BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Building D, Room 101
College of Southern Nevada
6375 West Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas
Thursday, March 1, 2012, 8:30 a.m.
Friday, March 2, 2012, 8:30 a.m.

Video Conference Connection to:
System Administration, Reno
2601 Enterprise Road, Conference Room
and
Great Basin College, Elko
1500 College Parkway, Berg Hall Conference Room

Members Present:	Dr. Jason Geddes, Chair Mr. Kevin J. Page, Vice Chair Mr. Mark Alden Dr. Andrea Anderson Mr. Robert Blakely Mr. Cedric Crear Dr. Mark W. Doubrava Mr. Ron Knecht Mr. James Dean Leavitt Mr. Kevin C. Melcher Dr. Jack Lund Schofield Mr. Rick Trachok Mr. Michael B. Wixom
Others Present:	Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mark Stevens Vice Chancellor, Health Sciences System, Marcia Turner Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, Steven Zink Chief of Staff & Special Counsel to the Board, Scott Wasserman Executive Director of Government Relations, Renee Yackira President Michael D. Richards, CSN President Stephen G. Wells, DRI President Lynn Mahlberg, GBC President Bart Patterson, NSC President Maria C. Sheehan, TMCC President Neal J. Smatresk, UNLV President Marc Johnson, UNR President Carol A. Lucey, WNC

Also present were faculty senate chairs Ms. Tracy Sherman, CSN; Dr. Morien Roberts, DRI; Dr. Sarah Negrete, GBC; Dr. Robin Herlands, NSC; Ms. Mary Arbutina, NSHE; Dr. Gregory S. Brown, UNLV; Dr. David Ryfe, UNR; Mr. Brad Summerhill, TMCC; and Mr. Jeffrey Downs, WNC. Student government leaders present included Ms. Aimee Riley, ASCSN President, CSN; Mr. Steve Gronstal; GRAD President, DRI; Mr. Alex Porter, SGA President, GBC; Ms. Makayla Morgan, NSSA President, NSC; Ms. Sarah Saenz, CSUN President, UNLV; Mr. Michael J. Gordon, GPSA President, UNLV; Ms. Stephanie Vega, GSA President, UNR; Mr. Scott Gaddis, SGA President, TMCC; and Ms. Heather Dodson, ASWN President, WNC.

Chair Geddes called the meeting to order on Thursday, March 1, 2012, at 8:32 a.m. with all members present except for Regents Anderson, Knecht and Schofield.

Regent Trachok led the pledge of allegiance.

1. Information - Introductions and Campus Updates *(Agenda Item #1)* – The eight NSHE campus presidents provided campus related updates on events that have occurred since the Board of Regents' last regular meeting.

2. Information - Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations *(Agenda Item #2)* - President Richards introduced Ms. Xelyna Mendoza, Student in CSN's Culinary program as well as Chef Tom Rosenberger, Department Chair of the Hospitality Management Department at CSN and President of the ACF Chefs of Las Vegas *(biographies and presentations on file in the Board office)*.

The meeting recessed at 9:00 a.m. for committee meetings and reconvened at 11:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2012, with all members present.

3. Information - Public Comment *(Agenda Item #3)* - Mr. Bentley McDonald, NSSA Vice President, NSC, addressed the Board in regard to the Nevada for Education initiative *(www.nevadaforeducation.com)*.

4. Information - Chair of the Faculty Senate Chairs Report *(Agenda Item #5)* – Dr. Robin Herlands, Chair of the Faculty Senate Chairs, provided a report to the Board concerning NSHE related issues or events that are of importance to the Faculty Senate Chairs Council including proposed revisions to the curricular review policies as well as work being done on the Access and Affordability Taskforce and the Rigor, Quality and Assessment Taskforce. Dr. Herlands related that the faculty senate chairs ask that the Regents continue to advocate for a resolution to the employee health insurance issues. She stated that the faculty senate chairs have expressed their support of a more transparent, clear and equitable funding formula model in addition to ensuring that the tuition and fees are maintained at the campus levels to allow for innovating and entrepreneurial initiatives on campus.

5. Information - Chancellor's Report *(Agenda Item #6)* - Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich related that Dr. Magdalena Martinez, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, had been one of the top candidates for the position of state superintendent. While she was not selected for the position, he was thrilled to have that level of employee working for the System. Chancellor Klaich deferred the remainder of his report until agenda item #27 *(Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education)*.

6. Information - Board Chair's Report *(Agenda Item #7)* - Chair Jason Geddes discussed current NSHE events and his current activities as Board Chair. Chair Geddes recognized the recent passing of Senator William J. Raggio, adding that Senator Raggio had been a true hero of higher education in the state of Nevada.

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – The Board of Regents approved the following Consent agenda items.

   7a. Approved - Minutes *(Agenda Item #8a)* – The Board of Regents approved the following meeting minutes:
   1) October 14, 2011, UNR President Search Committee *(Ref. BOR-8a(1) on file in the Board office).*
   2) October 21, 2011, special Board of Regents meeting *(Ref. BOR-8a(2) on file in the Board office).*
   3) November 21, 2011, GBC President Search Committee *(Ref. BOR-8a(3) on file in the Board office).*
   4) December 1-2, 2011, regular Board of Regents meeting *(Ref. BOR-8a(4) on file in the Board office).*
   5) December 12, 2011, NSC President Search Committee *(Ref. BOR-8a(5) on file in the Board office.)*

   7a. Approved - Minutes *(Agenda Item #8a)* – *(Cont'd.)*

   Regent Knecht referred to Page 9 of Ref. BOR-8a(2) *(October 21, 2011, special Board of Regents meeting)*, and asked if the side-by-side comparison of need-based and merit-based financial aid in Nevada compared to other states that he had requested would be forthcoming. He also asked that the report include comparison of costs that are informative on all levels. Vice Chancellor Abba replied that most recent data from the fall of 2011 was in the process of being compared and a full report will be presented to the Board at its June 2012 meeting. However, Vice Chancellor Abba indicated that the specific data that Regent Knecht has asked for will be available in the next few weeks.

   Regent Page referred to Page 19 of Ref. BOR-8a(4) *(December 1-2, 2011, regular Board of Regents meeting)* and asked if UNR's Athletics Department's rules interpretation data base had been shared with UNLV as requested. President Johnson indicated that he would confirm if that had occurred.

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Page then referred to Page 20 of Ref. BOR-8a(4) and indicated that he had yet to receive UNR's last NCAA audit report and the most recent NCAA probation report as requested. President Johnson replied that UNR's compliance officer had confirmed that the reports were forwarded the day after the December meeting.

Chair Geddes asked that both reports be provided to Mr. Wasserman so that they may be distributed to the full Board.

Regent Page asked Chancellor Klaich if he had received that report. Chancellor Klaich replied that he did not recall seeing that report.

Regent Knecht asked, although the January minutes of the NSC President Search Committee meeting were not yet available, if the presidential prospectus that was released conformed with the version approved by the committee at its January meeting. Specifically, his question referred to the minimum and preferred position requirements. He asked that in order to preserve the integrity of the process and to keep good faith with the NSC faculty and staff that information and resolution of that request occur in a timely manner.

Mr. Wasserman replied that upon receiving an inquiry regarding the content of that meeting, an audio recording had immediately been made available to NSC. NSC was invited to post the recording directly on their website or on a shared drive for all faculty and staff to access.

Regent Knecht asked for assurance that there was not a mistake on the prospectus, or that something would be done to remedy a mistake if one had been made. Mr. Wasserman indicated that the inquiry he had received had been regarding the motion in general and had not specified that a mistake had been made. However, he would be happy to review the action and specific motion made at that meeting.

Regent Knecht clarified that the question was whether there was a stated minimum qualification in terms of degree attainment or if there were additional preferred degree attainment qualifications. It appeared that the version of the prospectus that had been disseminated did not list a degree requirement, which was contrary to his recollection of the committees' recommendation.

Regent Melcher related that he had been asked that question and had gone to NSC's website to access the prospectus. The question asked of him was that the advertisement did not list the minimum qualifications. However, he felt that was not an issue as any serious candidate would then read the prospectus which clearly states "It is preferred that the presidential candidate hold a Ph.D. from an accredited institution and will have professional experience in higher education."

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – *(Cont'd.)*

7a. Approved - Minutes *(Agenda Item #8a)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Mr. Wasserman confirmed that the version of the prospectus with the degree requirement as read by Regent Melcher was the version on the NSC website.

Dr. Herlands stated that although she was not the faculty member that contacted the Regents, she felt that the discrepancy was that the committees' vote had been that the minimum qualifications be included in the prospectus and the advertisement. She indicated that concern had been addressed with the search firm but not with Mr. Wasserman. Although the printed advertisements could not be changed, the consultant indicated that the internet advertisements could easily be changed.

Regent Page asked who had created the advertisement. Mr. Wasserman recollected that the committee specifically approved the language of the prospectus *(or leadership statement)*. The motion related to advertisement was simply for which publications to advertise in, and did not address the wording. He added that in the UNR and NSC president searches, the responsibility for placing advertisements fell upon the search consultants. In the GBC president search, the responsibility fell to the GBC staff.

Regent Page noted that the consultant selected for NSC's search was at double the cost than the next preferred consultant and therefore he felt that the consultant should spend a little more time on the search.

7b. Approved - Acceptance of Gift, UNR *(Agenda Item #8b)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of UNR President Marc A. Johnson to accept a bronze statue and Craig Sheppard painting which have been bequeathed to the University of Nevada, Reno by Ms. Nena Miller under the Miller Family Trust *(Ref. BOR-8b on file in the Board office).*

7c. Approved - Capital Improvement, Charleston Campus Building "A" Mechanical Replacement, CSN *(Agenda Item #8c)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of CSN President Michael D. Richards to spend $972,000 from CSN's Capital Improvement Fees to replace the mechanical system in Building "A" at the Charleston Campus *(Ref. BOR-8c on file in the Board office).*

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – *(Cont'd.)*

7d. Approved - Capital Improvement, Henderson Campus Building "A" Mechanical Replacement, Csn *(Agenda Item #8d)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of CSN President Michael D. Richards to expend $815,000 from CSN's Capital Improvement Fees to replace the mechanical system which serves Building "A" at the Henderson Campus *(Ref. BOR-8d on file in the Board office)*.

7e. Approved - *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Removal of the MBA Program Professional Development Fee, UNR *(Agenda Item #8e)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of UNR President Marc Johnson for an amendment to the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual*, Chapter 7, Section 8, to remove the MBA Program Professional Development Fee of $250.00 *(Ref. BOR-8e on file in the Board office)*.

7f. Approved - *Handbook* Revision, Grant-In-Aid, General Administration *(Agenda Item #8f)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of Vice Chancellor Mark Stevens to revise the *Handbook* to modify the summer term grant-in-aid calculation *(Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 10.5) (Ref. BOR-8f on file in the Board office)*.

7g. Approved - *Code* Revision, Sexual Harassment *(Agenda Item #8g)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of Interim Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen for a proposed amendment to the Code provisions governing sexual harassment *(Title 2, Ch. 6, Sec. 6.2.5)* which will bring the Code into compliance with the Office of Civil Rights' April 4, 2011, "Dear Colleague" letter, recent Nevada legislation prohibiting discrimination based on gender identity or gender expression, and federal legislation prohibiting discrimination based on genetic information. This is the second hearing at which this Code revision is being presented *(Ref. BOR-8g on file in the Board office)*.

7h. Approved - Appointment to WestED Board of Directors *(Agenda Item #8h)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs Crystal Abba to appoint Dr. Christine Cheney, Dean of the College of Education, UNR, to the WestEd Board of Directors for a three-year term *(June 1, 2012, to May 31, 2015)*. WestEd is a nonprofit research, development and service agency that enhances and increases education and human development within schools, families and communities. The Board of Regents appoints three members of the Board to represent the Nevada System of Higher Education. The terms of the other two members appointed by the Board of Regents will expire on May 31, 2014 *(Ref. BOR-8h on file in the Board office)*.

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – *(Cont'd.)*

7i. Approved - Allocation of Grants-In-Aid, 2012-2013 *(Agenda Item #8i)* – The Board of Regents approved the Grants-In-Aid allocation for academic year 2012-2013. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 396.540 provides for tuition waivers for students from other states and foreign countries based on 3% of each institution's fall headcount enrollment. Board policy provides an equal number of grants-in-aid for Nevada students and requires that the total number of grants-in-aid allocated to each NSHE institution be approved annually by the Board. The recommended allocations are for academic year 2012-2013 and represent the total number each institution could award. In all cases, funding is not sufficient to support the maximum allowable number of grants-in-aid:

	IN-STATE	OUT-OF-STATE
UNR	545	545
UNLV	792	792
NSC	96	96
CSN	1,164	1,164
GBC	106	106
TMCC	348	348
WNC	128	128

7j. Approved – Tenure *(Agenda Item #8j)* – The Board of Regents approved the following recommendations for tenure of faculty members made by the Presidents of the NSHE institutions. Each applicant meets the standards for tenure in the NSHE Code and has been positively recommended by his or her institution following a peer review process.

CSN – *(Ref. BOR-8j(1) on file in the Board office)*
Mr. William Truax Frost
Mr. Matthew Mahrt
Dr. Heidi Porter
Ms. Michelle Scher
Dr. Gillian Silver-Rodis
Mr. Jeffrey Wagner

GBC – *(Ref. BOR-8j(2) on file in the Board office)*
Mr. Norman Whittaker

NSC – *(Ref. BOR-8j(3) on file in the Board office)*
Dr. Lawrence Rudd

TMCC – *(Ref. BOR-8j(4) on file in the Board office)*
Ms. Joy F. Alverson
Ms. Nancy Brewster-Meredith
Ms. Dolores M. Wonder

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – *(Cont'd.)*

7j. Approved – Tenure *(Agenda Item #8j)* – *(Cont'd.)*

UNLV – *(Ref. BOR-8j(5) on file in the Board office)*

Dr. Ernesto Abel-Santos
Dr. Janelle M. Bailey
Dr. Anthony Barone
Mr. Stephen Bates
Dr. Michele C. Clark
Dr. David Copeland
Ms. Kristen Costello
Ms. Darcy DelBosque
Dr. Kaushik Ghosh
Mr. Patrick Griffis
Dr. Timothy C. Hart
Dr. Jean L. Hertzman
Dr. Yen-Soon Kim
Mr. Taras Krysa
Mr. Cory Lampert
Dr. Mark J. Lutz
Dr. Scheniz Moonie
Ms. Susan Mueller
Mr. Aly Said
Mr. Sang-Duck Seo
Dr. Julie Staggers
Dr. Ralf Sudowe
Dr. Michelle Tannock
Dr. Cortney S. Warren
Dr. Jessica Word

UNR – *(Ref. BOR-8j(6) on file in the Board office)*

Dr. Patricia Berninsome
Dr. Fiona Britton
Ms. Teresa Byington
Dr. Catherine Chaput
Dr. Christian Conte
Dr. Daniel Cook
Ms. Cari Cunningham
Dr. Eelke Folmer
Dr. Xabier Irujo
Ms. Eunkang Koh
Dr. Elizabeth Leger
Dr. Qizhen Li
Ms. Anne Lindsay
Dr. Bernadette Longo
Dr. Eleni Oikonomidoy
Dr. Sonja Pippin
Dr. Mahasin Saleh
Dr. Gregory Stone
Dr. Vaidyanatham Subramanian
Dr. Michael Teglas
Dr. George Thomas
Dr. Wei-Chen Tung
Dr. Jonathan Weinstein
Dr. Murat Yuksel
Dr. Wei Yang

WNC
None submitted.

