

SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

System Administration, Las Vegas
4300 South Maryland Parkway, Board Room

Friday, April 22, 2022

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

Members Present:

Mrs. Cathy McAdoo, Chair
Dr. Patrick R. Carter, Vice Chair
Mr. Joseph C. Arrascada
Mr. Patrick J. Boylan
Mr. Byron Brooks
Ms. Amy J. Carvalho
Mrs. Carol Del Carlo
Dr. Mark W. Doubrava
Dr. Jason Geddes
Mr. Donald Sylvantee McMichael Sr.
Mr. John T. Moran
Ms. Laura E. Perkins
Dr. Lois Tarkanian

Members Absent:

Mrs. Carol Del Carlo

Others Present:

Ms. Crystal Abba, Officer in Charge
Dr. Constance Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs and Advancement
Mr. Caleb Cage, Vice Chancellor, Workforce Development
Mr. Andrew Clinger, Chief Financial Officer
Ms. Renee Davis, Acting Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs
Mr. James J. Martines, Interim Chief General Counsel
Ms. Keri Nikolajewski, Interim Chief of Staff to the Board
Ms. Tina Russom, Deputy General Counsel
Mr. Joe Sunbury, Chief Internal Auditor
Dr. Federico Zaragoza, President, CSN
Dr. Kumud Acharya, President, DRI
Dr. DeRionne Pollard, President, NSC
Dr. Karin M. Hilgersom, President, TMCC

Others Present: *(Continued)*
Dr. Keith E. Whitfield, President, UNLV
Mr. Brian Sandoval, President, UNR
Dr. J. Kyle Dalpe, Interim President, WNC

Faculty senate chairs in attendance were: Dr. Virginia Irintcheva, TMCC; Ms. Shannon Sumpter, UNLV; and Dr. Amy Pason, UNR. Student body president in attendance was: Ms. Dionne Stanfill, ASUN President, UNR.

Chair McAdoo called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with all members present except Regents Boylan and Del Carlo. Regent Brooks led the Pledge of Allegiance, and Chair McAdoo provided the Land Acknowledgement.

1. Information Only – Public Comment

Dr. Kent Ervin was concerned that multiple professional employees have left NSHE due to declining salaries. At the budget discussion in March, several Regents noted the importance of making faculty compensation a high priority. The Board must follow through with COLA and merit increases. Classified employees gained the right to collective bargaining in 2019, and those that formed bargaining units will receive three percent COLA on July 1, but NSHE employees without collective bargaining at the state level will only receive a one percent COLA. It would be in NSHE's and faculty's mutual interest to use collective bargaining agreements on salary to take funding requests to the Legislature with a united front. Current collective bargaining regulations are confusing, do not reflect current reality, and work to the detriment of NSHE and faculty in the state budgeting process. The Nevada Faculty Alliance welcomes a serious discussion on revising the NSHE *Handbook*.

Regent Boylan entered the meeting.

2. Approved – Minutes – The Board approved the following meeting minutes:

- December 30, 2021, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-2a on file in the Board Office.*)
- January 14, 2022, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-2b on file in the Board Office.*)
- February 17, 2022, Board of Regents special meeting (*Ref. BOR-2c on file in the Board Office.*)

Vice Chair Carter moved approval of the meeting minutes. Regent Tarkanian seconded. Motion carried. Regent Del Carlo was absent.

Officer in Charge Abba introduced Interim Chief General Counsel James Martines.

3. Information Only – Board Chair's Report – Chair McAdoo took a moment of privilege to provide a story about repairing relationships during divisive and tough times. People must embrace the struggle as a path to building character. As a result, NSHE will be stronger and better at serving students, faculty, staff, and administration.

