Majority Leader that spoke today, Regent Cobb proposed and read the following resolution into the record (*on file in the Board Office*).

Resolution to Encourage Support for Higher Education

WHEREAS, the reduction in funding proposed for Higher Education in the 2011 Executive Budget would cause irreparable damage to the universities, colleges and institutions of the State of Nevada; and

WHEREAS, economic recovery, the economic revitalization of Nevada's economy, and workforce development would be thwarted by implementation of the cuts contemplated by the Executive Budget; and

WHEREAS, the funding shortfall inherent in the Executive Budget cannot be covered by any reasonable increase in tuition and fees or reduction in salaries and wages of NSHE employees; and

WHEREAS, to avoid irreparable damage to the higher educational institutions of the State of Nevada which would necessarily result as a consequence of the drastic reductions contained in the executive Budget;

RESOLVED, that on this day, April 8, 2011, by the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education that the Governor and Legislature of the State of Nevada be encouraged to seek additional revenue sources to support our institutions to allow them to fulfill their missions of education, research and public outreach.

Regent Cobb moved approval of the Resolution.  
Regent Wixom seconded. Motion carried  
unanimously.

Regent Blakely noted that in all the budgets presented he did have one objection. He was concerned that within the proposal for the UNR College of Science that the Bureau of Mines database would be closed. He believed it was part of the educational system of UNR, but the database is also used by the geological and geophysical community in the state of Nevada. He had received many emails and concerns, with one actually stating that this would cost the state \$6 million. Additionally, this data has probably been used by the State of Nevada in its defense against Yucca Mountain. Regent Blakely requested that it be removed from the proposal and kept in place. President Glick reported they are going through a process on campus and he knew that the Bureau of Mines has prepared a response and the University will take the request and the response very seriously.

Regent Geddes thanked the presidents for their proposals in these trying times. He also thanked them for the DRI history which was fascinating. Regent Geddes noted that as a

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

Board they had expressed concern about cutting the same programs at both institutions and asked that Presidents Glick and Smatresk get together and go through the programs to make sure that programs are not completely eliminated from the state of Nevada.

Regent Geddes also asked for a better explanation from the Law School as to why there are no cuts, but they are tripling fees. Dean White noted that this exercise was about vertical cuts, and the Law School has no vertical cuts to make, so in order to make no horizontal cuts they had to raise fees. The Law School is doing an efficiency study and looking at places where they can make cuts and reduce the fee increases that they would have to make. But absent the conclusion of that process, the Law School does not know how much savings there will be, and he guessed that there would not be that much because they are a single unit and don't have appendages that they can remove. He added they can get smaller, but then they have to think about ending some of the programs that they have. Regent Geddes asked whether they were going to lose students if they raised tuition and fees as high as is proposed. Dean White related there is a substantial risk of losing the better students. There is a lot of competition among law schools for students and that is where the battle will lay. The Law School is extremely concerned with the proposal that they have put forward, but he did not think that raising fees to \$30,000 is at all sustainable. In the meantime, they are working on ways to keep those fees down. They are all watching their "marker schools" and their tuition is the same as UNLV's right now and they think they will go up slightly. They are hoping that there will be a little bit of room for a tuition increase. The plan for this year is to take some funds from state lines and cover it in other places. That way they can reduce any increases they may have. In year two, it was his guess they would have to do the same, but also take some substantial horizontal cuts to suppress the amounts. If the cut amounts are not reduced there will be substantial harm, such as becoming less competitive to students between law schools.

Regent Geddes noted that the Allied Health cuts at TMCC also concerned him because it was such a high need area. If they do have to cut in this area, maybe there is another way through something such as differential fees to address the budget shortfalls. Dr. Sanford reported they are working with the department, the health programs in the area and the hospitals. The proposal would be to reduce one of the three cohorts that are going through, because with the current economic situation they cannot place all three cohorts of completing students. They will continue to review the situation and make changes as appropriate.