Regent Trachok moved approval of the consent agenda in its entirety. Regent Leavitt seconded. Motion carried. Regent Wixom was absent.

8. Information - Chair of the Nevada Student Alliance Report *(Agenda Item #4)* – Ms. Aimee Riley, Chair of the Nevada Student Alliance, provided a report to the Board concerning NSHE related issues including the establishment of permanent early voting locations on NSHE campuses, the formation of an internal committee to update stances and coordinate student presence on the Interim Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education and the Access and to maintain a presence on the Access and Affordability Taskforce.

8. Information - Chair of the Nevada Student Alliance Report *(Agenda Item #4)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Ms. Riley stated that the NSA has expressed concern regarding what is felt to be a trend in the reduction of access to higher education. She stated that education is the key to innovation, job creation and the answer to economic issues. Businesses are looking for a skilled and educated workforce. Employers do not have to engage in as much training and employees can hit the ground running. Ms. Riley reminded the System that the non-traditional student model makes up a significant portion of the student body in Nevada. There should not be the expectation that all citizens perform at the same level. She stated that the System needs to ensure that meaningful and quality degrees and certificates are available and stackable. She acknowledged that everyone concerned is working hard towards resolution of the issues.

9. Information - NCAA Division I Joint Presentation by UNLV and UNR *(Agenda Item #9)* - Ms. Cary Groth, Athletic Director, UNR and Mr. Jim Livengood, Athletic Director, UNLV, presented for information an overview of NCAA Division I Intercollegiate Athletics programs at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the University of Nevada, Reno *(Ref. BOR-9 on file in the Board office),* including percentage of public and private school membership, football bowl game subdivisions and requirements, sport sponsorship, scheduling and attendance, finances, grant-in-aid expenditures, revenue and conference distribution, budgets and Title IX information.

Regent Wixom asked why UNLV counts paid attendance while UNR counts actual attendees. Ms. Groth replied that the NCAA allows attendance to be counted either way as long as there is a minimum of 15,000 attendees. Mr. Livengood replied that the answer is simply because it has always been done that way, adding that it probably would make more sense for both schools to count attendance the same way.

Regent Wixom asked what the implications were in determining how attendance is counted. Regent Wixom felt that by itself, only reporting one of those numbers may create an information gap. He asked it was possible for both schools to report both numbers. Mr. Livengood indicated that various factors such as exceptional pre-season ticket sales or the number of wins versus losses will create a perception that either number can appear more positive.

Regent Wixom noted that the presentation indicates that seven percent of Division I teams operate in the black which implied that 93 percent of teams operate in the red. He asked how much of that revenue distribution is governed by NCAA rules and how much is dictated by conference alignment. Mr. Livengood replied that NCAA Division I football is the only sport not governed by the NCAA in terms of distribution, adding that the NCAA only governs compliance. NCAA Division I football is really governed by the 120 schools in the conference and those schools determine the revenue distribution.

Regent Wixom asked if that meant that 10 percent of the schools then determine the distribution. Ms. Groth and Mr. Livengood clarified that the distribution is determined by a governing board.

9. Information - NCAA Division I Joint Presentation by UNLV and UNR *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Wixom asked who comprised the governing board. Ms. Groth and Mr. Livengood explained that the board is made up of the presidents of all eleven conferences but specifically weighted to what is referred to as the BCS *(Bowl Champion Series)* standings.

Ms. Groth added that it is important to note that 80 percent of the NCAA's revenue comes from the men's basketball television contract. The NCAA has a fair and equitable revenue distribution plan. However, in the BCS the football distribution is heavily weighted towards those BCS schools *(involving only six conferences)*.

Regent Wixom felt that, by and large, the NSHE is part of the 93 percent that is operating in the red. He was frustrated that nearly two thirds of Division I schools are funded by taxpayers. Taxpayers are in essence providing the infrastructure for the entire football conference while at the same time allowing a board to dictate who gets the revenue. Since the schools have signed up together, two-thirds of which are public institutions supported by taxpayer dollars, it has created an infrastructure that provides immense amounts of money that benefits approximately ten percent of the schools.

As a Board and System, Regent Wixom asked what could be done other than realigning conferences. Mr. Livengood replied that is precisely the AQ *(automatic qualifying)* and non-AQ BCC discussion. If every institutional board across the country asked that question, Mr. Livengood felt the 93 percent of schools operating in the red would have more of this type of discussion.

Regent Wixom felt that it was owed to the taxpayers to raise this issue collectively and band together in a potential class action lawsuit. He related that as he has watched and learned over the last seven years, the more infuriated he has become with the nonsense. He publicly stated that he would support joining a class action lawsuit with other boards and trustees. Regent Wixom added that the problem, particularly with football, becomes exasperated with conference realignment which dresses up the issue instead of addressing it. In essence, he felt that taxpayers will be underwriting the entire athletic system for the benefit of a few schools which he felt was completely unsustainable.

Regent Knecht thanked Regent Wixom for asking those questions. He particularly liked Regent Wixom's last point that the current funding system is unsustainable. He asked how a governance system in which there are 120 schools ended up with the monopoly. Mr. Livengood did not feel it was given by anyone but that it was taken, which was the crux of the problem. He noted that six conferences represent only 60 to 65 of the 120 schools that play at the Division I level. However, those 60 to 65 schools are the more powerful schools.

Regent Knecht asked if those six conferences are vulnerable to federal anti-trust action like professional sports. Mr. Livengood replied that although he does not feel that congressional action is always the answer, in this particular case he felt that it may be the only resolution.

9. Information - NCAA Division I Joint Presentation by UNLV and UNR *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Knecht indicated that he had never thought of conferences as being eleemosynary ventures and agreed that congressional action or litigation was necessary.

Regent Knecht referenced the chart handed out *(on file in the Board office)*, and noted that UNR's total revenue was approximately $21 M and UNLV's was approximately $34 M. He asked if FY 2010/11 was more or less representative of the last three or four years. Ms. Groth and Mr. Livengood replied that it was. On that basis, Regent Knecht asked that the revenues be broken down for the fiscal year into three categories: state general fund; state "other;" and self-sustaining. Mr. Livengood requested that staff be given time to prepare that information and submit it to the Board.

Regent Knecht also asked for disposition of spending by sport. Mr. Livengood replied that he would be happy to provide that information as well.

Chancellor Klaich asked that the universities work together to report the same informational categories to the Board.

Regent Knecht stated that the Board needed to be accountable to taxpayers and voters and that the decisions being made are in the best interest of the constituents. In that context, he did not have a conceptual issue with non-academic events if standards of fairness and efficiency were met. He agreed that athletics builds character and community. Although he understood the problems and limitations of offering sports programs, to see the minor sports such as cross country, fencing, wrestling and so forth eliminated or underfunded makes the entire venture much more unattractive for him. He asked that Ms. Groth and Mr. Livengood return with a proposal to bring back a wide range of sports beyond the number required by NCAA Title IX requirements.

Mr. Livengood agreed with Regent Knecht, adding that both universities want to provide as many sports as possible. However, the problem is with the funding base since there is a dependence on the revenue that the sports generate.

Regent Page also agreed with Regent Wixom and asked that this item be further discussed on a future agenda. He also requested that attendance reporting be consistent between the schools.

Regent Page noted that in the December 1-2, 2011, regular Board of Regents meeting minutes *(Ref. BOR-8a(4))*, he had expressed his surprise at not having been previously informed that UNR was on NCAA probation prior to that day. At that time, Ms. Groth related that the action had been taken four years ago. However, Regent Page referred to the NCAA University of Nevada, Reno Public Infractions Report *(22 pages)* published March 18, 2010, in which the event was referred to. He indicated that he remains surprised that the Board had not been made aware of the report or action. Ms. Groth explained that there had been an initial report four years ago that UNR had appealed. The report that Regent Page is referring to is the final report from the NCAA and that she would be happy to provide him with the full information.

9. Information - NCAA Division I Joint Presentation by UNLV and UNR *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Page disagreed with Ms. Groth on the timeline. The March 18, 2010, report indicates that the first documentation received was in 2007. Ms. Groth stated that she would be happy to provide a timeline.

Regent Page clarified that he was not asking for documentation but rather for an explanation as to why it was felt unimportant to provide the information to the Board at the time of the issue. Ms. Groth replied that she would have to review the minutes of the Board to determine what had occurred and asked for time to pull that timeline together.

Regent Page indicated that he had been on the Board during that time and had never received that information. He asked the Regents if any had received the information. Regent Alden confirmed that he had not received the information.

Regent Leavitt asked if staff received sufficient direction to return at a future meeting with information on potential litigation or other possible steps to address the NCAA distribution issue.

Chair Geddes clarified that he had heard a request for two different issues: 1) that the Chancellor and Athletic Directors bring back to the Board information on possible litigation in regard to NCAA distribution; and 2) an item to address when and what information is reported to the Board.

Regent Blakely felt that it would be too ambitious of Nevada to take on the larger schools, and expressed concern for being involved in something like that. He asked how combining the Mountain West Conference and Conference USA will benefit the schools. Mr. Livengood felt that there was no question that combining those conferences would help the schools in creating a different mix of schools but also in resource acquisition. However, he indicated that it was uncertain just how much help it would be.

Regent Blakely felt that it was more beneficial to pursue conference realignment or changes rather than NCAA distribution.

Regent Crear felt that it was more important for reporting to occur from the athletic directors to the presidents and then from the presidents to the Board. President Johnson related that it was typical for that type of information to be relayed to the Board in the form of a Regents Alert.

Regent Wixom clarified that he was not suggesting that Nevada take on the larger schools. However, he was suggesting that the System find out what its options are in conjunction with other boards. He endorsed conference realignment as a positive move, but felt that it was not a sufficient move. Until the 97 percent of schools that are underwriting the three percent step up and say that the unfair distribution practices need to stop, nothing will change and taxpayer dollars will continue to underwrite and fund a very small percentage of students.

9. Information - NCAA Division I Joint Presentation by UNLV and UNR *(Agenda Item #9) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Alden stated that although not a criticism of UNR, every UNLV athletic director has reported to the Board any NCAA violations and have taken that reporting seriously.

The meeting recessed at 12:27 p.m. and reconvened at 1:03 p.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2012, with all members present.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10)* – The Board of Regents approved policy changes regarding intercollegiate athletics. Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs Crystal Abba presented proposed revisions to the current policies governing intercollegiate athletics including the requiring of Board approval of initial and subsequent contracts for athletic directors and head coaches of football and men's and women's basketball; clarifying the Board's role in athletic searches; requiring Board approval of changes in an institution's athletic conference membership; requiring annual reports to the Board; authorizing the Presidents to approve certain contracts; and revising other policies related to athletics *(Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.4.2 and Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23) (Ref. BOR-10 on file in the Board office).*

Chancellor Klaich stated that this was the second hearing for this *Handbook* and *Code* revision.

Vice Chancellor Abba related that the proposed revisions were discussed at the December 2011 meeting with most of the recommendations based on a report presented by Dr. Joe Crowley at the September 2011 meeting in addition to recommendations from the *AGB (Association of Governing Boards) Statement on Board Responsibilities for Intercollegiate Athletics.*

Vice Chancellor Abba indicated that an additional change proposed at the December 2011 meeting had not made it to the version before the Board that day. Specifically, the Board's concern was that allowing regents to provide nominations was allowing them, to some extent, interaction in the hiring process. To address those concerns, it was recommended that Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.c. *(Page 5 of Ref. BOR-10)* be amended to reflect the AGB's policy and to read as "Boards and Board members should not be directly involved in the process of hiring and firing coaches, athletic directors or other athletic personnel."

In addition, Vice Chancellor Abba related that the revisions address Board approval for changes in athletic conferences, provides clear requirements for accountability and annual reporting to the Board in regard to intercollegiate athletics and deletes specific NCAA academic requirements and inserts general language requiring adherence to all applicable NCAA academic requirements for eligibility.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Alden moved approval of the revisions as presented with an additional amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.c to read *"Boards and Board members should not be directly involved in the process of hiring and firing coaches, athletic directors or other athletic personnel."* Regent Trachok seconded.

Regent Trachok asked if the proposed amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.c would replace both sentences with just the one. Vice Chancellor Abba confirmed that the proposed amendment would delete the two sentences that currently appear in subsection c and would then be replaced with the single new sentence *"Boards and Board members should not be directly involved in the process of hiring and firing coaches, athletic directors or other athletic personnel."*

Regent Trachok asked if it would accomplish the same end to revise the existing second sentence to read "*Board members may not nominate candidates, ~~but~~ and shall not serve formally or informally on search committees or attempt to influence the search process in any manner."* Vice Chancellor Abba replied that would accomplish the same end.

Regent Trachok offered a friendly amendment to retain the first sentence and revise the existing second sentence to read "*Board members may not nominate candidates, ~~but~~ and shall not serve formally or informally on search committees or attempt to influence the search process in any manner."*

Regent Alden accepted the friendly amendment.

Regent Melcher felt that Regent Trachok's friendly amendment made the intent of the policy more clear.

Regent Crear disagreed that it was a conflict for regents to nominate individuals and that limiting a regents' ability to nominate qualified individuals was wrong. He agreed that regents should not be involved in the interview process but felt that making a recommendation was something that Board members should be able to do as part of the job.

Regent Melcher agreed with Regent Wixom's comments from the last meeting *(Page 19 of Ref. BOR-8a(4))* and read them into the record "*Regent Wixom felt that forwarding an inquiry is different from making a formal nomination or endorsement, adding that a formal nomination or endorsement would imply that a regent has become part of the process, which would create a conflict of interest."* Regent Melcher agreed that forwarding a name did not constitute a formal nomination.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Wixom felt that Regent Crear was referring to a regent's ability to forward a name, which was different than making a formal nomination and thereby injecting the regents into the hiring process. Regent Melcher agreed.

Regent Blakely indicated his support of Regent Crear's comments. He supported Vice Chancellor Abba's proposed amendment because it came directly from the AGB. Also, he felt that it was within a Board member's purview to submit nominations. He felt that Regent Trachok's friendly amendment reduced his rights as a Regent.

Regent Trachok explained that suggesting a name is different than nominating a person.

Regent Crear felt that there needed to be a clear definition of what it means to forward a name versus making a formal nomination. He felt that it was important not to limit a Regent's ability to forward a name.

Regent Knecht questioned what the issue is with a member of the Board publicly or privately recommending or advocating someone for a position. He noted that the overall context was that the Board is subject to implied and strictly interpreted open meeting and public disclosure laws. He felt that there was no possibility in a practical sense, for a Regent to secretly enter into the hiring process by advocating a person. He felt that lack of transparency was the issue, not that someone will advocate in good cause or good faith. He asked what possible conflict of interest there could be with a Regent forwarding a name.