4. Information Only – Transition Report – Officer in Charge Crystal Abba presented an update on metrics related to the Board of Regents’ Strategic Goals (Access, Success, Closing the Achievement Gap, Workforce and Research) in the wake of the pandemic, including information on critical issues, Legislative matters, System Administration budget shortfall, strategic planning, task forces, other challenges, and preparations for the arrival of an interim or acting Chancellor. *(Ref. BOR-4 on file in the Board Office.)*

In response to a question from Regent Geddes related to the decline in headcount during the pandemic, CSN President Zaragoza stated community college enrollment declined across the country because different elements were in play. First, when the community colleges went remote due to the pandemic, career and technical education (CTE) sections that are required for students to graduate, such as nursing clinicals, were closed. The second element was capacity, with only half the seats being offered because of the pandemic. Finally, CSN provided 100 fewer CTE sections because of COVID-specific shutdown requirements. TMCC President Hilgersom provided three examples: 1) students had infrastructure internet issues in their homes which made it difficult for them to attend school online; 2) TMCC has a large number of part-time students, many in the gig economy, which closed down during the pandemic; and 3) the University took more special admission students which impacted TMCC by approximately 250 students.

With respect to the System Administration budget shortfall, Vice Chair Carter asked if the position recruitments currently posted online would be frozen or removed. Officer in Charge Abba responded many of them are in SCS, and its budget is not currently in the same situation as System Administration. She indicated a hiring freeze is in place for all System Administration positions.

Regent Carvalho agreed it is crucial to involve the new Chancellor in strategic planning. However, the Strategic Goals were created in 2019, and she hoped that if changes are needed, they will be brought back to the Board for discussion.

Regent Carvalho believed discussion was needed on how and when new business items are brought up.

Officer in Charge Abba stated strategic planning is important because it provides the roadmap for how the System will get there. Officer in Charge Abba added it is important to track goals over time to see if they worked. She indicated that most new business items fall to Academic and Student Affairs, but dialogue is needed regarding priorities.

Regent Brooks left the meeting.

5. Information Only – System Administration Budgets – Chief Financial Officer Andrew Clinger provided an overview of the NSHE System Administration budgets, including the state and non-state support for the Chancellor’s Office, Board of Regents, and Internal Audit. *(Ref. BOR-5 on file in the Board Office.)*

Regent Brooks entered the meeting.

5. Information Only – System Administration Budgets – (Continued)

Regent Brooks thanked Chief Financial Officer Clinger for clarifying the source of funding for the chancellor separation agreement approved at the April 1, 2022, meeting.

In response to a question from Regent Brooks about Nevada Energy funds, Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated the funds are based on a customer service agreement entered into with Nevada Energy in December 2019. The funds are retention payments and were allocated to co-requisite in the past. Officer in Charge Abba added the payments were distributed to the institutions to support students, such as faculty stipends, training, and equipment.

Regent Perkins asked if travel expenses included travel to the institutions, with Chief Financial Officer Clinger responding yes, it is travel for staff and Regents. Regent Perkins stated NSHE learned so much during COVID about using virtual technologies for meetings and asked if the travel funds could be used to help decrease the budget deficit. Chief Financial Officer Clinger said each line item in the budget would be reviewed.

Chair McAdoo added that the cost of a Southwest flight had significantly increased and asked people to make flight arrangements early.

Regent Brooks noted that in FY21, System Administration had funding sources of \$10 million, with expenditures of \$9.5 million showing that it operated within its budget. In FY22, System Administration had funding sources of \$9.4 million, with expenditures of \$10.8 million, and asked if it was accurate to say that System Administration failed to operate within reasonable financial means. Chief Financial Officer Clinger responded yes.

Vice Chair Carter asked where the FY21 positive balance went, with Chief Financial Officer Clinger stating it was carried forward. There was \$3 million in reserves, and the FY21 surplus of approximately \$532,000, ending with \$3.5 million in reserves.

Vice Chair Carter asked what the deficit would have been if the frozen positions had been hired. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated the savings from the ten frozen positions for the balance of the year is \$425,000. If the positions were left vacant for an entire year, the savings would be \$1.7 million.

Regent Brooks clarified that FY21 shows a net increase of approximately \$500,000, but FY22 shows a substantial decrease in funds. He asked what prior years showed. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated that FY18, FY19, and FY20 all ended with various surpluses.

Vice Chair Carter asked how many positions outside of System Computing Services were there in FY21 versus how many in FY22. Chief Financial Officer Clinger did not have the information but would provide the information.

Regent Brooks clarified that from FY18 to FY 21 there was a surplus, and in FY22 there was a deficit. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated that was correct.

5. Information Only – System Administration Budgets – (Continued)

In response to a question from Regent Brooks related to contracts currently under review, Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated he was referring to various contracts for activities such as legal services and consulting.

