

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
Moyer Student Union Ballroom
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas
Tuesday, May 9, 2000**

Members Present:

Dr. Jill Derby, Chair
Mr. Mark Alden
Mrs. Thalia Dondero
Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher
Mr. Douglas Roman Hill
Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick
Mr. David Phillips
Mr. Howard Rosenberg
Mr. Doug Seastrand
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Tom Wiesner

Others Present:

Interim Chancellor Tom Anderes
Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols
General Counsel Tom Ray
Interim President Robert Silverman, CCSN
President Stephen Wells, DRI
President Ron Remington, GBC
President John Richardson, TMCC
President Carol Lucey, WNCC
President Carol Harter, UNLV
Vice President Academic Affairs David Westfall, UNR
President Richard Moore, Nevada State College at Henderson
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were Faculty Senate Chairs Dr. Candace Kant, CCSN; Dr. Paul Buck, DRI; Mr. Eric Bateman, GBC; Dr. John Filler, UNLV; Mrs. Mary Spoon, UNR; Mr. Bill Newhall, TMCC; and Mr. Perry Johnson, WNCC. Student government leaders present were Mr. Paul Moradkhan, UNLV; Ms. Cheryl Radeloff, GSA-UNLV; Mr. David Lee, UNR-GSA; Mr. Carlos Ledon, UNR; and Ms. Damita Jo Halcromb, WNCC.

Chair Derby called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. with all members present except Regents Alden and Sisolak.

1. Information Only-Communication Workshop - The Urban Group presented a workshop on communications in the Fireside Lounge.

Ruth Urban provided a quote that was to be the goal of the session. The quote was, "Each person's view is a unique

perspective on a larger reality. If I can 'look out' through your view and you through mine we will each see something we might not have seen alone."

Ms. Urban described what work had preceded the workshop including interviews with each Regent and observations of various Board meetings. She then gave an overview of the Regents' interviews while individual comments were kept confidential. She noted that the position of Regent took a personal toll because of the complexity of the issues and the time needed to be an effective Regent. Ms. Urban warned the members that the dynamics of any group ebb and flow.

After reviewing the interviews, overall themes were identified: trust and respect issues, time frustration, pride in furthering higher education, communication concerns, the decision-making process, cooperation and governance.

The Board interviews also identified behaviors that block effectiveness as: abusive language, sarcasm, personal attacks, ineffective use of time, fear of being open, little trust and taking personal opinions to the press for personal gain.

The interviews also identified better behavior as: civility, disagree without being disagreeable, staying focused during meetings, accepting decisions of the majority gracefully, being willing to listen and learn.

The members were asked to name those words or phrases that they distinguished as most important from the discussion. Listed were: disagree without being disagreeable, listen and learn, trust and respect, cooperation, communication, and time commitment.

Discussion followed with many noting their surprise that so many members recognized time commitment as such a big issue while others noted that the lack of trust was the primary issue.

Comments that challenged the members were seen as: members worked better together in small groups, public perception that the Board does not work in harmony, and being too partisan. It was stated that working together they could get more done and be more effective.

A lively discussion followed on the need for differences of opinion but it was how they disagreed that was the issue. Some stated that not everyone shared openly because of fear. Others hoped that when a decision was made they could come together and support the outcome. Many felt strongly that people should hold to their convictions even when in the minority but to do so without rancor.

Members were asked to list values that are important to the Board:

- Open communication skills
- Consideration of other points of view
- Welfare of the System-Students come first
- Goodwill-good intentions of others
- Trust
- Sticking with convictions with respect
- Respect what is said in open dialogue
- Private discussion with other Regents should be kept confidential
- Find the solutions not just the problems
- Cooperation

- Moving forward to better things
- Integrity
- Ethics
- Stability-do what is best for the System.

After reviewing the values listed there was consensus that members should have open discussions-getting the issues out and then moving on, respect the opinions of others and that tactics used should not be unethical.

Ruth Urban noted an observation she had made about the Board at their meetings that was very positive. She stated that members showed great respect to people who came before the Board.

Members were asked to name values they presently demonstrated as a Board:

- Strong convictions
- Students come first
- Open dialogue

Members were asked to name values that would be the most difficult to adopt as a Board.

- Integrity
- Respecting majority rule
- Ethics

Suggested guidelines the Board should follow were listed as the following:

- Focus on solutions instead of just problems
- Disagree without being disagreeable
- Hear other's perspective
- Value our time
- Do our best to be a governing/policy Board
- Do not operate now on past disagreements, hurts and disappointments
- Honor one another's differences
- Seek to understand views of other members
- Focus constructively

After a final review the members identified the major guidelines as:

Respectful and civil dialogue

Time Management - Included many factors (i.e. length of agenda, balance remarks with need to complete the agenda, etc.)

Ms. Urban ended the session noting that she believed all of the members wanted to make the Board better and more effective, and that the issue of time is greater than was expected. She also stated that she believed the members were closer than they thought they were.

The meeting reconvened at 10:45 a.m. with all Regents present.

2. Approved Student Tuition and Fees – The Board approved the 2001-03 student registration and tuition fees. Ref.
2 on file in the Board office.

Interim Chancellor Tom Anderes reported on a proposal for 2001-2003 tuition and fees to be implemented in Fall 2001. Fee increases range from 3-3.5% and are considered reasonable by student leadership and presidential participants. Proposed increases include:

Undergraduate Registration Fees:

- \$2.50/credit per year for the universities.
- \$2.00/credit per year at GBC.
- \$1.50/credit per year at the community colleges.

Graduate Registration Fees:

- \$3.50 per year for the universities

Dr. Anderes related that tuition is tied to the cost of education by policy. The System has already reached the policy threshold. Tuition was increased at the same rate of 3-3.5% per year. He indicated that the Good Neighbor Policy is just an extension of the existing registration fee with the universities based on the U.C. Davis index. The community colleges are indexed to a percentage increase beyond tuition. He stated that there had been strong support throughout the System including student leadership.