Chancellor Klaich stated that once elected to the Board, a Regent is no longer a regular person. If a Regent is saying to one of the presidents that it would be a great idea to hire a certain individual as dean of instruction, he would think that the normal reaction by the president could well be that they received a message not to make that Regent unhappy by not hiring that person. He felt that it was well of everyone to remember that good cause or good faith may be set aside and that advocating for a particular candidate may chill the right for the hiring body to independently make its selection.

Mr. Wasserman stated that under the conflict of interest law, elected officials cannot use undue influence for the employment of anyone, publicly or privately. Consistent with his advice in the past, he supports the Regents ability to nominate individuals for positions outside of the System. However, as the System's governing board, when making a formal recommendation or suggestion for a position within the System, it is difficult for a president or any employee to look at the regent as an individual and not as their boss.

Regent Knecht agreed with Chancellor Klaich that issues of good faith and cause could be set aside, adding that he could even entertain the notion that it could happen on a less than honorable basis. He felt that there was greater integrity to the process by allowing people to show their cards than by formally inhibiting them from saying so. He asked Mr. Wasserman to restate the statutory requirement of the conflict of interest laws.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Mr. Wasserman stated that the conflict of interest statutes prohibit a public officer from using undue influence including the securing of employment for another, adding that retribution would also be inappropriate, unethical and illegal and would still be under the conflict of interest statutes. Secondly, Mr. Wasserman acknowledged that the advice he provides to the Regents will always be a conservative reading of the laws. He felt that it is his job to keep Regents out of those types of situations, and up to that point, the Regents have followed his advice. In the specific issue being discussed, he felt that a Regent could merely pass along a name with no formal nomination or endorsement being made.

Regent Knecht felt that Mr. Wasserman was assuming and defining before-the-fact-advocacy as undue influence. However, he felt that no one had provided a compelling argument as to why that assumption should be made. Regent Knecht felt that a Regent does not leave their rights at the door when taking office. Secondly, Regent Knecht felt that cases of retribution did not come so cut and dry as to provide an open and shut case and that retribution happened in more subtle forms. He understood that Mr. Wasserman provides the most conservative advice.

Regent Wixom felt that Regents do give up certain rights as elected members of a Board that entails voluntarily submission to the open meeting law which they would not otherwise be subjected to as private citizens. Secondly, although this is not an academic issue, it has occurred in the past and needs to be addressed not as a hypothetical issue but as one that needs to be prevented from reoccurring. Third, Regent Wixom stated that it was important not to mix legal and policy issues. From a policy perspective, institutions will often create procedures under which supervisory individuals will not dictate what happens in terms of employment at other levels in order to protect the integrity of the process. Regent Wixom felt that nothing being discussed or done prohibits information from being passed on. However, the Board is trying to craft policy that will protect the integrity of the Board and of the process.

Regent Melcher agreed with Regent Wixom and appreciated Mr. Wasserman's counsel. He also agreed with Chancellor Klaich that although being an elected official is a great honor, they do give up some rights as private citizens but do take on what he perceived the most significant responsibility of hiring the presidents and chancellor. He related that when asked, he declines to make personal recommendations for individuals telling them that it may not always help them to appear to have a Regent's support.

Regent Knecht acknowledged that Regents give up certain rights when elected. However, he did not feel that it logically followed that Regents must also embrace giving up the right of expression. He believed that the question before the Board is how the integrity of the Board and the process could be promoted. He agreed with Regent Melcher that it is not always a good thing to have someone's recommendation and that is where discretion of both the Regent and the individual to be recommended is necessary.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Blakely objected to the wording in Regent Trachok's friendly amendment but expressed support for Vice Chancellor Abba's wording contained in the original motion.

Regent Crear asked if the sentence could address that a Regent can make a recommendation but not a nomination.

Given the Board's discussion, the intent of Regent Trachok's friendly amendment and the advice provided, Mr. Wasserman suggested that the amended language be as follows, *"A Regent may refer the name of a potential candidate but shall not endorse or formally nominate a candidate, and shall not serve formally or informally on search committees or attempt to influence the search process in any manner."*

Regents Alden and Trachok accepted the friendly amendment.

Regent Crear related that another impetus of the policy revision had been UNR's exiting the Western Athletic Conference without bringing it to the attention of the Board despite the institution having to pay a $5 M exit fee. Now, UNR and UNLV are both leaving the Mountain West Conference and while going to the same conference it is a different conference. He was not stating that the presidents have done anything wrong as they have done what Board policy allows them to do. Yet recently UNLV signed a formation agreement to enter into a new conference and there is no agenda item to seek approval of the Board. He understood that there was consultation with the Chancellor and Board Chair. However, he felt that the formation agreement should have been brought to the full Board.

Regent Crear referred to the second sentence of Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e. *(Page 5 of Ref. BOR-10)* that states "*In the event of rapid changes in conference configuration, an exception may be granted in this necessity for Board approval, and the Chancellor, after consultation with the Board of Regents Chair, may approve a change in athletic conference affiliation."* He felt that sentence was ambiguous at best and recommended that it be stricken and replaced with one that requires all changes in conference affiliation be brought to the full Board.

Regent Crear felt that without an agendized item to allow Board discussion he and his constituents were denied a voice, adding that athletic conference changes involved major and highly public decisions. Although he was not against the formation agreement, he felt that a decision should have been delayed until after discussion of the policy at that day's meeting.

President Smatresk stated that there had been no intent on the part of himself or President Johnson not to discuss the formation agreement, nor to unduly inform the Board of the decision. Regent Crear restated that he was not implying that the presidents had done anything wrong. However, he felt that the policy in general should be changed.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

President Smatresk explained that for the type of situation involved, it was critical to have a rapid response format. He stated that due to the open meeting requirements of the Nevada System of Higher Education, there is no such thing as an executive or closed session in which legally sensitive information can be shared in a confidential manner. With that preface, he explained that the conference landscape was changing rapidly for the Mountain West Conference, Conference USA and other larger conferences that involved daily situations with very high stakes entry and exit fees being paid out.

President Smatresk stated that one month ago, when agenda items were due, there was no formation agreement. Additionally, he indicated that he had not even been sure as recently as last Monday if there would be a formation agreement. He has worked with system legal counsel, Chair Geddes and Chancellor Klaich to forge ahead with the agreement. It had become clear to him that the situation could have resulted in UNR and UNLV no longer being founding members of a conference but reduced to members requesting entry into another conference after having had its own conference dissolved around them. He emphasized that was an important fact to keep in mind. From the universities' perspective, it was critical to proceed with the actions that had been taken. He felt that in any ordinary course, the entry or exist of a school from a conference would be brought to the Board for full and complete discussion. However, the current circumstances were extraordinary. Although he acknowledged that may sound like a somewhat weak explanation, he would state that it is a unique and extraordinary time in conference athletics. Although certain issues remained unresolved with the agreement, he believed that it was now available for public inspection.

Chair Geddes added that when this situation was brought forward, the actions of other boards were taken into consideration. He asked if those other boards were restricted under open meeting laws or if executive sessions were held that allowed for a frank discussion not allowed under Nevada's open meeting law. President Smatresk replied that it varied.

Regent Crear felt that special meetings were held for all types of things. The issues and ramifications of these types of situations involve multimillion dollar decisions. He felt that it was backwards not to allow this Board input on a $5 M decision to exit an athletic conference but yet it could discuss a $40,000 contract. He recognized that in all worlds it would be great if chief executive officers did not have to go to their boards for approval. However, the Board of Regents exists for a certain reason and he felt that providing input on those types of decisions was one of those reasons.

Regent Leavitt expressed support for most of Regent Crear's opinion with the exception that there needed to be an exception due to Nevada's open meeting law. He did not see any other way that the policy could be written in light of that open meeting law.

Chair Geddes indicated that a special meeting can be posted within four days. He also noted that time-sensitive employment contracts come to the Board, pending the Boards ratification. He asked if the policy could be amended to reflect that type of approval scenario.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Crear felt that however it is done the Board should be allowed final decision.

Regent Trachok indicated that he understood Regent Crear's concerns and felt that the Board should be involved in the process. However, he was also sensitive to the time frames involved. He suggested that the second sentence of Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e. *(Page 5 of Ref. BOR-10)* be amended to read "*In the event of rapid changes in conference configuration, an exception may be granted in this necessity for Board approval, and the Chancellor~~, after consultation with~~ and the Board of Regents Chair~~,~~ may approve a change in athletic conference affiliation.*" He felt that would allow the Board to delegate that approval to the Board Chair in those special circumstances.

Regent Knecht also shared Regent Crear's concerns, adding that the exceptions may be swallowing the rule and that would continue in the current world of rapid changing athletic conferences. He felt that Regent Trachok's suggestion may not solve all the issues but was a good step forward and one that he would support. In regard to informing and allowing the Board to be accountable, he hoped that there would be some expectation of a timely and adequate sharing by the Chancellor and Board Chair as to the actions taken and why.

Mr. Wasserman restated that the motion currently on the table was to approve the entire document with the exception of Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e and with an amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.c. *(Page 5 of Ref. BOR-10)* to read "*A Regent may refer the name of a potential candidate but shall not endorse or formally nominate a candidate, and shall not serve formally or informally on search committees or attempt to influence the search process in any manner.*"

Upon a roll call vote, Regents Blakely, Crear, Doubrava, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Melcher, Page, Schofield, Trachok, Wixom, Alden and Anderson voted yes. Motion carried.

Regent Trachok requested that discussion return to this item at a later time that day in order to develop an amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e for the Board's consideration.

11. Information - UNLVNow Project Update *(Agenda Item #11)* - UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk provided an update to the Board of Regents on the current status of the UNLVNow project.

President Smatresk indicated that the following report is dependent upon the final estimates to be submitted by Turner Construction and other consultants. The current plan involves construction of a 50,000 to 60,000 seat covered stadium to be located on the west side of the UNLV campus and north of Harmon Avenue, capable of hosting

11. Information - UNLVNow Project Update *(Agenda Item #11) – (Cont'd.)*

mega events for the region. Although still somewhat variable, it is anticipated that the project will cost between $450 M to $500 M to build the infrastructure, move displaced facilities and construct the stadium.

President Smatresk related that bonding of the stadium and ancillary facilities will require: 1) a place to move the displaced facilities that would preferably involve county land to the west of Swenson; and 2) ability to raise $35 M per year for approximately 20 years.

President Smatresk felt that with the amount of money involved, a fair question to ask would be who the major beneficiaries of such a facility will be and how it will be funded without costing the students, impacting the general fund, or diverting dollars from any academic enterprise. In answer to that question, President Smatresk stated that there are four conceivable funding sources: 1) gifts and pledges from partnerships. He indicated that a number of prominent entities in the region have stepped forward to offer support and it appeared to him that will be a significant source of funds; 2) the business plan. While there is a preliminary business plan that includes revenue from concessions, advertising and so forth, that source of funds will typically be valued at 50 percent of the projection. He indicated that stadium projects by themselves tend not to generate a tremendous amount of funding; 3) possible creation of a tax increment zone that would not raise taxes but would apply existing taxes to the funding of the stadium. The major amount of those funds would be generated in the subsequent phase of the project known as the University Village phase; and 4) gift and naming opportunities are significant and fall in the range of $200 M and $300 M.

President Smatresk felt that such a stadium would be a critical partnership between UNLV and the region. He noted that when the Thomas and Mack Center *(T&M)* was built, no one had thought it would be the event center that it has become, adding that the T&M brings many visitors into the city and generates approximately $250 M of direct revenue to the area as well as a significant amount of tax revenue. A mega events center would more than double the T&M's current capacity. The number of events that are currently passed over could be minimized which would generate significantly more revenue estimated at roughly $500 M per year for lodging, gaming, dining and so forth. The problem is that the benefit accrues more to the region than the operator *(UNLV).* Therefore, it is UNLV's belief that a substantive partnership with the city, county and other agencies will be necessary. UNLV is working with private partners and public entities to determine if that plan is feasible.

Regent Wixom asked if the project was still in-sync with the Mid-Town UNLV project, adding that both concepts should evolve together. President Smatresk replied that he and Mr. Michael Saltman of the Vista Group have had extensive discussions regarding residential developments.

Mr. Gerry Bomotti, Vice President of Finance, UNLV, confirmed that the institution is working with Mr. Craig Cavaleer and the Majestic Reality team to update the campus master plan, including the Mid-Town UNLV project.

11. Information - UNLVNow Project Update *(Agenda Item #11) – (Cont'd.)*

Mr. Michael Saltman, Vista Group, related that he has been working with the UNLV leadership and the Board of Regents for a number of years and was hopeful to soon bring the vision of the Mid-Town UNLV project together.

Mr. Craig Cavaleer, Majestic Reality, expressed his excitement for integrating Mid-Town UNLV into the overall campus master plan, adding that he would continue to work closely with Mr. Saltman.

Chancellor Klaich felt that the projected revenue was so compelling for the region and the state that it was incumbent upon the state to approve a fair and reasonable tax district. President Smatresk added that it was an opportunity for UNLV to be in deep partnership with the city of Las Vegas and to advance common goals.

Regent Crear asked if the Board could do anything to keep the project moving forward. President Smatresk stated that mega events center projects tend to have lengthy timeframes and that UNLV was fortunate to have a host of strong advisors. Depending on the outcome of critical meetings to be held over the next few weeks, the Board would receive a timeline at its May 31 – June 1, 2012, meeting. He indicated that he would be happy to provide the Regents with continued updates.

Regent Knecht related that he continues to be optimistic and hopeful for this project. However, he referred to economic issues faced by developments in northern Nevada and expressed caution that the Board not feel pressure to meet an artificial deadline and to ensure that the prospective returns are more than enough to offset the obvious risk. President Smatresk agreed, adding that the final plan will reflect one that can be approved.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Mr. Wasserman read into the record a proposed amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e:

"Any change by an NSHE institution in its athletic conference membership requiring an NSHE institution to vote on approval shall be approved by the Board on recommendation of the President and Chancellor with full consideration of all factors to include student competition in intercollegiate sports appropriate to the institution, fiscal resources available, and sound standards of student academic performance. In the event of rapid changes in conference configuration, an exception may be granted in this necessity for Board approval~~, and the Chancellor, after consultation with the Board of Regents Chair, may approve a change in athletic conference affiliation~~. In such circumstances, a change in conference affiliation requires the recommendation of the Chancellor and approval of the Board Chair who shall report his approval to the full Board."

Regent Alden moved approval of the proposed amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e. Regent Trachok seconded.

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Crear felt that the proposed language still did not require changes to come before the Board and asked how "rapid changes" were defined. Mr. Wasserman felt that language could be added after the first sentence to read "*If holding a Board meeting in compliance with the open meeting law is impracticable then an exception may be granted in its necessity for Board approval. In such circumstances, a change in conference affiliation requires the recommendation of the Chancellor and approval of the Board Chair who shall report his approval to the full Board."*

Regent Crear asked why a decision of this magnitude would be rushed when it involves multimillion dollars. Regent Page agreed with Regent Crear.