Regent Wixom stated they had learned a lot as a Board about the process. One of the lessons he had taken away from the process is how critical it is to support the presidents to the extent that if they second guess decisions that they make, it can become very problematic. As he looks at some of the programs up for elimination he struggles, because he understands how critical the programs are to Higher Education. With that said he is very supportive of the process. Regent Wixom noted that to the extent that they are eliminating programs, what efforts are they making to preserve, to the extent possible, undergraduate programs at each institution, with an understanding that there will be



3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

graduate programs at one of the two universities. President Smatresk pointed out that these were difficult lists to put together and to some extent were hastily assembled. There is a deeper level of review of these lists going on right now, with full faculty consultation and with discourse between the two institutions. As they evolve to a more refined list, the Regents will see that they are making every attempt to preserve access to at least one of the programs in either the North or the South. President Glick reiterated they are working together and if they look at the reductions, there is bias towards protecting undergraduate programs at the expense of the graduate programs, except for those programs that have national distinction or are alternatively approaching self-sufficiency. Regent Wixom asked them to have creativity in terms of preserving graduate level opportunities.

Regent Wixom noted that the Board did not have the background information or depth of knowledge in cutting programs, asked to what degree are the presidents engaging with both the academic and support side of the institutions to use their creativity in terms of restructuring what they do and how they deliver what they do to maximize savings. In response, President Smatresk discussed the cuts and the choices being faced to make those cuts. It turns out that some of the programs that have a small number of students and a relatively large number of faculty are incredibly high quality, but yet they are very expensive. So cutting those programs has a small impact of the revenue flow and generally a small impact on the total student population. On the other hand if you cut programs that have lower reputation and very high service obligations, then you are cutting enormous amounts of revenue. The bitter choice is to cut quality or cut revenue. There are not a lot of middle ground answers that make sense, so the Regents have to know that the way the cuts are being taken with tenured faculty will continue to selectively disable graduate and upper division in ways that are very destructive to the long term future of the state.

Regent Wixom followed up and asked how do they engage on all levels, and still allow creativity at all those levels. President Glick noted that as they went through the first set of cuts, they were greatly biased toward making cuts in the administrative support structure rather than academic cuts. By the very nature of the reductions that have been made, they have had to change the way they do business in order to survive. They also have collaborative efforts, such as the UNR located intellectual property office, which also serves DRI. President Glick stated they do consult on all levels, but there is less consulting than they would like to do, because of sheer time constraints. Regent Wixom stated he was still not comfortable and asked who vets the process. President Glick noted that at UNR it is senior leadership. President Smatresk stated that it was a little different at UNLV because it was generally at the dean level. But they have also said it must have grass roots input, which means the entire faculty across the campus must be consulted. All ideas must be considered by the executive team in each college. After that, it reaches the provost, the provost reviews those plans, a faculty committee is consulted and then an administrative proposal is made. Regent Wixom noted that in his other job he always heard employees giving opinions on how things could run better. This company created an avenue for ideas to be heard and reviewed, and it was an incredible success. Regent

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

Wixom understood the process by design had to be administrative, but he did not want the process to prevent innovation. He just wanted to make sure that people had an avenue available to have their thoughts heard. President Smatresk reported that the purpose of the faculty advisory committee is to collect data by all means possible, and gather input from all sectors of the campus.

Regent Alden noted that the Board established the state college system to train teachers and nurses. There are a lot of two plus two programs at the community colleges. Regent Alden was perplexed why they were hanging onto undergraduate education at the two universities where it is so much more expensive. He asked at the next meeting they come back with answers to why they are holding onto undergraduate education at the universities and can they move curriculum from one program to another program in Las Vegas.

President Glick reported that before the proposal to eliminate the theatre and dance program was made they had extensive discussion with UNLV to make sure they could offer a quality program. President Glick noted he was less depressed about losing the major than losing the capacity to make sure that students across the campus have the learning experience opportunity in theatre and dance. President Glick did not want to minimize the closure because he believed it was a huge loss for the community, for the university and for the students.

Regent Alden asked if there was a way to preserve the course offerings in philosophy. President Smatresk noted they are reviewing the process right now. Under the executive budget proposal, UNLV has to lose 330 people and they have already stripped the ability to serve the infrastructure. UNLV is already drained and President Smatresk was worried that with this type of loss they will not be able to function. President Smatresk stated there is a mandatory part that will have to impact academics. The question is how: do they get rid of all the non-tenured faculty; do they do vertical cuts that make the university look silly on a national level; or do you try something else, something more challenging that will probably keep them in court the rest of their lives. Every time a program is taken off the table, another has to be put on. Every time a person is taken off the table, another has to be added. This is enormously painful. He believed that the proposals being generated with deeper consultation and more time will preserve the core mission and capacity. He believed the reorganization that they were going through will create an easier decision with regard to what needs to be kept, and will keep a core mission that they will be understandable, can be executed and can be sustained. They are getting down to the level that they are nearly handpicking faculty and it is not a good thing to do, in order to keep programs alive.