Vice Chair Carter asked a question related to agenda item fiscal notes and fiduciary duty. Specifically, in September and December 2021, the fiscal impact statements for the strategic planning effort read, “This effort will have costs associated with it; however, much of this work is already absorbed within the normal duties of NSHE staff and other partners.” At that meeting, he asked how much it would be, and staff estimated it would be under \$100,000. Vice Chair Carter asked whose responsibility it is to let the Board know if that is not true. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated it would be the Chancellor’s responsibility. He added that through February 2022, \$182,000 had already been spent on that consultant.

Regent Brooks asked Chief Financial Officer Clinger to repeat the three areas for which there are consulting agreements and to specifically identify those hired for legal purposes and whether the contracts have expired or will not be renewed by NSHE. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated not all have been terminated or expired. Legal fee projections for FY22 included Kamer Zucker Abbott \$150,000; Ballard Spahr \$307,500; and \$204,000 to review NSHE real estate transactions. Additional areas include a strategic planning consultant at \$170,000; a consultant hired to review and update NSHE salary schedules at \$97,000; and a consultant for government affairs services projected at \$70,000.

In response to a question from Regent Arrascada related to whether the investigation attorney fees were considered under legal fees, Chief Financial Officer Clinger responded that it is included in legal fees.

Regent Arrascada asked if there is anything tangible from the Gunter Group that justifies submitted invoices of \$182,000. Vice Chancellor for Workforce Development Caleb Cage stated a sizable portion of the amount was staff support in the interim between the announcement of the plan in September 2021 and the hiring of the Program Manager in January 2022. In addition, the Gunter Group developed the format and coordinated the listening sessions. There were also services provided for the Council of President’s retreat and the Cabinet retreat.

Regent Arrascada stated the Strategic Plan is imperative and extremely necessary and needed. However, the invoices date back to November 2020, and he has not seen anything tangible up to the most current invoice. Regent Arrascada requested a justification for the expenses. Vice Chancellor Cage stated he will work with Officer in Charge Abba to develop a timeline and rationale.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Carter about property insurance, Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated Risk Management uses a broker to get bids on property insurance. Then it is allocated to the institutions.

Regents Boylan and Brooks agreed with Regent Arrascada’s request for information.

5. Information Only – System Administration Budgets – (Continued)

Regent Brooks appreciated the presentation but wondered what had been done to address the budget and balance concerns. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated slide 9 shows a \$1.6 million deficit that grew to \$1.9 million. There were discussions with the former Chancellor and the Cabinet, and the focus at that time was on how the System Office compared to other system offices across the country. The former Chancellor wanted the data on how NSHE compared with the assumption that the System Office is under-resourced compared to other system offices. Discussions were focused on the revenue side. As the deficit grew, there was some discussion about a hiring freeze and reviewing contracts, but there was a reluctance to hold positions vacant and make some of the other cuts that were necessary, and ultimately no measures to reduce System expenditures were implemented.

Regent Brooks clarified that the action and conversation was to provide more funding for hiring to better support Cabinet members. Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated that was a fair characterization.

Regent Carvalho stated she was alarmed when she saw this, but she is also encouraged by the presentation and that necessary steps are being taken to resolve the issues. However, she believed a more formal process to keep the Regents informed was needed.

Regent Carvalho wondered if the Chancellor role can engage consultants without approval or if there is a mechanism used that says the System may not have the money to hire a consultant. A more formalized process is needed so the Board knows where money is going before it happens and does not end up in this situation again.

The meeting recessed at 10:31 a.m. and reconvened at 10:46 a.m. with all members present except Regents Arrascada, Del Carlo, and McMichael.

Chair McAdoo stated that the Fiscal Year 22 budget would end in a shortfall. However, she believed that all efforts must be made to reduce expenditures in the future, so the System ends in a better position. Reducing expenses is not easy, but measures must be taken to reduce the projected shortfall.

Regents Arrascada and McMichael entered the meeting.

6. Approved – Update on Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board Search – The Board approved leaving the Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board position announcement open for another 30 days to see if additional qualified candidates emerge, but if not, to move forward and bring the three qualified applicants as identified by Committee Chair Moran to the search committee to interview in consideration of making a final recommendation to the full Board.