Dr. Anderes provided an analysis of UCCSN fees relative to western states (i.e. the 14 WICHE states). He recommended future review of the policies to ensure they are serving the System in the best manner.

Two-Year Institutions:

- Registration Fees – Nevada ranks 10th out of 14 states.
- Non-Resident Registration – Nevada ranks slightly higher for both community colleges and universities.

Undergraduate Universities:

- Resident Undergraduate Registration – Nevada ranks 15th out of 16 states.
- Resident Graduate Registration – Nevada ranks 14th out of 16 states.

Tuition & Fees at Public Institutions:

- Non-Resident - Nevada ranks 5th out of 14 states for community colleges.
- Non-Resident – Nevada ranks 7th for universities.

Dr. Anderes discussed the proposed fees for Nevada State College at Henderson. A registration fee of \$60/credit was proposed for 2002 and \$62/credit for 2003. This fee is placed appropriately mid-way between fees established for the universities and community colleges, as is the proposed \$5,750 tuition fee for 2002. A graduate registration fee will be deferred until 2004, due to the emphasis on development and startup of undergraduate programs.

Dr. Anderes related that an important aspect for the presidents was taking a portion of the increase to be applied to capital projects, major renovations, childcare, or other areas that will not receive the necessary level of support from the state general fund (\$1.00 for the universities and GBC upper-division, and \$0.50 for community colleges).

Dr. Anderes provided a brief history and forecast of total general fund revenues. From 1990-2000 the UCCSN experienced an annual growth rate in the general fund exceeding each prior year. The Governor's Forum discussed funding expectations for the next biennium. The UCCSN will share in 19-20% of the total general fund revenues. Nevada's rate of growth have exceeded projections from 1990-2000. With an approximate 5% rate of growth, the

UCCSN will not be funded as generously as in previous years. Dr. Anderes related that general fund revenues are driven by sales tax and gaming revenues. The sales tax is forecast for an annual 5% rate of growth. Rates of growth have been as high as 20% in the past, averaging closer to 9-10%. Gaming tax revenue is projected at 3% growth in comparison to the 7-8% experienced in the past. Dr. Anderes related that, with these revenue projections and the present rate of expenditures, the UCCSN could realize a \$500 million deficit by 2009. He stated that, like other state agencies, higher education would need to identify other resources to enhance programs. The state will be unable to fund everything so important enhancements (super priorities) will need to be identified. Dr. Anderes felt that when comparing the UCCSN with other western states and the demand curve of expenditures with fewer revenues, the UCCSN would be asked to reallocate existing funds, reduce budgets, or find new revenue sources.

Mr. Alden expressed his pleasure that the graduate fee at Nevada State College at Henderson would be deferred to 2004. He expressed concern with non-resident fees, adding that he felt a duty to Nevada residents. He wondered if non-resident fees could be increased without deterring future students. He requested an analysis of the percentage of fees (resident vs. non-resident) that support operating costs for the Boyd School of Law and the School of Medicine. Dr. Westfall replied that increases with the School of Medicine reflected a general inflationary increase request.

Mrs. Dondero asked how the System would scale back. Dr. Anderes related that the System would need to evaluate what programs it offers and at what level they are offered. He indicated that it appears the governor wants to address caseload (enrollment) growth. With a long-term projection of 7% growth per year over the next 8-10 years, the state would want to continue to provide support for faculty and instructional support staff to support the additional students. The problem lies with the growing gap in support dollars (libraries, student services, ADA, etc.) and finding sufficient resources to support those areas.

Dr. Kirkpatrick asked whether an increase in tuition resulted in a corresponding decrease in state dollars received and how much total money would be generated by the increase (\$1.00-universities and \$0.50 community colleges). Dr. Anderes replied that he could report those figures on an FTE basis but not in dollars. Mr. Dave Keebler, Vice President Resource Management-TMCC, reported it would amount to approximately \$150,000 based on a projected 5,000 FTE at TMCC. President Harter replied it would yield approximately \$400,000 at UNLV. Dr. Anderes indicated that the money could be applied to smaller projects or to a long-term debt.

Mr. Sisolak asked about the WICHE rates at the law school and the School of Medicine. Dr. Westfall replied that non-WICHE students pay a slightly higher fee at the medical school. Dr. Anderes indicated that the rates are assessed annually. Mr. Sisolak asked about students establishing residency after their first year and whether they remained within the state. Dr. Westfall estimated that students would be motivated to establish residency in order to avoid out-of-state tuition rates. He added that some remain in Nevada, adding that the School of Medicine has a pretty good track record for retaining its own students.

Mr. Seastrand clarified that the Board was approving the increase in tuition fees and not how it would be spent. He asked whether the Board would approve the allocations as well. Dr. Anderes replied that the Board would approve the increase. Each institution will determine the allocation. For example, \$1.50 of the \$2.50 registration fee increase at the universities will be used for capital projects. He stated that it would be difficult to project how the money would be used until the general fund appropriation is released. The monies will be used for student access and technology. Mr. Seastrand suggested revisiting the issue of how the student fee is spent. Dr. Anderes clarified that Regent Seastrand desired a per-credit allocation and review of the budgets generated by those fees.

President Harter noted that UNLV was not asking for an increase in fees for the law school next year.

Mr. Hill moved approval of the student tuition and fee schedule as proposed. Mr. Sisolak seconded. Motion carried.

3. Approved Appointment, Interim Chancellor – The Board approved the appointment of an Interim Chancellor of the UCCSN effective July 1, 2000. Chair Jill Derby presented a recommendation including the terms and conditions of the appointment. Ref 3 on file in the Board office.

Chair Derby stated that Interim Chancellor Anderes had advised the Board that he accepted a position in Oregon and would be leaving the last day of June. She recommended the appointment of Dr. Jane Nichols as Interim Chancellor.

Mr. Alden moved approval of the appointment of Dr. Jane Nichols as Interim Chancellor effective July 1, 2000. Mr. Sisolak seconded.