Regent Melcher felt that it had been known for a while that the situation had been brewing and that there could have been a special meeting where the Board could have been allowed to consider conference realignment and how to move forward.

Regent Alden felt that it was enough that the Board of Regents could hire and fire the presidents. He indicated that in these types of situations, it is difficult for the Board to be next to the presidents when they are trying to do what is best for the institutions. He felt that presidents need to be given latitude when the chemistry of the environment is changing rapidly. The Board's final approval would then be required.

Regent Leavitt offered a friendly amendment to the motion that the existing language for Section 23.1.e be used with the addition of "subject to final Board approval." at the end of the last sentence. Mr. Wasserman suggested that be changed to "subject to ratification by the Board." Regent Leavitt accepted that suggestion.

Regents Alden and Trachok accepted the friendly amendment.

In response to Regent Melcher's comments, Regent Crear stated that although this has been known about for some time, outside of his personal discussions with the UNLV Administration, it has not been formally discussed by the Board. He felt that no matter how it is written, the Board needed to have final approval.

Mr. Wasserman read into the record the last proposed amendment to Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 23.1.e:

"Any change by an NSHE institution in its athletic conference membership requiring an NSHE institution to vote on approval shall be approved by the Board on recommendation of the President and Chancellor with full consideration of all factors to include student competition in intercollegiate sports appropriate to the institution, fiscal resources available, and sound standards of student academic performance. In the event of rapid changes in conference configuration, an exception may be granted in this necessity for Board approval, and the Chancellor, after consultation with the

10. Approved - *Handbook & Code* Revision, NSHE Intercollegiate Athletics *(Agenda Item #10) – (Cont'd.)*

Board of Regents Chair, may approve a change in athletic conference affiliation, subject to ratification by the Board."

Upon a roll call vote, Regents Crear, Doubrava, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Melcher, Page, Schofield, Trachok, Wixom, Alden, Anderson and Blakely voted yes. Motion carried.

Regent Crear asked if this policy change applied to the UNR and UNLV conference change and if the formation agreement was a done deal.

President Smatresk replied that the Chancellor has signed the formation agreement which has been entered into in theory for perpetuity or until exit from the conference. He indicated that copies of that agreement would be distributed to the Board.

Regent Crear asked if the approved policy revision applies to the current conference situation and if it was done. President Smatresk replied that it was. Regent Crear requested to receive a copy of the agreement.

Chair Geddes asked President Smatresk to send the agreement to Mr. Wasserman for distribution to the Board.

President Smatresk clarified that the formation agreement was not about leaving the Mountain West Conference, it was about the fact that the Conference will no longer exist as of June 2013.

Chair Geddes clarified that the formation agreement was signed previous to the Board's adoption of the policy revision and therefore the policy revision would not apply to that specific agreement.

12. Approved - Regents' Awards *(Agenda Item #12)* - The Board of Regents approved the 2012 Distinguished Nevadans and Regent Scholar recipients:

A. Distinguished Nevadans - *Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 14: (Ref. BOR-12a on file in the Board office).*

- Judge Carl J. Christensen, Retired *Nominated by Regent Wixom (Ref. BOR-12b on file in the Board office).*
- Dr. Michael A. Golberg *(posthumously) Nominated by Regent Schofield (Ref. BOR-12c on file in the Board office).*
- Ms. Pat Lundvall *Nominated by Regent Leavitt (Ref. BOR-12d on file in the Board offi* Mr. Stanley Paher *Nominated by Regent Knecht (Ref. BOR-12e on file in the Board office).*
- Dr. Rachakonda D. Prabhu *Nominated by Regent Page (Ref. BOR-12f on file in the Board office).*
- Mr. Guy L. Rocha *Nominated by Regent Geddes (Ref. BOR-12g on file in the Board office).*

12. Approved - Regents' Awards *(Agenda Item #12) – (Cont'd.)*

A. Distinguished Nevadans – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Crear moved approval of the 2012 Distinguished Nevadan nominees. Regent page seconded. Motion carried.

B. Regents' Scholars – *Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15 and Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 2(5) (Ref. BOR-12h and BOR-12i on file in the Board office).*

- Ms. Carleen Saladino, CSN.
- Ms. Vivian Farnsworth, GBC.
- Ms. Anam Quadir , NSC.
- Ms Lisa Hoffman-Davis, TMCC.
- Mr. Nicholas Thaler, UNLV *Graduate*.
- Ms. Emily Tamadonfar, UNLV *Undergraduate*.
- Ms. Crystal Colombini, UNR *Graduate*.
- Mr. Muir Morrison, UNR *Undergraduate.*
- Ms. Maira Ibarra, WNC.

Regent Knecht moved approval of the 2012 Regents' Scholars. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

13. Approved - Honorary Degrees *(Agenda Item #13)* - The Board approved the 2012 Honorary Degree recipients *(Board of Regents Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 14, and Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 1.2)*: *(Ref. BOR-13a on file in the Board office)*

A. Honorary Baccalaureate Degrees:

- Ms. Eleanor Little, GBC *(Ref. BOR-13b on file in the Board office).*

B. Honorary Associate Degrees:

- Mr. Donal Hummer, Jr., WNC *(Ref. BOR-13c on file in the Board office).*
- Senator Mike McGinness, WNC *(Ref. BOR-13d on file in the Board office).*
- Mr. Thomas Schoeman, CSN *(Ref. BOR-13e on file in the Board office).*

Regent Knecht moved approval to waive the limitation for publicly elected recipients for Senator Mike McGinness and to approve the 2012 Honorary Degree recipients. Regent Trachok seconded. Motion carried.

14. Information - *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2013-15 Tuition & Fees, William S. Boyd School of Law, UNLV *(Agenda Item #14)* - UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk and Dr. John White, Dean of the William S. Boyd School of Law, presented for information the proposed tuition and fee structure for the 2013-15 biennia. No fee increases were requested. Final action on the proposed tuition and fees is scheduled to occur at the June 2012 meeting of the Board *(Ref. BOR-14 on file in the Board office).*

15. Information - *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2013-15 Tuition & Fees, School of Dental Medicine, UNLV *(Agenda Item #15)* - UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk and Dr. Karen West, Dean of the UNLV School of Dental Medicine, presented for information the proposed tuition and fee structure for the 2013-15 biennia. No fee increases were requested. Final action on the proposed tuition and fees is scheduled to occur at the June 2012 meeting of the Board *(Ref. BOR-15 on file in the Board office)*.

16. Information - *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2013-15, Tuition & Fees, University of Nevada School of Medicine *(Agenda Item #16)* - UNR President Marc Johnson presented for information the proposed tuition and fee structure for the 2013-15 biennia for the University of Nevada School of Medicine *(UNSOM)*. The request reflects an increase in resident tuition and fees of 8 percent per year for each year of the 2013-15 biennium and non-resident tuition and fees increase of 3.4 percent per year for each year of the 2013-15 biennia *(Ref. BOR-16 – see attachment 1a on file in the Board office)*.

At the June Board meeting, President Marc Johnson will seek approval of the full amount of the proposed increase being allocated to the State Supporting Operating Budget of the Medical School, net of any increases in the UNR General Improvement, Capital Improvement, Activities and Programs and Technology fees and the Student Access Fee. The proposal considered in June will include approval of an increase in the Student Access Fee for the 2013-15 biennia from 15 percent to 20 percent *(Ref. BOR-16 – see attachment 1b on file in the Board office)*.

Final action on the proposed tuition and fees is scheduled to occur at the June 2012 meeting of the Board.

President Johnson related that previous discussions by the Board indicated that School of Medicine fees were too low and needed to be increased in the direction of the WICHE average. The proposed fee structure also does away with the old structure of averaging of fees for out-of-state students. Current out-of-state students will be grandfathered in but all new out-of-state students will be charged under the new structure.

Regent Anderson asked if an out-of-state student will be considered out-of-state all four years. President Johnson confirmed that is correct, adding that once an out-of-state student, the student always remains an out-of-state student for the purposes of tuition.

Regent Page asked if it was known what the fiscal impact of the proposed fees would be. Dr. Thomas Schwenk, Dean of the School of Medicine, replied that it would be approximately $400,000 to $500,000.

Regent Crear asked where the additional funds would go. Dean Schwenk replied that the structure for supporting the students is complex. However, the funds could go in several directions, all of which are student related. Approximately 25 percent will be

16. Information - *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, 2013-15, Tuition & Fees, University of Nevada School of Medicine *(Agenda Item #16)* – *(Cont'd.)*

returned in the form of student financial aid. The increased class size will require additional teaching support. A bigger issue that is related but not directly addressed by the tuition increase is the pipeline issue for residency training. These funds will not necessarily go directly towards that, but all increases help the educational environment in trying to provide adequate residency and fellowship opportunities so that as many graduates as possible stay in the state. Dean Schwenk stated that all of the funds will be completely directed toward teaching, financial aid, instructional support, career advisement, mentorship, summer session research and clinical opportunities and so forth.

Regent Crear asked by how many students enrollment will be increased. Dean Schwenk replied that current enrollment is roughly 60 students per year and will be increased by six spots per year for the next six years.

Regent Crear asked if the number of residency programs offered will also increase. Dean Schwenk stated that residency programs was a separate but high priority issue. He related that the School of Medicine is not a stand alone educational enterprise but must be linked with resident and fellowship training or the benefit of the program is lost. He explained that medical school is different from dental and law school because dentists and lawyers go to work upon graduation, whereas doctors do not. Consideration needs to be given to the entire pipeline. Although the funds generated from the proposed increase will not be directly related to development of the residency program, those funds will increase the class size which must then be linked to increased residency programs.

The meeting recessed at 2:53 p.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2012, and reconvened at 10:31 a.m. on Friday, March 2, 2012, with all members present except for Regents Alden and Schofield.

President Smatresk announced that on Wednesday, March 7, 2012, at 10:00 a.m., Governor Sandoval will be on the UNLV campus to dedicate the first of the DMV automated service kiosks in the Student Union. He invited Regents and meeting attendees to attend that event.

Regent Wixom reminded Board members that on March 9, 2012, a special Investment and Facilities Committee will be held to review investment procedures and how the System's investment pool and accounts operate. He felt that it would be an enormously beneficial use of the Regents time.

7. Approved - Consent Items *(Agenda Item #8)* – *(Cont'd.)*

7h. Approved - Appointment to WestED Board of Directors *(Agenda Item #8h)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chair Geddes related that although the Board had appointed the new and current Dean of the UNR School of Education to the WestEd Board of Directors, the previous appiontment, Dr. William Sparkman, had requested that he be allowed to continue serving in that role *(letter on file in the Board office)*. Chair Geddes indicated that he had thanked Dr. Sparkman for his service and that his name would be kept on file for future consideration.

17. Information - Public Comment *(Agenda Item #21)* - Mr. Karl Neathammer addressed the Board in regard to a controversary in the Carson City community related to a Human Sexuality class offered by WNC. He felt that a requested assignment was unconscienable and violated the collective norm of common decency and violates women's rights to privacy. He asked that the related requirement be eliminated from the course.

Mr. Bus Scharmann, former Dean of the WNC Fallon Campus, addressed the Board as a representative of the Restore Our College Campus Committee in Fallon *(full statement on file in the Board office)*.

Dr. Gregory Brown, UNLV Faculty Senate Chair, addressed the Board to request an agenda item for the April 20, 2012, special Board meeting devoted to the discussion of the employee benefits and compensation issues and how the System can address, in the short and long term, the risk to the System's competitiveness.

Mr. Bentley McDonald, Student, UNLV, addressed the Board in regard to the Nevada for Education initiative *(www.nevadaforeduation.com)*.

Mr. Ken Woods, Executive Director for the College Board for Higher Education, addressed the Board to thank Nevada for its hospitality at the College Board's annual regional forum in Las Vegas the previous week hosted by co-chaired by UNR President Marc Johnson and Washoe County School District Deputy Superintendent Pedro Martinez. Mr. Woods indicated that at a future meeting he would like to present to the Board a comprehensive report of the work done by the College Board in the state of Nevada.

Mr. Curtis Blackwell, WNC, commented on the human sexuality class spoken of earlier and applauded open dialogue between men and women on a subject that is contriversial and difficult but that pertains to every human being.

On behalf of himself and Chair Geddes as private citizens, Vice Chair Page read a statement into the record. They believe it is imperative that the task force for System Administration continue to encourage the PEBP Board to look to alternatives to improve benefits for all participants and use reserve funds for the benefit of all participants whether that is reducing premiums, adding to the HSA/HRA accounts, reducing participant contributions or providing gap insurance, we need to make sure that PEBP understands the need to mitigate the problems that employees are experiencing due to the drastic changes in plan design that occurred in the transition to the new health care plan.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* - Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich presented a report on the progress of the Legislature's Interim Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education, including an update on the development of an alternate funding formula model that was presented to the Committee by the Chancellor at its February 29, 2012, meeting, NCHEMS *(National for Center for Higher Education Management Systems)* recommended discipline clusters

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

and weights, definition of price, definition of performance pool and potential implementation factors *(full presentation on file in the Board office)*.

Chancellor Klaich reported that the goal of the matrix is to determine a weight by reference to the cost of delivery to determine the price of the student credit hour completed. For example, it will not cost as much to offer a basic liberal arts class at an undergraduate level as it will for science or engineering class at an upper division level. He clarified that was not a reflection on the value of the degree but rather on the cost of delivery.

Chancellor Klaich related that after the Interim Committee's first meeting in January, the System asked NCHEMS to provide information on the best practices of other states. Chancellor Klaich stated that looking only at Nevada would do nothing more than provide a historical perspective on good and bad decisions that may have been pushed by a formula for which there is unanimous agreement needs to be replaced. It was important to look at states such as Texas, Ohio, Illinois and Florida that have decades of longitudinal data available.

Based on those best practices, Chancellor Klaich stated that NCHEMS was asked to create a matrix which resulted in the identification of clusters. Academic and Student Affairs was then asked to catalog every course offered and to count every course completed within the NSHE. Based on the NCHEMS and NSHE data, a matrix was then created *(slide 8 of the presentation on file in the Board office)*. For example, a freshman student taking a master's level Engineering course for 3.0 credits *(weighted at 5.0 per credit hour)* at UNLV will be weighted at 15. Every course, every completion and the proposed weighting system were then applied throughout the System. Based on that process, it was determined that approximately 2.7 million weighted student credit hours of work is being done throughout the System. That number was then used to determine what the state of Nevada pays for one unit of work *(weighted student credit hour)* by taking the approximate General Fund allocation and dividing it by the 2.7 million weighted student credit hours provided by the seven instructional institutions within the System. Although the results vary depending on the assumptions applied, the same three credit course being offered anywhere in the System will receive the same compensation regardless of where it is offered.

Chancellor Klaich related that he disagreed with arguments being made that the proposed weights will not accurately reflect the higher cost or workloads among the different institutions, adding that it was time to look at relative work done and to price that work equally. He noted that the higher cost of the research institutions are taken into consideration by the heavier weights assigned to upper division and graduate courses.