Interim Chief General Counsel Martines stated due to the sensitive nature of the search process, he reminded the Board of the importance of staying within the scope of the agenda item language and not discussing candidate information at this point in the process.

6. Approved – Update on Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board Search –
(Continued)

Committee Chair John T. Moran provided an update on the progress of the Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board search and invited input and discussion from the Board concerning next steps.

Regent Boylan stated a part-time counsel would not be in the office regularly, would have to take time to catch up on daily events, and could cost NSHE extra dollars for additional lawyers. He believed that the Board would have been in a better position if it had its counsel during the last few months. The Board must revisit the minimum requirements of the position, and the Board must appoint a new Committee to complete this work. Regent Boylan asked if the same criteria would be used to hire a part-time counsel versus a full-time counsel.

Regent Boylan moved approval to resume the ad hoc Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board Search immediately and that the best-qualified applicant/applicants be forwarded to the full Board for approval expeditiously.

The motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Regent Geddes clarified there were three qualified candidates, but directions from the Board were four or more qualified candidates. Committee Chair Moran stated there were three qualified candidates for consideration.

Regent Geddes stated he favored extending the search for another 30 days to see if additional qualified candidates emerged. Otherwise, he was comfortable with only three qualified candidates for consideration.

Vice Chair Carter stated he believed the position should be split into having a Chief of Staff and a Counsel.

Regent Brooks stated this was the first communication that there were three strong candidates, but nobody was brought forward because there were not four. Regent Brooks voiced his frustration with the process and the time it has taken.

In response to a question from Regent Brooks related to next steps, Committee Chair Moran stated the Board set the parameters, and when those parameters were not met, the Board Chair was notified. The Board Chair moved quickly to agenda the agenda item.

Regent Carvalho stated the Board just received information about the budget shortfall, and the System Office has implemented a hiring freeze, yet the Board is talking about hiring an attorney. It is an anomaly for a taxpayer-funded government board to have its own attorney. She knows she does not have the support, but the Board does not have the money to continue this. She believed this was an opportunity for the Board of Regents to

6. Approved – Update on Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board Search –
(Continued)

show that it is genuinely acting in the best interests of NSHE and its constituents. She would be comfortable with a part-time counsel that works on an ad hoc basis if necessary, and she urged her colleagues to contemplate this.

Regent Brooks stated it was his understanding that funds have been allocated, whether it is a permanent or ad hoc position. Chief Financial Officer Clinger said the Officer in Charge does not have the authority to freeze positions within the Board Office because it is the purview of the Board. Regent Brooks clarified the funds are available, with Chief Financial Officer Clinger responding yes.

In response to a question from Regent Boylan about the criteria to be used, Interim Chief General Counsel Martines responded that when hiring for an internal position, there will be requirements such as so much public service and experience representing boards. But when you are recruiting outside counsel to fill a job temporarily, it is much harder to require that they have experience doing public work when they are in private practice. Director of Human Resources Sherry Olson agreed with the comments made by Interim Chief General Counsel Martines.

Regent Boylan stated the criteria should be changed. It is such an important position for the Board. If there is one qualified candidate, the Committee should see them.

Chair McAdoo reiterated that the Board voted for a minimum of four applicants.

Regent Geddes moved approval to leave the Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board position announcement open for another 30 days to see if additional qualified candidates emerge, but if not, to move forward and bring the three qualified applicants as identified by Committee Chair Moran to the search committee to interview in consideration of making a final recommendation to the full Board. Chair McAdoo seconded.

Regent Perkins stated the Board had debated the criteria. She is in favor of the motion on the table.

In response to a question from Regent Carvalho about position salary savings, Chief Financial Officer Clinger stated it is correct that if the position is left vacant to the end of the Fiscal year, it is a savings of \$72,000.

Regent Brooks stated he is in favor of the motion to move the search forward. However, he said it is possible that none of the candidates meet the Committee's expectations. Therefore, he wondered if it would be better to table the item and have the Search Committee meet to discuss a contract-basis hire, so the Board does not only have one direction to proceed.

6. Approved – Update on Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board Search –
(Continued)

Regent Geddes stated there are three qualified candidates, and the motion on the floor allows an extension to allow for more candidates.