Chair Derby reported that Dr. Nichols would be offered the same terms and conditions offered to Dr. Anderes:

- 15% increase in Vice Chancellor salary
- \$12,000/year housing allowance (in city away from current residence)
- \$6000/year auto allowance
- All to be pro-rated to terms of service, effective July 1, 2000

Mr. Hill felt that, if Dr. Nichols had to sign a lease on a Las Vegas property, the Board should be reasonable with compensating her (*i.e. appointing a new Chancellor mid-lease or in the middle of the month*).

Motion carried.

Dr. Kirkpatrick expressed concern for the lack of Vice Chancellors in the Finance and Academic Affairs departments. Dr. Nichols expressed her appreciation to the Board for their support and acknowledged the concerns voiced by Dr. Kirkpatrick. She related that the Board had faced tremendous challenges and accomplished a great deal in the past 2½ years. She vowed to carry the message that Nevada has an excellent Board and system of higher education. She noted that the Board faced 90% growth in student enrollment in the last 10 years and has put good policy in place to serve the students and faculty well. She indicated that there is much work ahead in the next few months and that she would like to position the System well for the arrival of the next Chancellor and legislative session. She appealed to the Board for their help. The Board needs to establish mission differentiation and/or a master plan for higher education as well as a plan for the governor and legislature indicating the UCCSN's direction. The System will be receiving a study (commissioned by the governor) on economic development and how higher education can best be positioned to support technology. In June she plans to bring forward a recommendation for an Interim team for the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Academic Affairs positions. She will need to review staffing for the interim period to ensure the System is prepared to move forward. Mr. Hill stated that Dr. Nichols had always exhibited herself as the consummate professional, adding that he was looking forward to working with her. Dr. Kirkpatrick felt it important for the System to know that Dr. Nichols has the full support of the Board and the Board would back-up her decisions.

4. Approved Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda.

(1) Approved Minutes – The Board approved the April 6-7, 2000 minutes.

(2) Approved Tenure on Hire, UNLV – The Board approved tenure on hire for the following individuals effective July 1, 2000:

- Dr. Dick Gerdes, Professor of Foreign Languages. Dr. Gerdes is the incoming chair of the Department of

Foreign Languages. The department faculty voted unanimously to recommend tenure upon hire.

·Dr. Ronald L. Sack, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering. Dr. Sack is the incoming dean of the Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering. The faculty in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering voted 14-1 to recommend tenure upon hire.

(3) Approved Appointment, Acting Vice President, DRI – The Board approved the appointment of Dr. John W. Hess as Acting Vice President for Finance and Administration, retroactive to April 1, 2000. Dr. Hess currently serves as Vice President for Academic Affairs with a current salary of \$140,472. This appointment carries no change in his current salary, or additional compensation.

(4) Approved Foundation Appointments, GBC – The Board approved the following GBC Foundation appointments:

·Foundation Trustee - Llee Chapman, Administrator, Barrick Goldstrike Mine

·Foundation Finance Committee Member – Kurt Neddenreip, Financial Advisor, Morgan Stanley Dean Whitter

(5) Approved Cell Site Easement, UNR – The Board approved granting an easement to Sierra Pacific Power Company, which would allow for the construction and operation of an AT&T Wireless cell site at the north end of UNR's main campus.

(6) Approved Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CCSN – The Board approved the use of Capital Improvement Fee funds for a Receiving Secured Storage Area for the West Charleston Campus at a cost of \$1,600.00.

(7) Information Only-Acceptance of Gifts, UNLV – The Board was notified of the acceptance of the following gifts to UNLV:

·\$1,250,000 from DonRey Outdoor Advertising Company to construct a women's intercollegiate softball facility.

·\$500,000 from James Rogers to construct a women's intercollegiate softball facility.

·\$100,000 from Jerry and Sue Lykins to construct a women's intercollegiate softball facility.

·\$1,000,000 to establish an endowment fund for the women's intercollegiate golf program.

(8) Approved Construction of Women's Softball Facility, UNLV – The Board approved of the UNLV Foundation to construct a softball field and stadium on the UNLV campus for use by the women's intercollegiate softball program. The softball facility will be located near Harmon Avenue at Swenson, on the west side of the campus. The construction cost of approximately \$2,000,000 is being provided entirely from gifts and other private funds. No state funds are involved. When this facility is finished, the UNLV Foundation will give the facility to the UCCSN and UNLV.

(9) Approved IFC Approval for Additional Student Fee Collection, FY00 –The Board approved authorization to seek Interim Finance Committee approval to expend additional student fee revenues within the State Supported Operating Budgets of the UCCSN for fiscal year 1999-00 for the following:

·Boyd School of Law - \$125,000

Mr. Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda. Mrs. Dondero seconded.

Mr. Sisolak asked why some items on the Consent agenda included a dollar value, while others did not. Dr. Anderes replied that there was no absolute limitation for those items included on the Consent agenda. He stated that a threshold could be considered. Mr. Seastrand noted UNLV donations from DonRey and thanked the individuals for their generosity. President Harter indicated that the endowment fund for the women's intercollegiate golf program was also from DonRey Media.

Motion carried. Mr. Rosenberg abstained.

5. Approved State College Mission, UCCSN – The Board approved a general mission for any state college created within the University and Community College System of Nevada. Ref. 10 on file in the Board office.

Dr. Kirkpatrick requested the item be postponed to the June meeting. Dr. Derby related that the item was scheduled for this meeting, as June's agenda is already full.