Chancellor Klaich thanked the presidents for the work in moving the process forward to that point.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chair Geddes asked Chancellor Klaich what his intention was for when the actual model and numbers will be presented to the Board. Chancellor Klaich replied that should occur on March 19, 2012.

Regent Trachok asked, when addressing the General Fund appropriation and the seven teaching institutions, would that mean less tuition. Chancellor Klaich replied yes, adding that the previous year's higher education state General Fund allocation was approximately $473 M. Of that amount, the numerator of the fraction to the instructional base of the institution is netted by approximately $100 M, which goes to non-formula budgets. On top of that allocation is the tuition generated by the institutions which has not yet been included in the calculation. Once that calculation is done, the institutions will add their own tuition and fees so that there will not be movement of student fees between institutions. Chancellor Klaich clarified that due to the Board's input at the January 20, 2012, special meeting, further changes had been made to the proposed method.

In regard to the diseconomies of scale for the two smallest community colleges, and in references to Mr. Scharmann's previous testimony under Public Comment, Regent Knecht asked Chancellor Klaich to expand on why there had been a lack of support for the rural factor in the last legislative session. Chancellor Klaich felt that Mr. Scharmann was referring to System staff's recommendation to the Board that running the formula in times of severe budget and enrollment swings did not make sense and had requested that the Board leave funding static at the institutions. That request rewarded some institutions while penalizing others. That recommendation was ultimately adopted by the Board, Governor and legislature.

Regent Knecht felt that the more substantive and forward looking issue would be the base allocation economies of scale, particularly for the smallest campuses and satellite locations. Regent Knecht asked if there was a plan for dealing with the "rural factor" which he characterized as the much smaller class sizes that could be found at rural community satellite campuses versus the much larger class sizes found in urban areas. It seemed to him that the choices available were for the students to either pay for the diseconomy of scale to move to larger urban areas.

Chancellor Klaich explained that answer is part of the third part of the implementation strategy which includes difficult decisions. First, the model will be built within a static appropriation or revenue-neutral scenario. He stated that is not a comment on funding levels, but a reflection of the model within the System that is felt to be appropriate in allowing data-driven deliberations to proceed. However, in that context, when policies are changed that impact the distribution of dollars, there will be winners and losers. As money is taken from one policy to another, effectively that is money coming out of someone else's pocket. It will be important to keep in mind that the decisions become more about fundamental fairness of the distribution or allocation of dollars.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chancellor Klaich related that an economy of scale based on class size had been proposed and rejected. The recommendation coming forward will not be based on class size but rather the administrative or allocation base needed to run a college regardless of its size.

Regent Knecht felt that revenue neutrality does not have to be an issue in the new formula because there is a phase-in aspect that obviates a concern about revenue neutral. Chancellor Klaich felt that if Regent Knecht was saying that a new formula should be implemented on new money, the results of such an implementation would take a very long time.

Regent Knecht thought there would need to be a two or three cycle phase-in target, adding that there would be no point in redoing the formula if a change is not going to be made. He felt that the purpose of dealing with revenue neutrality or mitigation is in starting at the present point and mitigating the effects as the changes are fully implemented over time. Chancellor Klaich agreed, adding that implementation was the third part of the strategy that involved the hard work yet to be done.

Regent Knecht indicated that his concern with determining administrative factors in the base allocation is that although presidents and other administrators may be essential, they do not contribute directly to the instructional cost. He felt that an economy of scale adjustment was needed for those instructional costs on the smaller campuses.

Chancellor Klaich explained that there were a number of recommendations inherent in the proposed formula that was intended to drive behavior. For example, although sympathetic to the argument that remedial education students require higher levels of hands on work, it was determined inappropriate to allocate dollars to drive the need for remediation. In addition, a recommendation will be made to consider alternatives technological methods to drive enrollment other than face-to-face articulation between faculty and students.

Regent Knecht noted that three years ago he had laid out a challenge to the Board in regard to technology as an alternative to face-to-face articulation. However, in regard to remediation, there was an argument that it was not the higher education system's to make up for the failures of the K-12 system. Secondly, when using the term "drive behavior" in regard to small rural communities, it sounded to him that the behavior being driven was that the citizens need to relocate to larger communities. Although he did not feel that was the message the System wanted to send, he asked if that message was accurate that it be communicated that way. Chancellor Klaich stated that he and Regent Knecht may disagree on that point, adding that he did not think he has said what Regent Knecht had implied.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chancellor Klaich asked that the Board not close its eyes to the dialogue regarding the shifting of dollars from one geographical area of the state to another, adding that it will be up to the Board to balance that policy.

Regent Knecht felt that the geographical aspect of changing the formula may perhaps be the only thing being communicated and that more of the story needed to be told. Chancellor Klaich disagreed with Regent Knecht, feeling that the story had been well written for many years in the use of the current formula.

Regent Crear appreciated that the new formula was being constructed in a manner that would be easier to understand.

Regent Crear requested further explanation of the weighted student credit hour *(WSCH)*. Chancellor Klaich explained that a three credit hour class of the same level taught at a community college or at a university will receive exactly the same funding. The different weights are not assigned by institutions, but rather by level. For example, more costly upper division courses at the universities will be weighted more heavily.

Regent Crear asked if the weighted student credit hour for a particular class is $300 but it costs UNLV $150 to teach that class while only costing CSN $25, will UNLV claim that it is underfunded. Chancellor Klaich acknowledged that UNLV would probably feel that way.

Regent Crear asked if the true cost of teaching a class at each of the institutions will be evaluated, including salaries, merit pay, benefits, and so forth. He asked if the dollars were comparing apples to apples. Chancellor Klaich replied that the formula attempts to do that by using models from other states that have used a weighted method of funding for many years and have the longitudinal data available, adding that the cost trends throughout those states are consistent.

Regent Crear asked if actual numbers were being used. Chancellor Klaich replied that the formula will not be using actual numbers from Nevada. Instead, the formula will use actual numbers from four other states that have used this method for years.

Regent Crear asked if it costs UNLV $100 to teach English 101 but it costs CSN $50, is that really a comparison of apples to apples. Chancellor Klaich replied that each institution will be receiving the same amount of dollars and each will have to make decisions on how to spend those funds.

Regent Crear asked how an accurate comparison can be made or if there should be a standardized method of weighting the institution as well. Chancellor Klaich replied there should not, adding that weighting the institutions would succeed in only considering what has historically already been done in Nevada. The proposed formula tries to rely upon national norms and accepted data.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Geddes felt that it will be helpful when the new formula is applied with actual dollars in a proposed budget.

Regent Knecht added that this is a two step process with the first step being the consideration of what the ratio of costs were for lower division courses at any given institution *(establish weights)*. The second step is to ask what the overall average cost levels are at each of the institutions.

Chancellor Klaich asked the Board to remember that the conversation pertains only to state general fund dollars, with tuition and fees generated at the institutions being in addition. For example, the four year institutions having fees approximately twice those of the community colleges and will end up with a much larger budget to deliver the same product.

Regent Crear noted that leads to the current methodology that an institution which generates more tuition and fees should receive less general fund dollars. Chancellor Klaich confirmed that is the method used in the current funding formula which will be stopped with the new formula.

Regent Crear felt that the proposed funding model would still allow the larger institutions to generate more funds than the smaller institutions. Chancellor Klaich clarified that the issue should not be cost, but rather price, adding that the question should be what the state of Nevada will be willing to pay for an English 101 class. He felt that the answer to that question is for the state of Nevada to fund equally. When taking into consideration tuition and fees, if an institution can save money, then it gets to keep and spend that savings elsewhere. By the same token, if costs are higher at a particular institution, then that institution needs to make those costs up out of its tuition and fees.

Regent Blakely related that he still favors the proposed formula. He understood the concern that the community colleges may be negatively impacted but as stewards of the taxpayers, he felt it was important to be as fair as possible. He felt that the difficulty was that there was a comfort level with having enrollment as the driver.

In terms of base and administrative support for small community colleges, Regent Doubrava asked where in the process a discussion would occur regarding the possibility of the counties participation to offset some of the potential inequities of the smaller colleges. Chancellor Klaich replied that is not currently directly related to the funding formula discussion. He felt that the mission of the community colleges was just that, to impact their communities. It is a common model throughout the country that local entities provide support to their community colleges. Although that has not occurred in Nevada, Chancellor Klaich felt that it was time to begin that difficult discussion. Chancellor Klaich stated that he had not supported that conversation in the past due to his concerns regarding governance factors.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Melcher expressed his appreciation to Regents Geddes, Page and Wixom for representing the Board on the Interim Committee. He felt that it was important to trust the process.

Chancellor Klaich felt that the process will work with everyone working together to deal with the issues. He emphasized that he will not reverse engineer the process to direct factors, functions and numbers in order to arrive at a result. However, he will provide data and allow the numbers to reflect what they will and offer assumptions based on those results. It will be the Board's responsibility to then tell the System if those assumptions are fair or not.

Regent Melcher expressed interest in reviewing funding models that will provide local support for community colleges. He recognized that would be a major change and will take years to effect but felt that it would be a more practical funding model.

Regent Page stated that although the rural factors are important, it was also necessary to remember the mission and costs of the research institutions.

Regent Anderson stated that although not perfect, the proposed formula is an improvement over the current funding formula. She related her previous attempts at having a conversation with local entities had not been met enthusiastically.

Regent Doubrava asked if the states of Texas, Ohio, Illinois and Florida have integrated or separate community college and university models. Chancellor Klaich replied that a fully integrated model of higher education such as the one in Nevada is more the exception than the norm.

Regent Doubrava stated that although he could appreciate the need to use structural norms, the states mentioned more than likely have separate governance boards. Chancellor Klaich indicated that was a good point for staff to research in order to provide an answer.

President Smatresk indicated that other than Hawaii, the only states that have an integrated governance structure are roughly half the size of Nevada.

Regent Knecht expressed his support for the overall effort and felt that discipline weights and performance orientation was a good step forward. In regard to local entity support, he was aware of at least one county in Nevada that would be willing to talk seriously about funding support. He agreed with Regent Page that the research and development missions and associated costs needed to be considered but emphasized the need to consider revenue. He felt that grants, in general, were supposed to cover direct and indirect costs and overhead. He felt that the issue should also include a conversation in terms of an appropriate margin between state sponsored research and contract research. Overall, he asked how much research should be funded by the taxpayers versus entrepreneurial efforts.

18. Information - Report on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #27)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Chancellor Klaich related that as previously reported there will be a performance pool aspect in the new funding formula. Through its work and policies, it is recognized that the Board has guiding principles including that the work done must contribute to and align with the goals of the state, that the Board wants more degree completers at all levels of higher education including associates, bachelors and certificates and that differing missions will be recognized. There is also agreement that there is a three-year weighted average in the current formula to smooth precipitous effects of enrollment and a similar smoothing mechanism should be used in the new formula.

Regent Trachok asked if a student taking and completing an astronomy class at WNC for personal interest and not for degree completion would be considered a success under the new formula. Chancellor Klaich stated that instance would not be considered a success in terms of the proposed formula since personal satisfaction cannot be measured and squared with the taxpayers of Nevada. It will be left to the Board and to the community colleges to determine if such courses can be offered. The System has an obligation to get students in and out with a degree. Offering personal enrichment classes historically offered by the community colleges is becoming much more difficult in a budget constrained environment.

Regent Trachok asked if a student with a useful occupation wants to take a specialized course at a community college because their employer has told them that successful completion will result in a salary raise, would that scenario be considered a success even if a certificate was not involved. Chancellor Klaich replied that it would perhaps be a success. Generally a benchmark has been placed around the area that Complete College America has defined as a certificate of value constituting a year's work or thirty credits. There is also the potential for other measures of value including certification by outside bodies. He emphasized that it will be important to have clearly defined rules that everyone plays by, including a definition of what completion is or is not.

Regent Knecht added that although difficult to measure, there are alternative forms and levels that can be recognized while ensuring that the formula not be gamed. It will be important to recognize that real value and real achievement exists even if it does not fit into a classic degree format.

Regent Melcher felt that it was important to make sure that the formula does not conflict with workforce development efforts particularly in areas that are designated as vital to the state's industry.

The meeting recessed at 12:13 p.m. and reconvened at 12:42 p.m. on Friday, March 2, 2012, with all members present except for Regents Alden and Wixom.

19. Approved - *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* Revision, Periodic President Evaluation *(Agenda Item #17)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich for revision to Board policy concerning the process by which an external consultant is selected to conduct a periodic president evaluation. Specifically, the proposed revision amends *Procedures & Guidelines Manual*, Chapter 2, Section 2.3, to eliminate the president's responsibility to provide the Chancellor with a list of possible consultants and places the responsibility of the selection of a consultant on the Board Chair with the Chancellor's recommendation *(Ref. BOR-17 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Page moved approval of the proposed amendment to *Procedures & Guidelines Manual*, Chapter 2, Section 2.3. Regent Trachok seconded.

Regent Leavitt asked if the proposed revision would also apply to the Chancellor's periodic evaluation policies. Vice Chancellor Abba indicated that the policy revision would apply to the Chancellor.

For the record, Regent Leavitt indicated that the consultant for the Chancellor's last evaluation in the fall of 2011 had been independently selected.

Mr. Wasserman believed that the reference material only applied to presidents but suggested that a friendly amendment could be offered to apply the proposed revision to the Chancellor's periodic evaluation policies as well.

Regents Page and Trachok accepted the friendly amendment.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

20. Approved - Faculty Hire Above Salary Range, Professor-In-Residence of Clinical Sciences, Orthodontics, School of Dental Medicine, UNLV *(Agenda Item #18)* – The Board of Regents approved the request of UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk to hire Dr. James Mah, Professor-in-Residence of Clinical Sciences, Orthodontics, at the UNLV School of Dental Medicine at a salary of $200,000, which exceeds the established maximum salary of $173,800 *(Ref. BOR-18 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Page moved approval of hire Dr. James Mah, Professor-in-Residence of Clinical Sciences, Orthodontics, at the UNLV School of Dental Medicine at a salary of $200,000, which exceeds the established maximum salary of $173,800. Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

21. Information - Report on Economic Development in Nevada *(Agenda Item #29)* - Mr. Jeremy Aguero of Applied Analysis presented for information a report on economic development titled "If Economic Development is Nevada's New Economy, What Does Nevada's New Future Look Like?" that addressed what economic development is in Nevada, including the recruitment of small businesses, the addition of new jobs to the economy and changing the mix of businesses; what the most and least diversified states are in the country *(Nevada 3rd least diversified)*; Nevada's diversity growth rate *(+7.5 percent in the last ten years)*; where Nevada is positioned from an economic development standpoint; phases of the business cycle; what economic development success looks like and Nevada's old economic plan versus its new economic plan *(full presentation on file in the Board office).*

Regent Knecht thanked Mr. Aguero for the presentation. He referred to Mr. Aguero's mention of the progress that Nevada has made over the last five years that indicated an improvement was being made. Regent Knecht elaborated that there were two schools of thought. The first was that there will be a long period of slow growth. The second school of thought was a more classic pattern, as illustrated in Mr. Aguero's presentation, of rapid recovery. Regent Knecht asked Mr.Aguero what his views were in terms of sustained growth rates over the next five years. Mr. Aguero replied that he expected recovery to be asymmetrical. When considering the makeup of the unemployed versus the employed, the differences among those two groups were remarkabley distinct. He felt that, particularly in Nevada, there was great danger toward painting the economy with a single brush. Some areas of the economy will see relatively rapid assent. Jobs have been added every month now for twelve consecutive months. However, he was not sure that growth was sustainable except within the leasure and tourism industry. He also felt that government contracting was an unknown factor while government tries to deal with implementing measures while receiving less revenue. Overall, Mr. Aguero expected a very slow and steady move out of the economy with the tourism industry *(Nevada's core economy)* being a force that will help elevate investment in other sectors. The tourism industry, combined with a strong force towards economic development, will really help push the economy.