Interim Chief of Staff Keri Nikolajewski restated the motion.

Motion carried via a roll call vote. Chair McAdoo, Vice Chair Carter, and Regents Arrascada, Boylan, Brooks, Doubrava, Geddes, McMichael, Moran, Perkins, and Tarkanian voted yes. Regent Carvalho voted no. Regent Del Carlo was absent.

7. Approved – Delegation of Authority to the Chair, Consistent with NRS 241.0357, in the matter of *Ballas v. State of Nevada ex. rel. Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education* – The Board approved authorizing the Board Chair to make any litigation decisions regarding the *Ballas* class action lawsuit, consistent with NRS 241.0357, after consultation with the Chancellor, or the individual authorized by the Board to serve in the role of Chancellor, and System General Counsel, consistent with the advice of System General Counsel. (Ref. BOR-7 on file in the Board Office.)

Interim Chief General Counsel Martines presented historical background and requested that the Board authorize the Board Chair to make any litigation decisions regarding the *Ballas* class action lawsuit, consistent with NRS 241.0357, after consultation with the Chancellor, or the individual authorized by the Board to serve in the role of Chancellor, and System General Counsel.

Regent Doubrava moved approval to authorize the Board Chair to make any litigation decisions regarding the *Ballas* class action lawsuit, consistent with NRS 241.0357, after consultation with the Chancellor, or the individual authorized by the Board to serve in the role of Chancellor, and System General Counsel. Regent McMichael seconded.

Regent Carvalho offered a friendly amendment to add "...after consultation with *and approval by* the Chancellor..."

Regent Doubrava clarified whether this language included an Officer in Charge, with Chair McAdoo stating it did.

Regents Doubrava and McMichael accepted the friendly amendment.

Officer in Charge Abba asked Interim Chief General Counsel Martines to clarify the language.

7. Approved – Delegation of Authority to the Chair, Consistent with NRS 241.0357, in the matter of *Ballas v. State of Nevada ex. rel. Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education* – (Continued)

Interim Chief General Counsel Martines clarified whether “*and approved by*” meant approval of both the Chancellor or the individual authorized by the Board to serve in the role of Chancellor, and System General Counsel. Regent Carvalho stated she intended that both approve it.

Regents Doubrava and McMichael agreed with and understood the intention.

Vice Chair Carter disagreed with the requested addition and stated he would vote no on the motion.

Regent Moran asked whether a particular individual approached Officer in Charge Abba related to this item. Officer in Charge Abba stated no person approached her. Instead, it was a discussion she had with the legal staff.

In response to a question from Regent Moran related to a Supreme Court decision, Officer in Charge Abba stated she is not advising the Board on this matter but has asked Interim Chief General Counsel Martines to advise the Board on this matter.

Regent Moran was trying to understand how and why this has come forward. This agenda item may create the appearance of not being transparent and in opposition to the mission in favor of shared governance. Interim Chief General Counsel Martines stated he had read the opinion in the past. This agenda item was specifically brought forward because of decisions that need to be made solely with respect to the Ballas litigation. To the best of his knowledge, this was brought forward to make timely decisions moving forward as discovery is picking up. Officer in Charge Abba stated this is a matter of efficiency in terms of the ability to make quick decisions. She does not believe it is appropriate to give the Chancellor authority over this. The Board is the elected body, which delegates that authority to the Chair of the elected body in consultation with the Chancellor and General Counsel. She stated it is in that role that she will advise to the best of her ability on this matter. However, because it is a legal matter, it is most appropriate for the attorneys to advise; therefore, she recommends that the Board follow the briefing paper, which provides that the authority rests with the Board through Board leadership.

Regent Moran stated to delegate this authority creates a slippery slope related to the Board’s responsibilities. He believes that there are very few situations where there would not be an opportunity to bring any significant decision in any litigation before the Board.

Regent Carvalho stated it was not her intention to create a division. However, during this consultation, if the Chair thinks the advice of General Counsel is not how he/she wants to proceed, then there is no safe harbor.

7. Approved – Delegation of Authority to the Chair, Consistent with NRS 241.0357, in the matter of *Ballas v. State of Nevada ex. rel. Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education* – (Continued)

Interim Chief General Counsel Martines believed it was inherent that any public officer has certain liabilities if they do not comply with legal advice.