Dr. Nichols reported that the item was brought forward from an April meeting request. She generated a draft statement based on other states' general mission statements as well as System community colleges. The idea was to position the institution between the two universities and the community colleges and more clearly define the context within which any new state college would fit. Dr. Nichols reported that the mission statement indicates that state colleges are primarily baccalaureate degree-granting institutions with a focus on providing superior, student-centered educational opportunities for the citizens of the state. A limited number of professional master's programs may be offered that meet workforce needs. An attempt was made to outline the focus of state colleges as has been done with the community college mission statement. Dr. Nichols reviewed the traditional Carnegie classification of institutions. Baccalaureate colleges are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. Nevada is one of the few exceptions that has a community college with selected 4-year degrees, but still maintains the primary mission of being a community college. Nationally, 72% of public baccalaureate colleges offer master's degrees. Dr. Nichols related that offering limited master's degrees at baccalaureate institutions allow for increased opportunities for students to pursue professional master's programs and the ability to respond to community needs related to professional development, but also creates faculty workload issues, potential increased costs, and may compete with current university programs. Dr. Nichols recommended that a limited number of professional master's programs be offered that meet workforce needs.

Mr. Alden moved approval of a state college Mission Statement. Mr. Rosenberg seconded.

A discussion ensued regarding the difference between Carnegie classifications. Dr. Nichols clarified that baccalaureate I are traditional liberal arts colleges with more selective admissions than baccalaureate II, who offer no more than 40% of their degrees in the liberal arts. President Richardson requested an amendment to the second sentence of the statement to delete "but who may not meet the admission standards of the UCCSN universities." He felt it was unnecessary and implied that students enrolled because they could not get into a university.

Regents Alden and Rosenberg agreed to the amendment.

Ms. Cheryl Radloff asked about the number of master's programs and how it related to teaching assistantships. Dr. Nichols indicated that none of those issues had been decided. Dr. John Filler reported that quite a bit of discussion had been generated at UNLV, especially relative to the limited number of professional master's programs that meet workforce needs. He related that simply creating the seats was not the answer and that the mission statement should be more specific. Dr. Nichols acknowledged the broad language, adding that it was incumbent upon the Board

to ask the institutions to demonstrate the need when any degree or program is presented for approval.

Dr. Harter commented that creating a level of state colleges could help distinguish universities from state colleges and allow universities to increase their admission standards and become more selective. Dr. Candace Kant stated that the CCSN senate encouraged her to look for a general mission statement referring to access, diversity, linkages to the UCCSN institutions, and programs based on demonstrated community need. She was particularly happy with the statement providing for the development of academic programs in partnership with other UCCSN institutions.

Motion carried.

6. Information Only-Closed Session Employee Evaluation - In compliance with NRS 241.030, a closed session was held for purposes of discussion of the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an employee of the UCCSN.

Mr. Alden moved approval of moving to a closed session. Mr. Sisolak seconded. Motion carried.

The meeting moved to a closed session at 12:00 noon and reconvened at 2:50 p.m. in open session with all members present.

7. Approved President's Contract, UNLV – The Board considered and made a decision regarding President Carol Harter's contract, including employment terms and conditions. Dr. Anderes reported that her current contract extends through June 30, 2001. He recommended extension of the contract for an additional 3 years to June 30, 2004.

Mr. Phillips moved approval of the extension of President Harter's contract. Mr. Sisolak seconded.

Mr. Alden began to read a memorandum from May 3, 1997. Mr. Phillips asked whether it was discussed during the personnel session, adding that he would object to confidential matters being publicly discussed. General Counsel Ray stated that matters relating to the personnel session and the individual's personnel file are confidential according to Board policy and Nevada law. He advised the Board not to discuss matters that relate to personnel sessions. Dr. Derby clarified that Regent Alden had heard the advice of legal counsel. Mr. Alden clarified that the memorandum had not been discussed in the personnel session. He stated that it was a confidential memorandum he wrote to himself.

The memo related that Mr. Alden, in his capacity as a Regent, attended the 18th annual UNLV Career Day reception on February 12, 1997 in the Sy Redd Room of the Thomas and Mack Center. Mr. Sisolak requested clarification from General Counsel regarding the direction of the memo. General Counsel Ray allowed that Mr. Alden could have a personal opinion, but advised him not to discuss or state matters that should be handled in a closed personnel session. He expressed his discomfort with providing confidential advice in a public setting. Chair Derby advised Mr. Alden, on the advice of General Counsel, that it was not wise to read his memo into the record. Mr. Alden insisted, citing his duty to his constituents. Mr. Phillips asked whether there were copies available for Board members. Chair Derby asked whether Mr. Alden would consider the distribution of copies of the memo to the Board as adequate. Mr. Alden stated that he wanted to read the memo into the record, but would provide copies for the Board.

Mr. Alden again began to read the memo as follows. At the reception and following formal presentations, he attempted to engage President Harter in conversation regarding the new campus spokesperson's policy recently initiated. He indicated that he was supportive of a policy disseminating accurate information about the university to the media. He expressed concern that the new policy should not infringe on any employee's right to freedom of speech and not interfere with a long-held tradition for academic freedom. As he was speaking, Mr. Alden alleged that Dr. Harter launched a verbal attack on him for his statements to the Las Vegas Review Journal regarding the use of

student parking fees to pay bond debt. Mr. Alden felt that, as elected officials, Regents have the right and the responsibility to speak out on matters of policy affecting the universities and colleges of Nevada. Mr. Alden alleged that Dr. Harter attacked the presidency of Dr. Kenny Guinn. Mr. Alden stated that, while he has great admiration for the work of Dr. Guinn, he is not a member of the Board and is not consulted regarding Board policy. Mr. Alden alleged that Dr. Harter asked Mr. Alden when he was going to stop criticizing her administration and stated that he should consult with her prior to discussing any policy issues. He maintained that she walked away while he was responding. Mr. Alden professed that he refused comments to the press regarding the matter.

Mr. Phillips asked whether Mr. Alden wrote the memo to himself. Mr. Alden replied that he gave it to former General Counsel Don Klassic. Mr. Phillips asked whether it was intended to be published. Mr. Alden replied that he did not make the memo public earlier because Dr. Harter was in the process of her evaluation.