Chancellor Klaich noted he has three quick takeaways from the discussion.

1. They will drill down on every option they have to bring to the Board so they have the maximum information to make decisions.
2. The presidents have done a lot of work with their senior administrative staff, faculty and students in a very short time. The direction of the Board is to continue following an intensive path of shared governance on the campus.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

3. He has been engaged in discussion with Regent Knecht over a period of time with respect to the potential for available balances in accounts. Regent Knecht has offered to come to Reno and sit down with him and Mr. Eardley and go through options that could be presented to mitigate some of the cuts coming forward.

Regent Page referred to costs savings and some saying that certain ideas will not create a great savings. For example, the consolidation of billing for over-night packages; some think that it will not make a significant savings, but if you take all the ideas for cost savings, they will add up to a significant cost savings. Another one of his pet peeves is marketing. It does not seem logical that during a time when they are cutting budgets and do not have enough classes for students, that we continue to advertise for more people or send out printed glossy invitations. Put marketing on hold, because there is money to be saved.

Regent Page noted they had previously talked about Switch Nap and moving servers, and the project has not moved anywhere, because they always hear that it will not save any money. There are fortune 500 companies in Las Vegas that use Switch Nap, but we always hear that it will not work for higher education. Conversations in the System move too slow. President Smatresk agreed, and noted he was in favor of Switch Nap. The problem is that the data exists in a variety of formats on servers that range from young to old. In order to take advantage of the colossal data storage compression capabilities of Switch Nap it will actually require between \$500,000 and \$1 million worth of data compression services. They have attempted to get a federal earmark, but they will need the money to save money. Regent Page asked that they follow-up on these types of deals and get everyone back to the core mission.

Regent Knecht understood the difficulties with the process, but he urged the Presidents now that they have gone through the ugliest exercises, to go back and work with the faculty more extensively. He suggested five takeaways for all the institutions that he would like to see reflected and considered in the process:

1. At a certain point we need to rethink the exclusive focus on vertical cuts instead of horizontal cuts, and to pick and choose and prioritize, but that does not mean that some departments should be held harmless and others cut out. He thought it would be worthwhile to ask those participating in the shared governance process to come up with some horizontal ideas to spare some of the worst vertical cuts.
2. At UNR they are contemplating cuts to math, which provides more student credit hours than anybody else. For one reason, they are the universal function to other departments. Secondly, for engineering and others you must have math and they rely on them heavily. It would seem that this would be the appropriate use of some of the differential fee money that engineering is to receive. They might step up and take some share of the burden.
3. The other concern is that the campuses should be emptying their rainy day funds. Nevada is in the worst shape ever. We need to really assure that even though things may not be better in two years, now is the time to draw down the reserves.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

4. Besides fund balances, we have land assets. The System needs to be looking at some of the hard assets. He recognized that going forward things may be different and we should respond to the circumstances with initiatives and considerations in this area.
5. Bridging Plan –When you bring in national class scholars for open positions, there are substantial salary costs plus three to eight times the salary costs in startup research funding. While we must build for the future, at this point the universities may have to take a breather from this approach. The universities may have to consider a bridging strategy for two to three years of using a lecturer’s services at 2/3 the salary and overhead cost and with no startup funding for the research laboratory.

Regent Knecht believed they had reached a point that some triage has to be done to find a way to get through the next few years. These are five substantive ways that should be considered.

Regent Melcher noted he had in hand a letter dated April 5, 2011, from the Independence Valley, North Fork 4-H Club, that contains a message to Governor Sandoval and others (*on file in the Board Office*). Regent Melcher noted that the following paragraph was very disconcerting to him.

“We write this letter to you asking for your support of Cooperative Extension Service and the programs they offer. We realize that a budget reduction of the Cooperative Extension Service is inevitable, but would support the 33% budget you have proposed, as opposed to the 72% budget reduction proposed by President Glick.”

Regent Melcher noted that what they were missing is that the 72% is because of the 33% that was proposed by the Governor. The chain reaction of negative activity is exactly something that the System needs to think about when addressing these issues. People do not understand the whole context of things that are happening.