Regent Knecht asked Mr. Aguero for his thoughts on the national outlook. Mr. Aguero indicated that on the national level, encouraging factors included that the Gross Domestic Product *(GDP)* has been up for two consectuive years, two million jobs have been added since the economy bottomed out and the stock market is up over 83% from where it was at the bottom of the economy. Although there are clouds on the horizon, consumer confidence is increasing. Many other countries are starting to hold the United States up as the place that has recovered.

Regent Page asked if there was one issue for southern Nevada that needed to be focused on. Mr. Aguero replied that although education was the proverbial silver bullet, it was the area where Nevada was failing.

22. Approved - 2012-2018 Strategic Plan, WNC *(Agenda Item #19)* – The Board of Regents approved the Western Nevada College Strategic Plan for 2012-2018 *(Ref. BOR-19a, BOR-19b and BOR-19c on file in the Board office).*

President Lucey and Mr. Gil Martin, Faculty, WNC, provided a presentation *(Ref. BOR-19c)* on the process that WNC faculty, staff and students underwent in creating the 2012-2018 Strategic Plan, including initial communication strategies, revision of initiatives and indicators, as well as the Strategic Plan's themes, objectives, initiatives and performance measures.

Regent Knecht referred to page 14 *(Distance Education Enrollment)* of Ref. BOR-19c and asked President Lucey to explain "video received" and "video send." President Lucey explained that "video send" sites are where the instructor is located, while the "video received" sites are satellite locations where there are only students.

Regent Knecht noted that in 2010, there was a count of 422 video send sites and 301 video received sites and asked how that worked. President Lucey clarified that the numbers reflect enrollment and not the number of classes, adding that the enrollment numbers indicated that there had been approximately 4 students at the send sights and 3 at the received locations.

Regent Knecht noted that in video received locations, the numbers have increased from 154 in 2004 to an enrollment of 301 in 2010. However, video send locations have decreased from 484 to 472. He asked President Lucey to elaborate on that trend. Ms. Connie Capurro, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, WNC, related that there is a trend in Nevada and nationally that more people are enrolling in online courses. However, there are fewer instructors available to teach interactive video courses.

Regent Blakely felt that the data indicated that there was a larger portion of students that have elected to take interactive video courses rather than in person. Ms. Capurro agreed with that assessment, adding that there are many students that take a combination of classes.

Regent Knecht referred to a graph on page 12 of BOR-19a that reflected the number of associate degrees and certificates awarded by school year. He requested an explanation for why certificates, after reaching a high mark in 2005-2006, have declined by approximately 50 percent. Ms. Capurro replied that one major factor was that WNC stopped awarding certificates for practical nursing and now only offers degrees in that field.

Regent Knecht asked if previously eliminated certificate programs would be brought back or if WNC would only consider new programs. Ms. Capurro replied that WNC has a continual process of review and that certificate programs may be added but that it was unlikely that degree programs would be added.

22. Approved - 2012-2018 Strategic Plan, WNC *(Agenda Item #19)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Knecht felt that one key element of the plan was to increase completion, including certificates. Ms. Capurro hoped that with the consolidation of a number of programs that will help to increase the number of completers. President Lucey added that WNC anticipates participation in more cooperative agreements such as with Dream It Do It.

Regent Knecht referred to statements made regarding community *(page 6 of BOR-19c and page 10 of BOR-19c)* and to data on page 17 of BOR-19a that reflects the percentage of total area high school graduates attending WNC in the summer and the fall terms following high school graduation from 1999 to 2009. He felt that, compared to Carson City, Douglas County and the rural component, the data indicated that Churchill County had remained nearly flat and asked for a reason as to why. President Lucey replied that rural students do not often see themselves as college ready or having developed an interest in attending college. For that reason, a rural cohort is being created so that rural students can benefit from programs such as the Bridge to Success program. It is hoped that the rural cohort will be as successful as the Latino cohort has been with their students.

Regent Knecht felt that in order to have student success faculty was needed. He asked what the total faculty count was at the Fallon campus. President Lucey replied that there were nine faculty members currently at the Fallon campus. President Lucey stated that she could not apologize for the size of the faculty as there is no budget and no way to support the current mission appropriately with the current funding levels. She added that there has been a 30 percent loss in faculty and staff at both WNC campuses in the last five years.

Regent Knecht indicated that he had no doubt that WNC had been hurt by the budget reductions, adding that he personally had complained on behalf of WNC as to why that institution had been shorted more than the other institutions in the last round of budget reductions. However, he was questioning the allocation of faculty among the campuses. He noted that in approximately 2004, the Fallon campus had 17 to 19 faculty members while the Carson City campus had 56 faculty members *(Memorandum from President Lucey dated February 17, 2012, to the Fallon Campus WNC Advisory Board).* In 2011, the Carson City faculty numbered 40 but that number had increased to 46 presently.

President Lucey clarified that the Carson City faculty numbered 56 in 2008 and that the proposed faculty for 2012 is 40 in Carson City and 14 in Fallon although that campus's current faculty count is 9.5. Those numbers represent a 29 percent loss for Carson City and a 32 percent loss at the Fallon campus. The decision about where to place resources has to be a presidential decision. She does what she can with the resources that she has. Her desire is to meet the needs of all of the students and meet the needs as best as possible given the circumstances. Through WNC's economic development initiatives, it is her hope that WNC will be able to provide more occupational opportunities for Fallon students going forward. Dealing with the loss of $3 M that was not that much to start with has required the institution to scramble with

22. Approved - 2012-2018 Strategic Plan, WNC *(Agenda Item #19)* – *(Cont'd.)*

the results being the loss of enrollment, loss of programs and a faculty that is being asked to do more and more with less and less. She was proud and delighted with the faculty in taking on a strategic plan of this quality under these circumstances. She felt going forward that WNC would be successful going forward because of the quality of the organization.

Regent Knecht questioned statements made in an email from the Chancellor with the February 17, 2012, memorandum from President Lucey to the Fallon Campus WNC Advisory Board attached to it that indicated that at a Fallon Town Meeting information presented by the Fallon campus faculty had been emotional in tone as well as incomplete and misleading and therefore had not accurately reflected reality. However, his sources from Fallon contest the numbers presented by President Lucey in her February 17, 2012, memo, and that their campus has incurred the deepest losses compared to the other WNC campuses. He was not sure which party had the incomplete or misleading data but felt that needed to be dealt with. Secondly, in regard to the statement that the meeting had been found to be emotional in tone, his sources have indicated that the meeting had been the furthest thing from emotional in tone. Regent Knecht felt that given the circumstances, he would be entirely sympathetic to a community worried about losing jobs and its higher education campus. However, his sources have told him that the meeting had been sober and constructive.

Regent Knecht felt that the evidence suggests that the Fallon campus has suffered disproportionately. Of 51 faculty members solicited with union activation cards, 43 have signed to request a vote for an affiliated faculty union with TMCC. It was also his understanding that the last English instructor at the Fallon campus that retired has not been replaced but an additional English instructor was added to the Carson City campus.

Regent Knecht felt that the strategic plan failed to address the reality faced at WNC's Fallon campus. Discussion at the town hall meetings included a full range of options including affiliation with the other community colleges such as GBC or TMCC. Although he had tried to explain to them, without ruling that option out, that may not be a solution as those two institutions have also experienced budget reductions. Their efforts have begun with the first step of fact finding, including the creation of a task force on fact finding and one on public education and interfacing with public officials.

Regent Knecht related that the Fallon community's discussion also included the possibility of going private/nonprofit and thereby indicated their willingness to raise local support. He felt that the bottom line was that there is enough uncertainty about the data and facts to postpone approval of the strategic plan that day and that any action could be tabled until the May 31 - June 1, 2012, Board meeting pending answers being provided to the Fallon community's questions.

Regent Knecht moved approval of postponing consideration of this item until the May 31 – June 1, 2012, Board meeting pending receipt of requested information. Regent Doubrava seconded.

22. Approved - 2012-2018 Strategic Plan, WNC *(Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Blakely related that prior to the last legislative session, the Board considered a number of options for WNC. At that time, he and President Lucey had a discussion on her plan for WNC including reductions in services to Fallon. During that discussion, she had indicated to Regent Blakely that in order to comply with the budget, she would have to make cuts to the Fallon campus. He had told her at the time that she would need to do what she needed to do given the circumstances. Although he understands Regent Knecht's concerns, he felt that President Lucey was put into this situation through the requirements placed before her by the Board of Regents.

President Lucey related that WNC has a plan in place at the Fallon campus although not an ideal plan. The Fallon campus has been assured that it will have both transfer degrees *(Associate of Arts and Associate of Science)* available on a regular schedule to allow students to finish the degree in two years, as well as interactive video classes. The economic development team will also remain active in Fallon. There have been conversations between the Lyon County Manager and WNC's Director of Economic Development and Workforce on next steps that could be taken but that they would have to be self supporting. The two occupational programs that were cut *(customer service and computer office technology)* did not have sufficient enrollment and it was determined that those programs would need to be offered through a credit fee or self supporting basis. President Lucey related that she had spoken with Dr. Ross and Dr. Macintosh about WNC's occupational lab space in Lyon County that is not being used so that they can build a market for occupational students that will allow WNC to revive those programs in the future.

Chancellor Klaich accepted that there could be a difference of opinion about the numbers reported and that can and should be looked into. However, he requested that the Board not postpone approval of the strategic plan. He felt to do so would disrespect the entire process.

Regent Knecht felt that the issues were not just about the numbers but rather if fairness had been extended to the Fallon campus and its community and that the Board wants to make this the best strategic plan that can reasonably be made under the circumstances. The people of Fallon have identified a real issue that is not reflected in the proposed strategic plan. He asked that WNC work with the people of Fallon to ameliorate and understand their concerns, particularly as there was not a cost to waiting.

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

Regent Crear moved approval of the 2012-2018 Strategic Plan for WNC as presented. Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried. Regent Knecht voted no. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

23. Approved - *Handbook* Revision, University Admission Requirements *(Agenda Item #22)* – The Board of Regents approved a revision to Board policy governing university admissions *(Title 4, Chapter 16, Sections 3 and 4)*. Specifically, the proposed revisions require that students seeking admission to the universities must take the ACT or SAT prior to admission, effective fall 2013 *(Ref. BOR-22a and BOR-22b on file in the Board office).*

President Smatresk related that 95 percent of students that apply to UNR and 97 percent that apply to UNLV currently take the ACT. The requested revision will not substantively affect the current admission process but will support K-12 in its admission procedure efforts and will help the universities to gather better data through participation in a voluntary system of assessment. That process will allow the universities to conduct better learning outcome assessments of freshman versus senior students using normalized tests that are nationally standardized to help the universities better understand where the deficits are and where improvements can be made.

President Johnson added that by supporting K-12 to implement the taking of the ACT test in the junior year, it will help students in the senior year to go to college and be college ready. The ACT also provides students an opportunity to request that scores be sent to specific schools which helps the universities with recruitment and pathway efforts.

Regent Crear moved approval of the revision to Board policy governing university admissions *(Title 4, Chapter 16, Sections 3 and 4)* that requires students seeking admission to the universities must take the ACT or SAT prior to admission, effective fall 2013. Regent Leavitt seconded.

Regent Anderson asked if a minimum score was being obtained. Presidents Johnson and Smatresk indicated that the score was not being tracked at this time. However, for students that fall below the minimum score for admission as established by the Board of Regents, alternative pathways are available.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

24. Approved - Revision to Mission Statement, NSC *(Agenda Item #25)* – The Board of Regents approved a revision to the Nevada State College Mission Statement, including the institution's three core themes of promoting student success, fostering education opportunities to encompass access and diversity goals and to strengthen the community *(Ref. BOR-25 on file in the Board office).*

President Patterson related that a great deal of work went into preparing the revised statement. The need to reconsider and revise the statement follows NSC's one year accreditation report. President Patterson noted that approximately two thirds of the previous mission statement was eliminated which made the statement much more

24. Approved - Revision to Mission Statement, NSC *(Agenda Item #25)* – *(Cont'd.)*

efficient while still recognizing the institution's three core themes of promoting student success, fostering education opportunities to encompass access and diversity goals and to strengthen the community.

Regent Page moved approval of a revision to the Nevada State College Mission Statement, including the institution's three core themes of promoting student success, fostering education opportunities to encompass access and diversity goals and to strengthen the community. Regent Anderson seconded.

Considering that NSC was in the midst of a presidential search, Regent Crear questioned if it was appropriate for the mission statement to be revised at this time or if it should be postponed until after the new president has been hired. President Patterson replied that he would normally agree. However, the NWCCU *(Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities)* requires certain tasks be accomplished on a specific timeline.

As a member of the NWCCU Board, President Sheehan confirmed that there is an absolute strict adherence to the timelines and that the NWCCU requires approval of mission statements by the governing board. She also related that she had inherited a mission statement when she joined TMCC and found it helpful in providing her insight to the culture of the institution.

Regent Crear noted that there had been a mission statement in place and asked if the NWCCU had required a new and revised mission statement. President Patterson replied that there was no requirement. However, if the institution wants to make changes to the existing mission statement it must be done at that time. The report that is submitted to the NWCCU for consideration of accreditation is due and will include the mission statement as a key component.

Regent Crear asked if a revised mission statement could be submitted to the NWCCU at some other point during the seven year accreditation cycle. President Patterson indicated that a revised mission statement could be submitted in perhaps three years but felt that it would look odd to the NWCCU to have a mission change during the middle of a cycle.

Regent Knecht agreed with Regent Crear's concerns, adding that it appeared the institution was allowing the accreditation commission to drive the timetable and dictate the institution's actions. He felt that if there was sudden insight in the next year, NSC' s mission should be revised, but it may be problematic and the accreditation commission may not be interested in seeing the need for change. He suggested that NSC give the NWCCU the mission statement that was in place at the time the report is submitted. He did not oppose the revised mission statement as presented. However, the mission statement should not be driven by the NWCCU's calendar.