Dr. Kirkpatrick clarified that the extension was to 2004 and that Dr. Harter would not be reviewed again until that time. Dr. Derby stated that Dr. Harter would incur a periodic review in 2003. Dr. Anderes stated that there would be annual evaluations. Dr. Kirkpatrick stated that he could not support the extension to 2004. Mr. Phillips indicated that he would support the extension of her contract. Dr. Derby expressed her pleasure with UNLV's advancement, adding that the Board was lucky to have her leadership.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick voted no.

8. Approved Chancellor Search Committee Report - Chair Thalia Dondero reported the Chancellor Search committee met on May 2, 2000 and introduced Dr. Shirley Chater, Senior Consultant, Academic Search Consultation Service.

Mr. Seastrand moved approval of the committee report. Mr. Alden seconded. Motion carried.

8.1 Approved Chancellor Prospectus - Dr. Shirley Chater presented the proposed prospectus for the search for a UCCSN Chancellor. The Board approved the proposed prospectus. Ref. 4.1 on file in the Board office.

Dr. Chater related that she had spoken confidentially with many people, including the governor and legislators, regarding the strengths of the UCCSN as well as challenges and qualifications for the next Chancellor. She has reviewed the Regents' Strategic Directions, Planning Report (1999-2003), and Bylaws and was very impressed with their planning efforts.

The prospectus will be shared with prospective candidates and includes a profile of System institutions and the state. Comments from the legislature's and governor's WebPages were also incorporated into the prospectus. The leadership statement was developed in part by the search committee. Dr. Chater related that they hope to have results by August.

Dr. Chater indicated that only final candidates' names would be released and that the advertisement would be run May 26th and June 9th. Mrs. Gallagher felt the Board should conduct a separate vote on the leadership profile. She felt it important for every Board member to buy into the new Chancellor's job description and felt the need for a record.

Dr. Kirkpatrick moved approval of the proposed Chancellor prospectus. Mr. Alden seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Carlos Ledon disagreed with a statement made in Ref. 4.1 (page 2, "Agenda for the next Chancellor), which places an emphasis on where the Chancellor should concentrate his attention. He felt the Chancellor should

recognize statewide issues and growth. Mrs. Dondero felt it was relative to the growth in southern Nevada. Mr. Rosenberg stated that an applicant would need to know about the growth in southern Nevada and this was not intended to disenfranchise any part of the state.

8.2 Approved Recruitment Proposal - The committee reviewed a proposal for applicant recruitment including advertisement placement and additional publicity/recruitment methods and recommended approval. Ref. 4.2 on file in the Board office.

Dr. Kirkpatrick moved approval of the recruitment proposal. Mr. Alden seconded. Motion carried.

8.3 Approved Search Calendar - The committee discussed meeting dates and other event dates regarding the search calendar and recommended approval. Ref. 4.3 on file in the Board office.

Mr. Phillips moved approval of the search calendar. Mr. Sisolak seconded. Motion carried.

Dr. Derby encouraged people to submit names of suggested candidates to Dr. Chater.

9. Approved Reapportionment Presentation - Dr. Pat Goodall and Dr. Keith Schwer from the UNLV Small Business Development Center made a presentation regarding the census and reapportionment as it relates to the Board. An interactive discussion was held and action taken regarding the scope of work.

Dr. Goodall reported that the Nevada Constitution stipulates that the legislature is responsible for the structure of the Board of Regents and for determining the method of election. In the 1960's federal court decisions determined that the districts are supposed to be essentially equal in population. After each census the Board's districts must be reviewed for equal distributions of population. Nationally, only four states have elected boards (Colorado, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada). After the census the legislature could make the decision with no Board input. The Board also has the right to suggest to the legislature their preferences for redistricting.

Dr. Schwer stated that the Bureau of Census is currently in the field. Results are projected to be available April 1, 2001. There is some indication that the final numbers might be available earlier, but the state will already be in legislative session. Dr. Schwer reported that current preliminary numbers are available to look at possible alternatives. He indicated that computer software is available, which provides reapportionment alternatives. The significant decision the Board faces is the size (number of members). Once the Board has addressed this key critical issue reapportionment will follow. He indicated that they would both be available to provide information and answer questions for the Board and the legislature.

Mrs. Gallagher asked how the Board would decide upon its size prior to moving forward and whether the consultants had any recommendations. Dr. Schwer stated that smaller boards tend to operate more efficiently. A second issue is representation to meet the diverse needs of the state. He felt this is a critical tradeoff that elected officials should address. He indicated that the Board would need to decide; he and Dr. Goodall were prepared to provide information to help the Board with that decision. Dr. Derby requested they provide alternatives for different sizes. Dr. Goodall indicated that with the software they could provide alternatives for different scenarios. Mr. Hill expressed a preference for the Board remaining the same size, but agreed it made sense to evaluate different scenarios. Dr. Schwer requested Board guidance for the alternatives. Mr. Hill suggested they prepare alternatives for a 9-, 11-, and 13-member Board. Dr. Kirkpatrick asked whether they had reasonable population projections with which to run the data. Dr. Goodall replied that they did, adding that the Regents were not required to be an odd-numbered board. Other states have even-numbered boards with tie votes failing. Mrs. Gallagher expressed a preference for remaining an odd-numbered board. Mr. Seastrand asked whether a mix of elected/appointed boards had been considered. Dr.

Goodall replied that he was not aware of any in the country. Colorado uses a mix of district and at-large representation (6 districts, 3 at-large). Mr. Sisolak asked about partisan boards. Dr. Goodall replied that the only one he is aware of is in Michigan, where there are three boards and Regents run at-large on a partisan basis (8 members for 8 year terms). He believed the other states are non-partisan. Mrs. Dondero asked whether changes to the size and makeup of the Board would require legislative approval. Dr. Goodall replied that those changes would require legislative action. He indicated that moving to an appointed board would take a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Hill moved approval of the consultants providing scenarios for nine, eleven and thirteen Regents. Dr. Kirkpatrick seconded.