Regent Melcher asked that restructuring be considered if mergers, consolidations and closures end up happening. It is very possible that since GBC services all the way from the Idaho border to Pahrump, that maybe it would be efficient for GBC to pick up other areas, in service areas of the other institutions for minimal expense. The System needs to look at a way to salvage through restructuring.

Regent Blakely asked that the individuals that are able to develop 100% of their pay be excluded from the salary reductions. He believed that would set a new atmosphere at the colleges, that if you are enterprising, you would be able to keep your salary in its current state. Vice Chancellor Patterson noted that because this was such a specific topic, he recommended that this be a specific item on a future agenda. It might also be more appropriate after the Legislature takes final action.

Regent Anderson briefly echoed the comments about eliminating glossy invitations and reports and believed that it would save money.

4. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Differential Program Fee Proposals - (Agenda Item #7) - The Board of Regents approved the Differential Program Fee proposals of UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk and UNR President Milton D. Glick for their respective graduate level Business programs. (Ref. BOR-7 on file in the Board office).

Regent Geddes moved to approve the UNR and UNLV Differential Program Fee Proposals. Regent Page seconded.

Dr. Michael Bowers, Executive Vice President and Provost at UNLV, and Dr. Marc Johnson, Executive Vice President and Provost at UNR, jointly requested the Board's approval to charge a differential fee of \$100 per credit hour in the MBA programs at both universities. The fee is consistent with Board policy as it is a high cost and high demand program at both universities.

Regent Alden asked if the universities keep this money. Dr. Bowers stated the money stays on campus in the programs themselves. Chancellor Klaich added there is a bill before the legislature that clarifies this. Regent Wixom asked if the Board had the authority to do this. Chancellor Klaich believed the Board was in good shape to approve and to keep the fees for the programs.

Regent Schofield asked about tuition going to general fund. Chancellor Klaich reported there are two bills that have been introduced by Senate Finance that pertain to retaining fees, which will be heard on Monday and he will be there to testify in favor of those measures. Chancellor Klaich stated he met with the Senate Majority Leader and told him just how critical these were to the agenda as well as the overall study of the formula that is integral to these. He was confident that these bills would be processed satisfactorily.

In response to Regent Crear, Dr. Bowers indicated that this is a permanent change.

Motion carried.

5. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees - (Agenda Item #8) - The Board approved a revision to the language in the Procedures & Guidelines Manual (*Chapter 7, Section 7E*) to base summer registration fees on the amounts charged in the following fall rather than the previous spring (Ref. BOR-8 on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved to approve the Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees. Regent Geddes seconded.

Vice Chancellor Stevens noted that summer school fees are self-supporting fees and are not placed into the state general fund, except for a few of the nursing enrollment dollars. Chancellor Klaich stated they do keep all the money, except for some nursing fees because the System is partially funded for those. Vice Chancellor Stevens noted that the summer term was utilized in meeting the doubled nursing enrollments. Regent Alden

5. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees - (Agenda Item #8) – (Continued)

stated the System wants to keep all of the tuition dollars. Chancellor Klaich stated that normally the state does not subsidize any summer school education, but with the double nursing mandate, it was determined that the System would be able to count the enrollments for state funding. Chancellor Klaich stated it was a net gain for the System.

Motion carried.

6. Approved - Proposed Sale of S-Bar-S Ranch Wadsworth, Nevada - (Agenda Item #9) - -  
The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick's requests for approval of Amendment 3 of the Option Agreement which reduces the sale price of the S-Bar-S Ranch and related water rights by \$250,000 to \$3,466,880. In exchange, NSHE would receive a full release with Buyer assuming all liability for any and all future environmental remediation at the S-Bar-S Ranch. (Ref. BOR-9 and Handout on file in the Board office.)

Regent Alden moved to approve the Proposed Sale of S-Bar-S Ranch Wadsworth, Nevada. Regent Geddes seconded.

Regent Wixom clarified the Board had already approved this, but now they are in the process of adjusting the price to address environmental impact issues. Mr. Zurek noted there is some ground water contamination that still has to be dealt with, so the deal that has been negotiated is that UNR is walking away with no further liabilities at a lower price.

Motion carried.

Regent Cobb asked that the supplemental email from Mr. Zurek, that clarifies some of the issues, be included as part of the record (*on file in the Board office*).