24. Approved - Revision to Mission Statement, NSC *(Agenda Item #25)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Aside from the accreditation issue, Regent Anderson felt that after ten years of existence, NSC had narrowed down its mission statement to be more efficient. She felt that a new president needs to see what the new mission is and where the college is going and agreed with the institution that any revision should be done before a new president is hired.

Chancellor Klaich asked President Sheehan to elaborate on the significance of a mission revision. President Sheehan explained that an institution's governing board does not prevail above the external accrediting agency. The NWCCU dictates a schedule that requires approval of mission statements which in turn drives core themes. That information then establishes what occurs in year 1, 3, and so on. If there is a revision to a mission statement that is not approved by the institution's governing body, it places that institution out of compliance which then presents a level of risk to accreditation.

Regent Page expressed concern that the Board not forget that many people worked hard on the revised mission statement. He felt that if the new president does not like the mission statement that it can be reviewed and changed over time.

Dr. Robin Herlands stated that the one year report due to the NWCCU was due that day. The themes and objectives indicated on the revised mission statement are outlined on that one year report. She felt that there was a risk of non-accreditation if the mission statement was not approved that day.

Regent Crear questioned the process but indicated his support. He asked when the review and revision process had begun. Dr. Herlands replied revision to the mission statement had been considered over the last several years because there were aspects of the old mission statement that were problematic such as the potential offering of master degrees.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

The meeting recessed at 2:53 p.m. and reconvened at 3:01 p.m. on Friday, March 2, 2012, with all members present except for Regents Alden and Wixom.

25. Information - iNtegrate Project Update *(Agenda Item #23)* - Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Steven Zink presented for information a report on the conclusion of the first phase of the NSHE iNtegrate project, which replaced the System's aging student information system. Vice Chancellor Zink also provided an overview of current planning activities related to the next phase, iNtegrate 2, to replace legacy NSHE financial and human resources systems *(Ref. BOR-23 on file in the Board office)*

25. Information - Integrate Project Update *(Agenda Item #23)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Vice Chancellor Zink related that the iNtegrate Project was the largest technology project that the NSHE has ever engaged in. In 2007, the Board authorized and endorsed the vision for the iNtegrate project that was designed to replace the major administrative systems for the entire System. Those systems were the student information system *(phase 1)*, financial *(phase 2)*, and the human resources *(phase 2)*.

Vice Chancellor Zink was pleased to report that the System and various campuses have completed the implementation of the first phase of the project. The project was completed on time and on budget *(approximately $25 M)* which was no easy feat particularly for the state of Nevada due to its multi-type institutions across great distances.

Vice Chancellor Zink related that the real story behind the project's success was that it was achieved in the face of budget cuts, declining numbers of staff and staff hours in the form of reduced hours and furloughs. He commended student services staff for their extraordinary effort. He thanked CedarCrestone for being an extraordinary partner and went above and beyond what they were responsible for to bring the project to successful conclusion. Vice Chancellor Zink also thanked Chancellor Klaich for being an invaluable executive sponsorship of the project.

Vice Chancellor Zink related that the project is now moving into the second phase, which is known as iNtegrate 2. There is widespread representation on the project's steering committee. Two consulting contracts are currently in the process of being issued to look at the chart of accounts for all institutions and to review existing processes and procedures to determine what is being done consistently and differently across eight different campuses.

Regent Crear expressed concern that the implementation time for the project has been so great that the systems will be obsolete before it is even installed. Having experienced implementation of a similar project while at Hawaii, President Smatresk related that implementation of the simplest part of the project took five years and broke every year for three years. He stated that NSHE actually started its project two years ago and finished the first part in one year.. He related that the quality of the data is far superior to the legacy system and joined Vice Chancellor Zink in congratulating everyone involved. It had been the best implementation he has ever experienced.

Mr. Michael J. Gordon, GPSA President, UNLV, asked if the student surcharge for iNtegrate 1 will be eliminated, be reverted to computer labs and other student-related technology needs on the campuses or will the fees be reassigned to iNtegrate 2. Chancellor Klaich indicated that the Board had requested annual reporting on the use of those fees. When the report is presented, the Board will have the opportunity to question the results and possibly revisit Mr. Gordon's question.

25. Information - Integrate Project Update *(Agenda Item #23)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Crear asked if the fees generated from the student surcharge were to be used for backfill and although that phase of the project has been implemented, he imagined there were still backfill needs. Vice Chancellor Zink replied that UNLV had put in additional funds which is why that institution experienced an outstanding result. The projected level of backfill was not needed. However, there are ongoing costs.

Regent Blakely saluted the resolve of the Board members in going forward with the project and expressed his support.

Regent Crear felt that since the surcharge was approved to provide backfill, and that backfill did not come about, he asked that the annual report indicate where those funds were applied. Vice Chancellor Zink replied that the fees did go toward backfill, but more in the form of additional consultant fees due to the effect of budget reductions on staff.

26. Approved - *Handbook* Revision, Mission Statements and Strategic Plans *(Agenda Item #24)* – The Board of Regents approved a revision to Board policy concerning the approval of institutional mission statements and institutional strategic plans *(Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 3)*. Specifically, the proposed revision aligns the cycle of approval for institutional mission statements and strategic plans with the seven year accreditation cycle *(Ref BOR-24 on file in the Board office).*

Vice Chancellor Abba related that Board policy provides that institutional strategic plans must be approved by the Board at least every six years. Typically, the institutions have included their mission statement in their strategic plans and, therefore, the mission statements received de facto approval under the approval of the overall strategic plan. In recent years, institutional mission statements have come forward independently for review and approval at the request of the Board, and the institutions have since followed suit by bringing forward for Board approval any revisions to their mission statements. Further, for accreditation purposes, the Northwest Accreditation Commission requires the mission statements be approved by the governing entity.

Vice Chancellor Abba stated that the Academic Affairs Council recommended that the Board's policy on institutional strategic plans be clarified by requiring the approval of mission statements, in addition to the institutional strategic plan, on at least a seven year basis in alignment with the seven year accreditation cycle. The proposal as written will still allow the institutions to bring forward for approval institutional mission statements and strategic plans at anytime during the seven year period if they so desire

Regent Crear moved approval of a revision to Board policy *(Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 3)* that aligns the cycle of approval for institutional mission statements and strategic plans with the seven year accreditation cycle. Regent Trachok seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

27. Information - Institutional Service Area *(Agenda Item #26)* - The Board of Regents discussed its current policy that designates the geographic regions of the state that each institution may serve *(Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 11).* The discussion included whether or not service areas should be adjusted, quality of service, equity of service, and related issues. *(Ref. BOR-26 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Melcher felt that a discussion regarding service areas would be timely due to the efforts being made on the funding formula and strategic planning. He felt that it was important to look at service areas and make sure that the urban areas are being served.

Regent Melcher felt that although serving communities is about mission, it is driven by finances and political boundaries. He referred to Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 12 of the Handbook and expressed his concern that it may have been more appropriate for the Board to discuss site closures under a separate agenda item instead of combining that discussion with budget reductions. If a separate discussion of site closures had occurred, the Board may have been able to determine if the communities impacted could have been served differently.

Regent Melcher stated that Nevada had eight different institutions that serve eight different populations. As a conversation starter, he asked why Great Basin College was not called College of the Great Basin. He felt that GBC was almost forced to use distance technology at an unprecedented level and has done a good job of it. He indicated that perhaps GBC could deliver two and four programs to communities that were once served by satellite campuses that were closed as a result of budget reductions. Perhaps there needed to be a re-evaluation of the I-80 corridor and communities along Highway 50.

Kevin Melcher related that with the redistricting plan to take effect in January 2013, there will be three Regents representing rural areas instead of just one. He questioned how that will impact the funding formula. He questioned if it would be easier to fund one institution rather than pieces of multiple institutions. He felt that a discussion encompassing those thoughts would be beneficial.

Chair Geddes agreed that a discussion would be worth pursuing but asked what the best approach would be. Regent Melcher felt that the best approach would be for the Board, presidents and System staff to have a frank but philosophical conversation about the issues concerning the rural communities. Regent Melcher added that he has not spoken with citizens from the communities that experienced site closures such as Mineral and Lincoln counties but felt that now was the time to look at how education could be delivered and improved throughout the state.

Regent Leavitt felt that, absent tradition and the taking of distance education out of the equation, perhaps it was time to look at geographical proximity versus artificial county lines.

27. Information - Institutional Service Area *(Agenda Item #26)* – *(Cont'd.)*

As part of the process, Regent Melcher felt that it would be important to communicate with and involve the rural communities to see what programs or vocations are needed from their perspective.

Regent Anderson felt that it was important to determine or define what services should be provided and then determine which institution can provide it.

Regent Doubrava felt that it would be important to keep in mind that the new funding formula is not enrollment driven which might change the characteristics of the service areas.

Regent Melcher indicated that if local funding comes to fruition in the future, that will also impact the conversation.

Regent Trachok agreed with Regent Anderson's suggestion. He felt that it was important to first define what services need to be provided, where those services need to be provided and which institutions would be best suited to provide it.

Chancellor Klaich suggested that the May 31 – June 1, 2012, Board meeting would be an appropriate time to schedule further discussion including an implementation plan on the recommendations of the Fresh Look Taskforce and the impact of those recommendations. He noted that the discussion may not answer all the questions raised but felt that the report would touch on many of the themes.

Regent Anderson indicated that although not all counties would want to engage in a conversation about funding, perhaps the rural counties currently not receiving services would be willing to step up for the much needed services.

Regent Geddes asked Chancellor Klaich to work on bringing the Fresh Look Taskforce recommendation forward to the next Board meeting and to include the state college and universities in the conversation.

28. Tabled - DRI Graduate Training Program *(Agenda Item #20)* – This agenda item was tabled until the June 2012 Board of Regents meeting *(Ref. BOR-20 on file in the Board office).*

29. Tabled - Strategic Directions for the Future of Higher Education *(Agenda Item #28)* – This agenda item was tabled until the June 2012 Board of Regents meeting *(Ref. BOR-28 on file in the Board office).*

30. Approved - Board Meeting Dates *(Agenda Item #30)* - The Board of Regents approved the proposed meeting dates and venues for the Board of Regents' meetings to be held in the remaining calendar year 2012 and next calendar year 2013.

30. Approved - Board Meeting Dates *(Agenda Item #30)* – *(Cont'd.)*

A. Remaining 2012 Meetings – Change in special meeting date only:

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

Tentative special meeting date if necessary: April 20, 2012.
Tentative special meeting date if necessary: August 24, 2012 (was July 20, 2012).
Tentative special meeting date if necessary: October 19, 2012.

B. Calendar Year 2013 Proposed Meeting Dates:

- February 28 – March 1, 2013 DRI Las Vegas
- June 6-7, 2013 UNR
- September 5-6, 2013 GBC
- December 5-6, 2013 UNLV

Tentative special meeting date if necessary: January 11, 2013.
Tentative special meeting date if necessary: April 19, 2013.
Tentative special meeting date if necessary: July 19, 2013.
Tentative special meeting date if necessary: October 18, 2013.

Regent Anderson moved approval of the meeting schedule and venues for the remaining calendar year 2012 and next calendar year 2013. Regent Melcher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

31. Approved - Academic & Student Affairs Committee *(Agenda Item #31)* - Chair Andrea Anderson reported that the Academic & Student Affairs Committee met on March 1, 2012, and Vice Chancellor Crystal Abba presented the *2011 NSHE Remedial Report* that includes information on the percent of Nevada high school graduates who require remediation.

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

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the December 1, 2011, meeting *(Ref. ASA-2a on file in the Board office).*
- UNLV - Program Elimination, BS in Applied Physics - The Committee recommended elimination of the BS in Applied Physics *(Ref. ASA-2b on file in the Board office).*
- UNLV - Program Elimination, BS in Computation Physics - The Committee recommended for approval the elimination of the BA in Computational Physics *(Ref. ASA-2c on file in the Board office).*
- UNLV - Program Elimination, MA in Ethics and Policy Studies - The Committee recommended for approval the elimination of the MA in Ethics and Policy Studies *(Ref. ASA-2d on file in the Board office).*

31. Approved - Academic & Student Affairs Committee *(Agenda Item #31)* – *(Cont'd.)*

- UNLV – Organizational Unit Change, Management, Entrepreneurship & Technology and Marketing & International Business - The Committee recommended for approval an organizational unit change to Management, Entrepreneurship & Technology and Marketing & International Business *(Ref. ASA-2e on file in the Board office).*
- TMCC – Organizational Unit Change, Divisions of Liberal Arts, Sciences, Business, Applied Industrial Technology and Web College - The Committee recommended for approval an organizational unit change to the Divisions of Liberal Arts, Sciences, Business, Applied Industrial Technology and Web College *(Ref. ASA-2f on file in the Board office).*
- *Handbook* Revision, Co-Admission Programs – The Committee recommended for approval a revision to the *Handbook* regarding Co-Admission Programs *(Title 4, Chapter 16, Section 5) (Ref. ASA-4 on file in the Board office).*
- Regents' Awards – The Committee recommended for approval the following individuals nominated for the 2012 Regents' Awards *(Ref. ASA-5 on file in the Board office):*
  - ✓ Nevada Regents' Creative Activities Award
    Joseph DeLappe, UNR
  - ✓ Nevada Regents' Teaching Award – Community College
    Daniel Bouweraerts, TMCC
  - ✓ Nevada Regents' Teaching Award - University, State College & DRI Faculty
    Dr. Kevin Graziano, NSC
  - ✓ Nevada Regents' Academic Advisor Award
    Cynthia Birk, UNR *(Undergraduate)*
    Dr. Curtis Love, UNLV *(Graduate)*
    Jana Wolf, CSN *(Community College)*

Regent Anderson moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Trachok seconded.

Although the B.S. in Applied Physics and the B.S. in Computational Physics at UNLV were being eliminated, Regent Knecht asked if a B.S. in General Physics still existed. President Smatresk confirmed that the elimination of the two programs was more a case of too overspecialized degree titles. UNLV still offered a graduate and masters degree in physics.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

32. Approved - Audit Committee *(Agenda Item #32)* – Vice Chair Kevin Melcher reported that the Audit Committee met on March 1, 2012, and received follow-up responses for five internal audit reports that were presented to the Audit Committee at its September 2011 meeting. In addition, two follow-up responses were received for audit reports that were presented at its December 2011 meeting.

The Committee requested a follow-up report on the UNLV Network Security Audit at its June 2012 meeting.

The Committee discussed the audit requirements for small Foundations. Further discussion will take place at the December 2012 Audit Committee meeting. The Committee requested information on the cost of audits for the December meeting.

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

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the December 1, 2011, meeting *(Ref. A-2a on file in the Board office).*
- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended for approval the following internal audit reports: *(Ref. Audit Summary on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ Campus Card Program, UNR. *(Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ Extended Studies, UNR. *(Ref. A-4 on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ College of Hotel Administration, UNLV. *(Ref. A-5 on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ Network Security Audit, NSC. *(Ref. A-6 on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ Fringe Pool, DRI. *(Ref. A-7 on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ Audit Exception Report. *(Ref. A-8 on file in the Board office)*
  - ✓ Foundation Audit Waivers. *(Ref. A-9 on file in the Board office)*
- Audit Exception Report - The Committee recommended approval of the Audit Exception report for the six months ended December 31, 2011.