Mr. Phillips asked about each institution having its own Board. Dr. Goodall replied that it was a separate issue and a big question. Dr. Derby proposed a friendly amendment that 10 and 12 members also be considered.

Regents Hill and Kirkpatrick accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Seastrand requested that more than one option per board size be submitted. Mrs. Gallagher cautioned that people need to be convinced to run for these positions and that the districts should be kept somewhat compact.

Motion carried as amended.

10. Information Only-Operating Budget Priorities - Further discussion was held regarding the 2001-03 biennial operating budget priorities. The discussion included a review of projected enrollments and funding allocations. Ref. 10 on file in the Board office.

Interim Chancellor Anderes reported that particular emphasis was placed on access, quality and technology.

Priorities:

1. Cost of Living Adjustments for all Employees

- 3% per biennium
- viewed as extremely important
- none provided last biennium

2. Addressing Historical Program Deficiencies - \$11.8 million

- UNLV\$3.7 million
- TMCC\$0.4 million
- CCSN\$7.5 million
- WNCC\$0.2 million

3. Access in 2001-2003 - \$58.2 million

- UNR\$14.1million
- UNLV\$21.1 million
- TMCC\$2.5 million
- CCSN\$18.1 million
- WNCC\$0.9 million
- GBC\$1.5 million

Mrs. Gallagher asked whether the System had a format that responded to the Governor's Forum request and whether the Chancellor had discussed it with the presidents. Dr. Anderes related that he had not discussed it yet with the presidents and that he felt the System was answering all of the governor's questions. He

indicated that they were preparing information in the exact format he requested for the May 1st submission and enhancement follow-up.

Dr. Sherwin Iverson explained the differences between headcount and full-time equivalent (FTE) students. FTE represents workload based on the number of courses in which students are enrolled. From 1990-2003 there will be a 92% increase in Systemwide AAFTE (28,000 students), which is equivalent to adding a WNCC-size institution every year for ten years. By comparison, enrollment increased 8.7% in U.S. public institutions during this same period. While it is easy to focus on campuses that have grown at an astronomical rate, all campuses have experienced massive growth. UCCSN community colleges have grown 153% and universities 53% in aggregate.

Dr. Iverson related that Nevada has encountered overwhelming growth. From Fall 1990 through Fall 2002 Nevada will experience a 78% change in overall population while headcount grew 77%. The Board adopted a goal of enrolling 55 students/1000 population by 2010. The current rate is 49/1000. Dr. Iverson concluded that the System and its institutions have a history of strong enrollment growth and planned enrollment for the next biennium is consistent with historical growth patterns. Although enrollment has increased rapidly, the number of Nevadans served per population has remained relatively constant.

Dr. Anderes continued with a the presentation of budget priorities:

4. Non-instructional support - \$55 million

- Funding support services to address student demand, safety/security, disabled services, diversity/outreach programs, gender equity, instructional support, childcare, MAP, and other institutional priorities.
- Represents funding universities at 65% and community colleges at 100% based on current formulas.
- Significant cutback from prior year requests.

5a. Re-instate Equipment Allocation - \$40 million

- No state funding for equipment provided in previous biennium creating critical deficiencies in numerous programs.

Mr. Alden asked whether UNLV language, biology and chemistry labs were included in 5a. Dr. Anderes replied that they were. Mr. Alden indicated that they were very important. He reported that last biennium the System received \$3 million in Estate Tax dollars to fund equipment. The prior biennium yielded \$17 million for seven institutions in multiple locations. The current System equipment inventory is \$170 million. A simple 5% annual replacement plan (not adding new equipment, just replacing existing) would require \$17 million. Additionally, new equipment is required. Technology is a complex issue and the System has a critical need.

5b. Addressing Technology Capacity – \$12.8 million

- System and institutional capacity must be enhanced in hardware and staffing to meet escalating demands.

6. Summerlin Planning - \$1 million

- Branch campus of UNLV
- Discussions with the private sector to provide money for services

Redfield Startup Costs – \$1.9 million

- \$700,000 for first year
- \$1.2 million for second year
- Instruction to begin later in the year

Dr. Anderes related that detailed overviews for the Nevada State College and Redfield projects would be

provided at the June meeting.

7. Health and Research Initiatives

7A. Expand applied and basic research grant programs - \$3 million

Enhance EPSCoR - \$4 million

Dr. Jane Nichols reported that the request reflects the growing importance of research within the System. EPSCoR was not fully funded last biennium and the institutions had to come up with matching funds in addition to the \$1.25 million. The System anticipates the need to match \$7.25 million for EPSCoR funds in the next biennium. She related that there are two types of research dollars for the campuses:

- 1) Applied Research** - money used by the campus and scientists to work with private industry, to transfer scientific knowledge to the commercial sector, or to benefit Nevada in various ways.
- 2) Basic Research** – money given to the campuses to support basic research needs for building the research infrastructure and bringing in potential new programs.

Mr. Phillips asked for the definition of EPSCoR. Dr. Anderes related that it stands for Experimental Program to Simulate Competitive Research. Mrs. Gallagher asked whether the \$3 million for basic and applied research was to come from the state. Dr. Nichols replied that traditionally the money has come from the Estate Tax, but was being formally requested from the state. Mrs. Gallagher clarified that the \$4 million was requested to match EPSCoR funds. Mr. Seastrand commented that if the matching funds were not available, the EPSCoR funds would not be received for the research. He recommended moving the priority up to #6.

Mrs. Gallagher asked whether a 1% cost of living adjustment (COLA) equated to \$40 million for the state. Dr. Anderes replied that the two increments of 3% would cost \$27 million. Mrs. Gallagher asked about the budget subtotal at 7A without Redfield start-up costs. Dr. Anderes replied that the budget enhancements totaled \$195.4 million without COLA, equating to a 21% increase. Adding the \$27 million COLA/merit/inflationary funding yields a 27% total increase from this biennium. He added that the System had never requested less than a 45% increase in prior years. Mr. David Lee asked about COLA for graduate assistants. Dr. Anderes replied that institutions review assistantships specifically via a separate salary schedule. The institutions identify resources even if a COLA were not approved. If a COLA is approved, the institutions can set aside some of those funds for that purpose. Dr. Kirkpatrick asked what percentage of the \$27 million was attributed to growth. Dr. Anderes related that it was intended as an adjustment to the fiscal year 2000 salary base. It has no implication for the new positions and does not relate to growth.