7. Approved - Regents' Scholar Award, CSN - (Agenda Item #10) – The Board approved a Regents' Scholar Award to CSN student Ms. Maryknoll Palisoc. Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15 and Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 2.5 (Ref. BOR-10a and BOR-10b on file in the Board office).

Regent Knecht moved to approve the CSN Regent's Scholar Award. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Page asked about the source of the \$5,000. Regent Knecht stated it was coming from the President's office at CSN. In response to an inquiry by Regent Page, President Richards confirmed that this was the result of a miscommunication.

Regent Doubrava saw the emails and understood how the error had been made, but then asked if CSN should not be allowed to have a Regent's Scholar Award the following year. Chairman Leavitt noted that was not an agenda item for discussion.

7. Approved - Regents' Scholar Award, CSN - (Agenda Item #10) – (Continued)

Regent Knecht stated that there is a \$5,000 cost for this Regent Scholar, but the institution is paying that cost and he believed that this was incentive to not making this mistake again.

Motion carried.

8. Approved - Chancellor's Task Force to Review PEBP Recommendations and Reform - (Agenda Item #5) - The Board approved acceptance of the Chancellor's PEBP Task Force report and to direct the Chancellor to convey the recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature. (Ref. BOR-5a, BOR-5b and BOR-5c on file in the Board office).

Chancellor Klaich expressed his appreciation to Mr. Bomotti for taking on this task force. Mr. Bomotti stated the task force members did an excellent job. One of the things they did was look at the existing data to try and find out where the current health care programs for NSHE compared to various groups. They looked at national public institutions of higher education and what the current existing programs are for employees today and what they will look like in July. In most cases they were able to establish what they had on a calendar year basis and what they were proposing in calendar year 2011. They found in general the PEBP program that we participate in now is about average with most comparatives. For other public employers in the state they were lower. In other regional universities they were closer to the average, but in no cases above the average. When they looked at what the PEBP would offer July 1, 2011, in all cases everything dropped significantly to the point that consultants said that unless the premiums for PEBP significantly dropped with the new programs, that we would be at a competitive disadvantage when compared to the national and custom data. It is fair to say that the System does not have cadillac type health care programs and we are at a competitive disadvantage beginning on July 1, 2011.

The task force also looked at the entire benefit package and determined that PEBP is about 7 ¼% points below the average institutions. At this time there are approximately 8,300 employees in NSHE that participate in the health care program out of 8,500 total. There are two programs, the PPO and HMO. The majority are in the PPO.

The major changes include rate changes and that the north and the south were pooled together, which led to higher increases for the participants in the south. The PPO option moved to a consumer driven health plan, which is basically tied with a health savings account option, and a high deductible. The biggest change is prescription drugs under the new PPO, because they will now be out of pocket until the high deductible is hit. The vision program went to an exam only program. There is a new spouse rule, that if your spouse has the opportunity or is eligible to participate in his/her employer's health program, then they were not eligible to be covered under the PEBP program.

The task force felt strong that it is important there not just be an episodic review of health care programs, but instead that the System needs some focused attention through a benefit programs task force or committee. The task force was also able to obtain from PEBP three years of detailed experience data for the employees. They felt it was

8. Approved - Chancellor's Task Force to Review PEBP Recommendations and Reform - (Agenda Item #5) – (Continued)

important to analyze that data to understand where they are for the larger pool and therefore what the options may be. They also include the option that the Board could structurally offer a supplemental health care program to employees if in fact they could find the funds and have those available. The last recommendation was that the System should look at alternatives to PEBP. There are many rules and regulations pertaining to this, but other employers have successfully left the program. The Clark County School District (CCSD) is one that did leave PEBP. They reviewed what happened to them after they left. They split into three groups; the teachers who were in a similar program to PEBP, and the other two groups bought a fully insured program. At this time the CCSD has better programs and better options for less money. CCSD has negotiated their rates at a deep discount. The task force thought a good option would be to test a pilot privatization model for NSHE.

Regent Page moved to accept the Chancellor's PEBP Task Force report and to direct the Chancellor to convey the recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature. Regent Crear seconded.

Regent Alden referred to the letter that states the System cannot leave the PEBP program. Mr. Bomotti thought that according to the *NRS* there are different criteria that would allow a program to leave the PEBP program. Programs have left with some sort of legislative action. Chairman Leavitt stated the Board would pursue this because it could result in substantial cost savings.