Regent Melcher moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

33. Approved - Business & Finance Committee *(Agenda Item #33)* –Vice Chair Kevin Melcher reported that the Business & Finance Committee met on March 1, 2012, and heard the following reports:

- Calendar year 2011 Self-Supporting Summer School and Calendar Year Budgets, Budget to Actual Comparisons, for each university and college of the NSHE.
- All Funds revenues and expenses of the NSHE for the second quarter of fiscal year 2011-2012.

33. Approved - Business & Finance Committee *(Agenda Item #33) – (Cont'd.)*

- NSHE Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets and the status of state appropriations for the second quarter of fiscal year 2011-2012.
- Budget transfers of state appropriated funds between functions for the second quarter of fiscal year 2011-2012.
- The University of Nevada, Reno reported on their Intercollegiate Athletics fundraising and development activities from fiscal year 2005 to current.
- The University of Nevada, Las Vegas reported on their Intercollegiate Athletics fundraising and development activities from fiscal year 2007 to current.

Action Items:
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Business & Finance Committee:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the December 1, 2011, meeting. *(Ref. BF-2a on file in the Board office)*
- 2011 Self-Supporting Summer School/Calendar Year Budgets, Budget to Actual Comparison – The Committee recommended for approval the report of the Self-Supporting Summer School/Calendar Year Budgets, Budget to Actual Comparison for the year 2011. *(Ref. BF-2b(1) & Ref. BF-2b(2) on file in the Board office)*
- Mid-Year Fiscal Year 2011-12 Self-Supporting Budgets & 2012 Summer School/Calendar Year Budgets – The Committee recommended for approval the NSHE mid-year self-supporting budgets for fiscal year 2011-12 and the self-supporting summer school/calendar budgets for calendar year 2012. *(Ref. BF-2c(1) & Ref. BF-2c(2) on file in the Board office)*
- University of Nevada, Reno Fire Science Academy *(FSA)* – Debt Reduction and Closure Cost Plan - The Committee recommended for approval a request to use the remaining balance of the proceeds *(approximately $4.2 M)* from the sale of the Mill & McCarran property to 1) address FSA closure/reclamation costs, 2) to use any remaining funds to further reduce the amount of outstanding capital debt and 3) to call the maturities of the outstanding FSA bonds selected by the Chancellor from the sources identified in the FSA Debt Reduction and Closure Cost Plan *(Ref. BF-4 on file in the Board office).*
- Nevada System of Higher Education Sale of Bonds – The Committee recommended for approval a resolution for the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the University of Nevada, Reno, to issue to $45 M in long-term fixed rate, tax exempt revenue refunding bonds to be issued in March 2012 or as soon as bond market conditions to refinance outstanding bonds for interest savings permit *(Ref. BF-5 on file in the Board office).*

33. Approved - Business & Finance Committee *(Agenda Item #33) – (Cont'd.)*

- Amendment of Desert Research Institute Letter of Credit – The Committee recommended for approval a resolution to allow the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the Desert Research Institute to enter into an amendment of the Reimbursement Agreement on the Taxable Lease Revenue Bond Series 2002, issued on June 14, 2002, in order to extend the Letter of Credit with Bank of America, for a period of 5 years through July 10, 2017. *(Ref. BF-6 on file in the Board office)*

Regent Melcher moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations.

Regent Melcher noted that the Committee's recommendation to approve the issuance of $45 M in long-term fixed rate, tax exempt revenue refunding bonds includes the recommendation to approve the bond resolution.

Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

34. Approved - Investment & Facilities Committee *(Agenda Item #34)* – Vice Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Investment & Facilities Committee met on March 1, 2012, and heard the following:

- David Breiner from Cambridge Associates reported on asset allocation and investment returns for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds as of December 31, 2011.
- Director of Banking and Investments Ruby Camposano reported that the balance of the Operating Pool reserve account as of February 29, 2012 was a positive $38.6 M.
- The Committee reviewed the proposal that monthly distributions from the Operating Pool, which were reinstated in July 2011, be utilized to provide a source of funds for institutions to match grant and contract activities. The Committee requested that information be developed that outlines how monthly distributions from the Operating Pool were being utilized by each of the institutions. In addition, the Committee requested information on how each institution's goal for increasing grant and contact activities would be achieved.

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

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the December 1, 2011, meeting *(Ref. IF-2 on file in the Board office).*
- The Committee recommended for approval Cambridge's Associates rebalancing recommendation to direct $10 M from the Operating cash accounts into the International equities, with $5 M allocated to Manning & Napier and $5 M allocated to MFS International.

34. Approved - Investment & Facilities Committee *(Agenda Item #34)* – (Cont'd.)

- The Committee recommended for approval Cambridge Associate's recommendation to make a $5 M commitment to a Private Equity investment within the Endowment Pool, specifically to Commonfund Capital Natural Resources Partners IX.
- The Committee recommended for approval to transfer $30 M from the Operating Pool Reserve account into the market fluctuation account.
- Lease of Retail Space in the Joe Crowley Student Union to Wells Fargo Bank, UNR - The Committee recommended for approval a proposed lease with Wells Fargo Bank for retail space in the Joe Crowley Student Union *(Ref. IF-6 on file in the Board office).*
- Approval to Exchange Property at Great Basin College Pahrump Campus – The Committee recommended for approval a direct exchange of the Pahrump High Tech Center *(owned by the NSHE)* for the vacant Mt. Charleston Elementary School campus owned by Nye County School District, subject to terms and conditions approved by the Chancellor after consultation with the Chair of the Investment & Facilities Committee *(Ref. IF-7 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Crear moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Trachok seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent. Regent Page abstained.

35. Approved - Workforce, Research And Economic Development Committee *(Agenda Item #35)* - Chair Kevin C. Melcher reported that the Workforce, Research and Economic Development Committee met on March 1, 2012, and heard the following:

Mr. Mark Muro, Washington Co-Director, Brookings Mountain West and Senior Fellow and Policy Director, Metropolitan Policy Program, presented the recent *Brookings-SRI Report: An Economic Development Agenda for Nevada.* The report identifies seven sectors that have the highest potential to restore growth and jobs in Nevada – tourism, gaming and entertainment, health and medical services, business IT ecosystems, clean energy, mining, materials and manufacturing, logistics and operations, and aerospace and defense.

Mr. Steve Hill, Executive Director of the Office for Economic Development reported on the status of the State Plan for Economic Development that was released February 7, 2012. The plan focuses on five objectives that include increasing opportunities through education and workforce development.

Mr. Ryan Costella presented information on Dream It Do It, a 501c3 organization dedicated to creating for the state a highly skilled workforce through the attainment of academic degrees and nationally portable, industry-recognized credentials aligned with the nationally-recognized Skills Certification System. The program promotes STEM education and will align to pathways within NSHE institutions.

35. Approved - Workforce, Research And Economic Development Committee *(Agenda Item #35)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Community college representatives from CSN, GBC, TMCC and WNC reported on their respective workforce development programs. The reports highlighted existing workforce development programs and how the institutions work with employers to develop such programs.

Action Items:
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Workforce, Research and Economic Development Committee:

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the December 1, 2011, meeting *(Ref. WRED-2 on file in the Board office).*
- Regents' Researcher Awards – The Committee recommended for approval the following individuals nominated for the 2012 Regents' Awards *(Ref. WRED-7a & Ref. WRED-7b on file in the Board office).*
  - ✓ Nevada Regents' Researcher Award
    Dr. Faramarz Gordaninejad, UNR
  - ✓ Nevada Regents' Rising Researcher Award
    Dr. Sajjad Ahmad, UNLV
    Dr. Qizhen Li, UNR
    Dr. Gannet Hallar, DRI

Regent Melcher moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Trachok seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

36. Approved - Cultural Diversity Committee *(Agenda Item #36)* - Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Cultural Diversity Committee met on March 2, 2012, and heard the following:

An informational presentation from Eagle Promotions, Mario Stadtlander, discussed the Minority Business Enterprise and Corporate Plus certification. The committee members emphasized the importance of looking at locally owned businesses to keep business in state.

Representatives from each institution reviewed the projects and costs associated with the American with Disabilities Act, including a review of HECC/SHECC funded ADA projects that are currently underway, other outstanding projects and recent accomplishments in addressing ADA standards.

Representatives from each institution reviewed their respective Tier II supplier diversity spending. Regent Crear noted the provision of the Procedures and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 5, Section 2, which requires an annual report to the Board on subcontract diversity spending.

36. Approved - Cultural Diversity Committee *(Agenda Item #36)* – *(Cont'd.)*

President Maria Sheehan presented an update on EDIC. Campus presidents agreed to serve on EDIC and will provide direction on diversity initiatives and priorities. Dr. Reginald Stewart discussed the alignment of the Diversity Summit with the Chancellor's Inclusive Excellence Advisory Board interim report of recommendations. Regent Crear requested that there be a focus on providing information to the public on the role of diversity in higher education as part of the Diversity Summit. Regent Crear requested an action plan at a future CDC meeting from EDIC in regard to how campuses will share prospective faculty applicants.

Under new business, the committee requested a report at a future meeting on the impact of the new formula model on minority students.

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

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the December 2, 2011, meeting *(Ref. CD-2 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Crear moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

37. Approved - Health Sciences System Committee *(Agenda Item #37)* - Chair James Dean Leavitt reported that the Health Sciences System Committee met on March 2, 2012, and heard the following:

- Chair Leavitt provided remarks throughout the meeting, including reiterating his commitment to give the UNSOM time to implement its planned programmatic enhancements. He also noted that he was pleased on the progress that is being made.
- Vice Chancellor Turner presented an update on the Health Sciences System Council. The second meeting was held on February 3, 2011. The members continued work on the program inventory initiative. Capture of certificates under 30 credits is also in progress. This information is also critical as it identifies training and re-training opportunities and will assist in addressing community and industry needs in Nevada. It is anticipated that the 2010 inventory will be completed by April 2012 and preliminary 2011 data will also be available by that time. HSS is partnering with the local health departments and Nevada's Health and Human Services (DHHS) on conducting a health assessment to identify patient and community needs, workforce supply and industry demand within health access and delivery of care. In addition, the health assessment will identify current health professions shortages and under different scenarios under health care reform. HSS is continuing work on the development of a

37. Approved - Health Sciences System Committee *(Agenda Item #37)* – *(Cont'd.)*

searchable database project of all NSHE HSS faculty research areas of interest and scholarly activities. Several members of the HSS Council are investigating various software systems that will facilitate this database. The HSS Council members are very supportive of these projects and are actively engaged.

- Regarding work on the Health Care Sector Council, Dr. Turner stated that the Council is working very closely with Nevada's Department of Education, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) and the Governor's Office of Economic Develop (GOED) on a data collection exercise and is aligning its mission to compliment the missions and goals of these other two statewide entities.
- Dr. Turner gave a status report on the health sciences programmatic assessment related to the academic health center (AHC) with the assistance of FTI Consulting. She presented a brief overview on FTI's various work with our school of medicine and the University Medical Center of Southern Nevada (UMC). The current project in which HSS is engaged broadens the scope to include other health professions to identify opportunities that can be included in the formation of an AHC with UMC. Currently, data collection from health sciences programs is being done in preparation of the FTI consultant's visit with key stakeholders which will take place this month.
- Dean of UNSOM/Vice President of the Division of Health Sciences, Dr. Thomas Schwenk, presented a status report on the recommendations provided by FTI Consulting and other initiatives regarding UNSOM operations and its pursuit of developing the AHC with UMC. He went over initiatives in detail including an update on the clinical practice plan and the creation of an RFP for Health Information Technology and practice management IT.
- Dr. Thomas Schwenk updated the Committee on planning efforts between UNSOM and UMC regarding a new facility. Dean Schwenk recently convened local department chairs and educational leaders to have a preliminary discussion on facility needs on the UMC Campus. Mr. Brian Brannman, CEO of UMC, stated that planning efforts between UMC and UNSOM are positive and moving forward in the right direction.
- NSC President Bart Patterson introduced Dr. Amy Chaffin to present the innovative specialized training program entitled, "Hearing Voices." This training is currently being given to nursing students at the NSHE HSS Clinical Simulation Center of Las Vegas. This transformation training program sensitizes the students to the challenges faced by some mental health patients.
- Regent Doubrava would like to discuss: (1) Occupational Therapy Assistant program at CSN, (2) hear a report from DRI on its mission to be more involved in health sciences research in the future, and (3) acknowledgement of and interaction with University of California San Diego, now that they have a presence in Nevada.

37. Approved - Health Sciences System Committee *(Agenda Item #37)* – *(Cont'd.)*

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

- Minutes – The Committee recommended for approval the minutes from the December 2, 2011, meeting *(Ref. HSS-2 on file in the Board office).*

Regent Leavitt moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Trachok seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Wixom were absent.

38. Information - University of Nevada, Reno President Search Committee *(Agenda Item #38)* - Chair James Dean Leavitt provided a brief report on the UNR President Search Committee meetings held on October 14, 2011, December 9, 2011, and December 16, 2011. The Committee selected R. William Funk and Associates as its search consultant. Semifinalist candidates will be considered by the Committee at its next scheduled meeting on April 5, 2012.

39. Information - Great Basin College President Search Committee *(Agenda Item #39)* - Chair Kevin C. Melcher provided a brief report on the GBC President Search Committee meetings held on November 21, 2011, January 13, 2012, and January 27, 2012. The Committee selected Cizek and Associates as its search consultant. Semifinalist candidates will be considered by the Committee at its next scheduled meeting on April 9, 2012.

40. Information - Nevada State College President Search Committee *(Agenda Item #40)* – Vice Chair Kevin J. Page provided a brief report on the NSC President Search Committee meetings held on December 12, 2011, January 10, 2012, and January 24, 2012. The Committee selected Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates as its search consultant. Semifinalist candidates will be considered by the Committee at its next scheduled meeting on April 11, 2012.

41. Information - New Business *(Agenda item #41)* – Chair Geddes requested the following items on a future meeting agenda:

- The Chancellor, Presidents and Athletic Directors will bring back to the Board information on what and when athletics-related information is reported to the Board *(Agenda Item #9 - NCAA Division I Joint Presentation by UNLV and UNR)*.
- An update from the PEBP and compensation taskforces *(Agenda Item #21 – Public Comment)*.
- iNtegrate financial report *(Agenda Item #23 – iNtegrate Project Update)*.
- Changes as recommended by the Board to the Handbook for Chancellor Periodic Evaluations *(Agenda Item #17 - P&GM Revision, Periodic President Evaluation)*.

Regent Alden requested that the discussion regarding service area continue at a future meeting *(Agenda Item #26 – Institutional Service Area).*

42. Information - Public Comment *(Agenda Item #42)* – None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Prepared by: Jessica C. McMullen
Special Assistant and Coordinator to the Board of Regents

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

Approved by the Board of Regents at the May 31-June 1, 2012, meeting.