Mrs. Gallagher asked about the increase received in the previous biennium. Dr. Anderes reported that the System received a total increase of \$120 million for the biennium, which was funded more from increases in tuition and fees and the Estate Tax. Mrs. Dondero asked about planning money for the Henderson campus. Dr. Anderes indicated that a separate budget would be provided for Nevada State College at Henderson (NSC). System Administration and Dr. Moore are reviewing options regarding startup date, identification of faculty, and curriculum. Dr. Moore stated there would be administrative planning and core faculty hiring during the first year (2001-02). The faculty would provide recommendations for degrees to be offered, requirements for majors, general educational packages, and course transfer. He anticipates having classes during the second year of the biennium. He indicated that he is working with the Chancellor to determine the number of students and costs.

Dr. Anderes reported that NSC would have a number of funding pieces related to instructional and non-instructional support funding required. He hoped to have the figures available for the June meeting.

Mr. Lee clarified that the \$27 million was allocated for classified and professional employees and asked where the graduate students' increase appeared. Dr. Anderes explained that there is a separate schedule that is updated frequently, adding that the institutions must identify the source of funding such increases.

7B. Support the dental school-UNLV - \$4.9 million

Dr. Anderes reported that the dental school would be funded primarily through clinic and Medicaid fees, adding that they should have a better sense of potential startup dates and what is necessary from general fund to support the school by the June meeting. Mr. Phillips asked about the source of funds. Dr. Anderes related that Medicaid funds, clinic fees, and some state general funds would be used. Mr. Phillips stated that Senator Rawson had indicated there would be no need for state funds and asked whether Senator Rawson would be at the June meeting. Dr. Anderes stated that he had been invited. Dr. Harter stated that some level of support for enrollments still needed to be determined. She related that funding at the level of nursing education would generate \$2 million through the instructional formula. She stated that they would also try to rely on the private clinic practice. Mrs. Gallagher asked whether the \$2 million would come from private clinics. Dr. Harter replied that the projection for the dental school revenue and dental practice plan revenue (including tuition in the 2nd year) over the biennium is \$4 million. She stated that UNLV requires a subsidy for what revenue is not generated during the first year.

7B.1. Establish pharmacy school-UNR - \$2.7 million

Dr. Anderes related that an initiative should be coming forward soon, but a placeholder had to be included in the budget for the program. Mr. Alden asked about the joint program (1st two years at UNR; 2nd two years at UNLV) with a joint degree. Dr. Westfall indicated that the Doctorate in Pharmacy would be jointly conferred by UNLV and UNR as a fully articulated program. Students may begin the pre-Pharmacy stage at any institution. The first two years of the professional program would be conducted at UNR with the last two years at UNLV with rural rotation included. A class size of 40-50 students is projected. Dr. Westfall indicated efforts would be made to establish public/private partnerships. Mr. Alden asked about the approximate operating cost per student excluding startup costs. Dr. Westfall stated that, in addition to tuition, they would need \$5 million per biennium. Mr. Alden indicated that they need to be more definitive, but believed the program could work, adding that the governor was a proponent of joint facility use.

7C. Economic Development Grants

- New program focusing on statewide priorities and economic development
- Diversification and workforce development
- Funding on basis of quality of proposals that specifically address economic development

8. Performance Funding

- Incentives to achieve objectives defined by Regents.
- 19 performance indicators-(retention, graduation rates, external research, job placements, etc.)
- Identify 3-4 indicators, establish specific targets, find area of most importance
- Create a pool of funds to be returned to institutions achieving the objectives

Dr. Anderes indicated that he has tried to provide a sense of total costs, acknowledging the needs of UCCSN and duty to the students while trying to show the governor that the System is supportive of his requirements.

Dr. Kirkpatrick asked] whether the growth projections include Millennium Scholarship increases. Dr. Anderes replied that the institutions had been asked for 10-year projections and that the governor was aware of that.

The meeting recessed at 4:40 p.m. and reconvened at 4:50 p.m. with all members present except Regents Alden, Phillips, and Sisolak.

11. Information Only-Capital Budget Priorities - Further discussion was held regarding capital improvement projects for the biennial capital budget 2001-03. Discussion also included a capital budget model, ADA planning and deferred maintenance/slot tax requests. Ref. 11 on file in the board office.

Dr. Anderes reported that the capital budget priority request is comprised of three components:

·Maintenance, Repairs and Renovations

- Funded through the slot tax (statutorily defined resource for higher education)
- \$15 million per biennium
- Campus identified maintenance of existing facilities, health and safety projects, ADA requirements and minor renovations
- Projects less than \$500,000

·Capital Improvement Project List

- \$20 million request; \$5 million in state general funds
- \$2 million ADA request to address guidelines

·Capital Budget Model

- Supplemental tool for Board, Chancellor and Presidents
- Prioritizes projects

Mr. Alden entered the meeting.

Dr. Anderes related that the ad hoc Equity Space committee received input from the consultant on the nature and applications of the model. Dr. Anderes will meet with institution presidents and facilities representatives in May to review the components of the model and determine the impact of project priorities. Three levels are incorporated in the model:

- Minor renovation
- Major renovations (exceeds \$500,000)
- New capital improvement projects

Dr. Anderes related that he hopes the Board never relies completely on the model for all of its answers, since there are many reasons to support capital improvement priorities. The current list supports the top priorities of each institution, completes projects that received prior funding, addresses student requirements, recognizes Board approval of NSC, provides selective placement of High Tech Centers, acknowledges the importance of research, and recognizes the potential for new campuses (i.e. Summerlin).