Regent Carvalho rescinded her original friendly amendment and offered a new friendly amendment to add "...and System Counsel, *consistent with the advice of System General Counsel.*"

Regents Doubrava and McMichael accepted the friendly amendment.

Regent Moran stated Board members do not want the Chair to accept liability in its entirety.

Regent Brooks stated it is important to recognize that this relates to one case and the Ballas litigation.

Motion carried via a roll call vote. Chair McAdoo, Vice Chair Carter, and Regents Arrascada, Boylan, Brooks, Carvalho, Doubrava, Geddes, McMichael, Moran, Perkins, and Tarkanian voted yes. Regent Del Carlo was absent.

Regent Brooks left the meeting.

8. Approved – First Amendment to Standard Office Lease Between UNLV on Behalf of the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine and 3010 Westbay LLC for Property Located at 3016, 3014 and 3010 West Charleston Blvd. – The Board approved the First Amendment to Standard Office Lease for property located at 3016 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 100, 110, and 205; 3014 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 110, 130, and 150; and 3010 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 150 and 125; also commonly known as Clark County Assessor parcel numbers 139-32-405-017, 139-32-405-018 and 139-32-405-026, and to grant authority to the Chancellor, or the individual authorized by the Board to serve in the role of Chancellor, to execute the First Amendment and any ancillary documents needed to implement the terms and conditions associated with the First Amendment, as deemed necessary and appropriate by System General Counsel. (Ref. BOR-8 on file in the Board Office.)

Regent Brooks entered the meeting.

8. Approved – First Amendment to Standard Office Lease Between UNLV on Behalf of the Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine and 3010 Westbay LLC for Property Located at 3016, 3014 and 3010 West Charleston Blvd. – (Continued)

UNLV President Keith E. Whitfield presented the First Amendment to Standard Office Lease for property located at 3016 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 100, 110, and 205; 3014 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 110, 130, and 150; and 3010 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 150 and 125; also commonly known as Clark County Assessor parcel numbers 139-32-405-017, 139-32-405-018 and 139-32-405-026.

Vice Chair Carter moved approval of the First Amendment to Standard Office Lease for property located at 3016 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 100, 110, and 205; 3014 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 110, 130, and 150; and 3010 West Charleston Boulevard, Suites 150 and 125; also commonly known as Clark County Assessor parcel numbers 139-32-405-017, 139-32-405-018 and 139-32-405-026, and to grant authority to the Chancellor, or the individual authorized by the Board to serve in the role of Chancellor, to execute the First Amendment and any ancillary documents needed to implement the terms and conditions associated with the First Amendment, as deemed necessary and appropriate by System General Counsel. Regent McMichael seconded.

Regent Tarkanian left the meeting.

Regent Brooks asked whether the \$3.1 million in costs was per year for six years.

Regent Tarkanian entered the meeting.

UNLV Associate Vice President for Planning, Construction and Real Estate Dave Frommer stated the \$3.1 million is for the full term of the extension, not per year. In response to a question from Regent Brooks related to the \$13.1 million, Associate Vice President Frommer stated it was for the base term of 72 months and if the School of Medicine were to execute two extension periods.

Regent Moran clarified the Board is posed with whether to approve an amendment for the pieces of property and further being asked to give approval to Officer in Charge Abba in conjunction with the attorney to sign on behalf of the System. Associate Vice President Frommer clarified for the record that this is a request to amend the current lease to add approximately 6,300 square feet and to allow for that amendment to be applied to the extension terms in the lease.

Motion carried. Regent Del Carlo was absent.

9. Information Only – New Business

Regent Boylan requested to know what Rory Reid achieved while contracted by NSHE for \$60,000.

Regent Arrascada requested the Board address long-term disability insurance for NSHE employees.

Regent Moran requested the Board explore implementing a “Regent Report Card,” including online surveys and public ratings of Regents.

10. Information Only – Public Comment

The meeting adjourned at 12:27 p.m.

Prepared by:

Angela R. Palmer
Special Assistant and Coordinator
to the Board of Regents

Submitted for approval by:

Keri D. Nikolajewski
Interim Chief of Staff
to the Board of Regents

Approved by the Board of Regents at its August 26, 2022, meeting.