Motion carried.

9. Information Only - System Credit Rating - (Agenda Item #6) – The Board discussed the recent downgrading of the State's credit ratings to the extent such action may have implications for costs and constraints that NSHE will face, and discussed and considered recent actions of credit-rating agencies in regard to the System's own credit ratings and perceived creditworthiness (*Ref. BOR-6 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Knecht reported that the state's bond rating has been downgraded by Moody's and the System has been placed on credit watch for a possible downgrade. This issue is very important, because credit worthiness and bond rating basically affects your interest costs even if you don't have any near term bond issues. If the System is downgraded at this point and go out in a year with a lower rating there will be higher interest costs going forward.

Moody's and other credit rating agencies are concerned about bond holders and bankers, who extend credit to parties such as us. They are really looking for coverage of the debt service obligations by the current revenues. To some extent they use metrics, such as coverage ratios. Regent Knecht believed that the System should reach out to the bond and credit rating agencies and let them know that we care about our credit worthiness and



9. Information Only - System Credit Rating - (Agenda Item #6) – (Continued)

want to assure it. Among the things that the System needs to emphasize is that the System's source of funds goes beyond state general funds, because if you read the materials received they cite things such as problems with the state general fund. We need to let them know especially that the increase in fees and tuition will bring in more revenues to cover such debt obligations, but as of this fiscal year the System's self-supporting revenues are now the largest source of revenues. The System has significant sources of revenue.

Regent Knecht suggested that the staff be instructed to actively communicate with Moody's to make sure that we present the best possible case that we can. The reason this is timely and urgent is that they normally have a 90 day window, and the system is within that 90 day window.

Chairman Leavitt did not believe they needed a motion because the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Stevens were working on this. Mr. Nash reiterated that the discussions with the agencies are important. They have kept them apprised and at the 90 day window informed them that they would like to wait and see what action is taken by the Governor and the Regents, and then report back once decisions have been made.

Regent Knecht noted that the stability of our total revenues is not apparent to the agencies and he felt that it should be pointed out. If progress is made on the initiatives being considered in the Legislature now regarding carry-forward, budget flexibility and the Letter of Intent, it will only be a positive for the System.

Regent Page agreed and he thought it was important to have Regent Knecht work with staff when talking with Moody's. Regent Knecht added that when people from top management reach out to the credit rating agencies it does make an impact on the credit ratings. It sends a signal that you are vitally concerned.

Regent Melcher heard that they are watching the Regents and how they react to what the state is doing and asked for clarification. Mr. Nash noted that the credit watch is a 90 day window where they are signaling that they are going to make a change in the credit rating. In this case they have indicated it would be downward. The System is generally rated based on the state's rating given the large amount of support received from the state.

Chairman Leavitt noted that if the economic forum numbers come out higher this will also impact this issue.

10. Approved - Board of Regents Special Meeting Dates - Calendar Year 2011 and 2012 - (Agenda Item #13) -The Board approved tentative special meeting dates for Board of Regents' meetings in calendar years 2011 and 2012 to supplement the regularly scheduled Board meetings. (Ref. BOR-13 on file in the Board office):

- May 6, 2011
- May 18, 2011 @ 1:00 p.m.
- July 29, 2011
- October 21, 2011
- January 20, 2012
- April 20, 2012
- July 20, 2012
- October 19, 2012

Regent Cobb requested that the special meeting for May 20<sup>th</sup> be considered for May 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Wasserman noted that the item is partly a result from the request at the last Board meeting to schedule potential special meetings between the quarterly meetings so they could be added to calendars. The first two schedules meetings are outside of that scope. They were put on the calendar to take care of any issues that may arise as the legislative session is closing. There also may be a need to meet by the end of April if the Legislature wants to hear the Board's recommendation on redistricting in that time frame.

Chairman Leavitt asked if there was any opposition to moving the proposed May 20<sup>th</sup> date to May 19<sup>th</sup>. Regent Page and Regent Anderson had conflicts on May 19<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Wasserman offered that May 18<sup>th</sup> was available.

Regent Cobb moved to approve the Calendar Year 2011 and 2012 Board of Regents Special Meeting Dates, with the revision of meeting on May 18<sup>th</sup> rather than May 20<sup>th</sup>, if necessary. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried.