Significant Changes from April Presentation:

- \$41 million reduction in funding request for UNLV Science & Engineering building

·\$23 million UNLV Wright Hall request moved up on priority list

·\$41 million reduction should reflect responsible request to governor and PWB

Ms. Vicky Havenscott spoke on behalf of the Pahrump Campus Initiative. She wanted the Board to recognize that Pahrump is one of the largest rural populations in the state of Nevada. She indicated that CCSN put Pahrump on their priority list, but not high enough to make the overall list. She reported that the Pahrump community has a growing population estimated at 50,000 within the next 5 years. She requested that Pahrump be included in the budget process for a higher education facility. She thanked the Board for a High Tech Center (shared facility currently under construction). She indicated that there is a great deal of community support, including a commitment for 80 acres of land and funding. She indicated that Pahrump would like to be on the priority list. Pahrump is 60 miles from any higher education source. She noted additions to facilities on the list serving smaller population areas. Mr. Bob Swidell reported that he is working with a large development firm (The Collins Group) in Pahrump on a master planned community for 8,000 houses. He has discussed higher education developments in Pahrump with industry representatives and plans to lobby the legislature in the next session for a facility.

Dr. Anderes related that the UCCSN recognizes the needs that exist in Pahrump. He acknowledged that President Silverman has plans that are on his list of priorities. He added that requests have also been received from Mesquite, Summerlin, Henderson, and Montecito. He indicated that the System needs to review the factors involved and what is required at these locations and arrive at a master plan.

President Silverman observed that CCSN was compelled to include Pahrump as a priority based on the growth in Pahrump and the need for economic diversification and development. He indicated that it is a critical factor in education and economic development of that area. Mrs. Dondero commented that the remoteness of that population should be considered. Dr. Silverman agreed that the distance becomes quite a disincentive for people to continue their education. Mr. Seastrand commented that he hopes the master plan will continue to look at distance education as a solution and mechanism to deliver education in other ways than building new buildings.

12. Approved Mission Statement, NSC at Henderson – The Board approved the adoption of the proposed Mission Statement for NSC at Henderson. Ref. B on file in the Board office.

Dr. Moore reported that they included suggestions from Drs. Nichols and Crowley. He felt the statement clearly delineated that NSC will be primarily a baccalaureate-granting institution with a few select master's degrees. The priorities of the college are also outlined, with a teacher-training component as its first priority. The second priority for the college is a special partnership with the community colleges to create programs that ensure a successful transition for community college students in pursuit of baccalaureate degrees.

Mr. Alden moved approval of the adoption of the proposed Mission Statement for NSC at Henderson. Mr. Hill seconded.

Mr. Seastrand suggested changing the academic organization statement to "smaller colleges." Dr. Moore felt it was a good suggestion and intended to incorporate it into the statement. He requested that faculty input be considered once they have been hired.

Dr. Kirkpatrick provided copies of correspondence between him and Dr. Nichols (on file in the Board office) regarding master's degrees at the state college. He requested clarification of a collection of colleges within a college. Dr. Moore replied it was similar to the practices in existence at both universities. Dr. Kirkpatrick commented that the teacher education preparation program at UNLV had no waiting list. He was concerned that the state college would compete with that program at a reduced rate of tuition. Dr. Moore felt there is a strong demand from individuals

wishing to become teachers. He related that he initiated a 2+2 education program at CCSN. Four hundred people enrolled in the first year with no reduction in UNLV's students. He emphasized that there is a strong demand in the valley for education courses. He felt a responsibility to help provide some of the 1,700 teachers per year that are required. He felt students should have a choice. Dr. Kirkpatrick emphasized that the program would duplicate one already offered at UNLV, and at a reduced rate. Dr. Moore felt the current need for 1700 teachers per year could grow to 3000 within ten years. He felt that more than one provider would be necessary. Dr. Kirkpatrick felt it would be less expensive to expand UNLV's program. He asked whether there were plans for a master's degree in education. Dr. Moore suggested that a master's program in education would be needed in the biennium following this one. He stated that the college would not open with graduate classes. Dr. Kirkpatrick questioned whether, with limited funds, this was the most efficient way to produce teachers. Mr. Rosenberg observed that UNR and TMCC offer similar courses and neither institution lacked enrollment. He stated that students prefer different environments. He suggested an arrangement similar to Harvard with a group of schools to provide more choices and encourage more teachers in Nevada. Mr. Alden agreed that another venue is required and that not every student desires a university experience.

Dr. Kirkpatrick moved approval of amending the mission statement academic organization to include "a consortium of smaller schools." Motion died due to lack of second.

Mrs. Dondero called for question. Motion carried. Regent Kirkpatrick voted no. Regents Phillips and Sisolak were absent.

The original motion carried with the amendment as noted. Regent Kirkpatrick voted no. Regents Phillips and Sisolak were absent.

13. Approved Interlocal Agreement, NSC at Henderson – The Board approved an Interlocal Agreement between the Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada and Clark County University Medical Services, Board of Trustees to provide funds for College Planning Services. Ref. C on file in the Board office.

Mr. Hill moved approval of the Interlocal Agreement for NSC at Henderson. Mr. Alden seconded. Dr. Kirkpatrick observed that the plans provide for health education and nursing programs. Dr. Moore stated that plans addressed studying health education programs. He indicated that the agreement addressed planning the state college. Dr. Kirkpatrick commented that it is very difficult and expensive to start a nursing program. Mrs. Dondero asked whether UMC had changed its name. Dr. Moore was not aware of a name change. Mr. Seastrand asked whether funds would be removed if a nursing program were not initiated. Dr. Moore replied that there were no requirements attached to the funds. General Counsel Ray concurred. He added that the scope of the work addressed developing the college.

Motion carried. Regent Kirkpatrick voted no. Regents Phillips and Sisolak were absent.

14. Public Comment – None.

15. New Business – None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst

Chief Administrative Officer to the Board