11. Information Only - Report on ACCT 2011 Governance Leadership Institute - (Agenda Item #11) - Regent Andrea Anderson presented a report on her attendance at the ACCT 2011 Governance Leadership Institute that was held in Las Vegas from March 16-18, 2011.

Regent Anderson reported that this was a very good institute. There were approximately 60 participants, with the majority being community college trustees. Six to eight presidents also attended. The presenters and the discussions were excellent.

Regent Anderson noted that they all have the same problems - for example, budget issues and guns on campus. The presenters and the participants agreed that the role of the boards has changed from entirely fiduciary to advocacy. All the boards are doing the same thing focusing on advocacy. They talked about the essentials for Board members; leadership, legal and oversight and student success. This is what all the boards seem to

11. Information Only - Report on ACCT 2011 Governance Leadership Institute - (Agenda Item #11) – (Continued)

be emphasizing. Colleges throughout are now focusing on core values. The extras are going away because of budget concerns. Access and community education are hurting. In dealing with faculty, it came out that the “petty” things really matter. There is nothing too little to talk about when dealing with faculty. The presidents made it very clear that they wanted everything referred back to them. They also suggested that we invite legislators to commencement for advocacy. They talked about developmental education and unfortunately only 15% are successful. Big improvements are needed in this area. They said that we cannot get better if we do not measure. So the trustees need to require results and measurements and inquire about it. Boards have traditionally over the years concentrated on enrollment and not success. That needs to be changed. All the boards want better success rates. They suggest giving adjunct faculty a slight increase in pay if they complete professional development. She thought that was interesting because much of the time adjunct faculty do not have the opportunities or the incentives. The last note is that advising is the key to success; advising needs to be emphasized.

Regent Anderson stated that if the institute comes again, she recommended everyone attend. Regent Anderson stated that talking with the other trustees was very valuable.

12. Information Only - Update on the Regents’ Efficiency and Effectiveness Initiative for the Nevada System of Higher Education - (Agenda Item #4) - Vice Chancellor Bart Patterson reported on the progress of the NSHE business operations review pursuant to the Board's Efficiency and Effectiveness (E&E) initiative.(Handout on file in the Board office).

Regent Geddes stated there was a very good memorandum that Vice Chancellor Patterson put together to explain where they are in the process. If anyone has suggestions please email Regent Geddes, Regent Page or Vice Chancellor Patterson. They will continue down the list looking for places to save.

Regent Knecht noted he did not see any reference in the institutional contingency budget plans, whether they could see the fruits of this initiative yet. Regent Geddes thought there were some in the summary, but they are developing metrics to measure actual cost savings.

13. Information Only - Update on Redistricting and Reapportionment - (Agenda Item #12) - Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief Executive Officer and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, provided an update on census information and redistricting as it pertains to the Board of Regents.(Handout on file in the Board Office.)

Mr. Wasserman noted that the updated census information has been provided to the state and is being provided to members of the public. In addition to receiving public input at the Board of Regents meetings and at legislative meetings, he has also been meeting with interested groups. He testified before the joint legislative committees that have jurisdiction over redistricting to let them know that the Board was progressing and we had received the updated census information. He will be preparing an updated redistricting plan for the Board’s consideration at the May 6<sup>th</sup> Special Board meeting. If the legislative committee needs to hear that plan earlier, the Regents may have to meet prior to May 6<sup>th</sup>.

14. Information Only - New Business - (Agenda Item #14) – Regent Melcher asked that as a Board they schedule a Board Development meeting in the late summer early fall. In doing so he would request that if they have the Board Development meeting that they put together a self-evaluation that each Regent would fill out as a Board member and as a Board as a whole. Chairman Leavitt noted that the duties of Board Development have been assumed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman. When he became Chairman they did an evaluation and review of the Board. He would recommend to the next Chairman that the Chair immediately set a date. Regent Melcher added he has just arrived back from the AGB Conference and he was amazed by how many have these types of meetings.

Chairman Leavitt directed Mr. Wasserman to include an item on the next agenda that would allow Regents Melcher and Doubrava to give an update on the AGB conference that they recently attended.

Chancellor Klaich added that a regular self-assessment is also a criterion for accreditation. The accreditation agencies want to know that the Board does this.

Regent Alden reiterated his request for additional salary reductions, excluding part-time and classified personnel.

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Prepared by: Angela R. Palmer  
Program Officer I

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

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