

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA Engineering Laboratory Center, Room 109/110 University of Nevada, Reno Thursday-Friday, August 10-11, 2000

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Mrs. Thalia Dondero
Mr. Douglas Roman Hill

Others Present:

Interim Chancellor Jane Nichols
Interim Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Dan Miles
Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs Sherwin Iverson
General Counsel Tom Ray
Interim President Robert Silverman, CCSN
President Stephen Wells, DRI
Vice President Stan Aiazzi, GBC
President John Richardson, TMCC
President Carol Lucey, WNCC
Vice President Juanita Fain, UNLV
President Joe Crowley, UNR
President Richard Moore, Nevada State College at Henderson
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were Faculty Senate Chairs Dr. Fred Jackson, CCSN; Dr. Paul Buck, DRI; Mr. John Patrick Rice, GBC; Mr. Bill Newhall, TMCC; Dr. John Filler, UNLV; Mrs. Mary Spoon, UNR; Mr. Perry Johnson, WNCC; and Ms. Stephanie Brown, UCCSN. Student government leaders present included Mr. Carlos Ledon, UNR; Mr. Ken Stanfield, WNCC; Ms. Victoria Jakubowski, UNR-GSA; Ms. Cheryl Radeloff, GSA-UNLV; and Mr. Paul Moradkhan, UNLV.

Vice Chair Howard Rosenberg called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. with all members present except Regents Dondero, Hill, Phillips, Seastrand, and Sisolak.

1. Introductions - Interim Chancellor Jane Nichols introduced UCCSN Health Education Coordinator, Dr. Michael

Harter. President Carol Lucey introduced WNCC Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Stan Aman. Vice President Juanita Fain introduced UNLV Vice President for Finance, Dr. Anthony Flores, and Interim Provost, Dr. Ray Alden, who begins his appointment August 16th.

Regents Phillips, Seastrand and Sisolak entered the meeting.

Dr. Fain also introduced Dr. Rebecca Mills, Interim Vice President of Student Life, and Dr. Richard Jensen, Senior Advisor to the President. President Stephen Wells introduced Mr. Bill O'Donnell, DRI Controller and Asst. Vice President for Finance, and Dr. Roger Jacobson who will serve as Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs in Dr. Jack Hess' absence. President Joe Crowley introduced Ms. Victoria Jakubowski, UNR-GSA president.

2. Chair's Report - Vice Chair Rosenberg reported that Chair Thalia Dondero would not be at the meeting due to a death in the family. He read a report provided by Chair Dondero, which warned of challenging months ahead for the Board while attempting to meet the needs of nearly 100,000 students. She encouraged the Board to: provide an environment that fosters learning, execute their duties with integrity and diligence, and not squander opportunities. She mentioned ongoing searches for CCSN and UNR Presidents, as well as a System Chancellor, acknowledging there was much work ahead.

3. Chancellor's Report - Interim Chancellor Jane Nichols provided an update on two ongoing studies. The Rand Report is underway, with Dr. Roger Benjamin and his colleagues working on it. The Batelle Study, authorized by the Governor and Lt. Governor, is much further along. There will be sessions held in mid-August to discuss the findings and provide feedback prior to the draft of final recommendations. The Batelle Study reviews the future of Nevada and what the state must do to better support economic growth and diversity. She then called for selected reports from the presidents.

President Joe Crowley, UNR - Dr. Crowley introduced Ms. Diann Laing, UNR Director of Instructional Technology, who assisted with his presentation. Dr. Crowley presented early photos of the campus taken at the turn of the century and compared them with recent photos:

- Morrill Hall - built for \$12,600 in the late 1880's, UNR has spent over \$1 million in renovation to save the building. The Alumni Association raised the funds for the project and resides in that building.
- Manzanita Hall - (women's residence) built in 1896, still used as a residence hall.
- Lincoln Hall - (men's residence) also built in 1896 and still used as a men's residence.
- The Quad - Elm trees kept alive by valiant efforts of Buildings & Grounds staff.
- Parking Garage/Residence Hall - \$4 million facility to be complete in late October.
- Frandsen Humanities - built in 1917, it now houses the English department and has undergone a \$3 million renovation.
- Jot Travis Student Union - has undergone a \$1.8 million renovation that includes new offices, food storage area, loading dock and entries, including an ADA ramp.
- New Residence Hall - \$11 million facility housing 259 students, double occupancy with private bathrooms and lounges on every floor.
- Student Services Building - connects to parking garage; houses police department, parking services, admission & records, financial aid, and student financial services.
- Athletic Fields - installed new synthetic and safe turf for the football field and renovated the practice fields. A new track around the field is also being installed.
- Medical School - \$10 million William N. and Myriam Pennington Medical Education Building to be completed in May 2001.

President Crowley reported that a campus celebration of the new facilities would be held August 15th at 10:00 a.m.

Vice President Stan Aiazzi, GBC - Mr. Aiazzi reported that GBC is initiating two certificate programs that will piggyback on the electrical maintenance program, highlighted for the Bachelor of Applied Science degree. It is an area of high demand and should prove beneficial for the students. A recent Foundation phone-a-thon raised \$62,000. Private donations of \$687,000 have been received to meet the \$908,000 match requirement for the \$4 million grant from the Reynolds Foundation. A hardhat party will be held August 25th to view the progress. Mr. Aiazzi reported that the center renovation should be complete in November. The Elementary Education program is in the first year of implementation with 74 juniors and seniors, and 160 total declared majors. The effort to teach people in rural areas so they will stay in the rural areas has been successful:

- 15 students (juniors & seniors) in Ely and Lund.
- 10 students in Battle Mountain.
- 15 students in Winnemucca.
- 30 students in Elko.

The state Department of Education has approved GBC's first report on the Elementary Education program. Northwest Association made a site visit regarding the distance education efforts, giving it a good report.

4. Approved Handbook Change, Institution Lobbyists - A review of the structure of lobbying with a System lobbyist was discussed. The Board approved adoption of a Board policy to prohibit institutions from contracting with private firms to provide lobbying services, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 21. (Ref. A on file in the Board office)

Dr. Nichols presented a plan for the role and responsibilities for the legislative relations position. The Chancellor would be the primary focus for coordination of the UCCSN legislative agenda. The System lobbyist would provide day-to-day contact for the UCCSN during session, reporting to the Chancellor on a regular basis. Regent Kirkpatrick suggested adding 'System' to clarify presidents in the 2nd bullet. The plan clarified that campus lobbyists must not take positions which are in opposition to Board priorities or place other UCCSN institutions in a negative light. Dr. Nichols referred to suggested language for a Handbook change prohibiting the use of external lobbyists without prior Board approval.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook change, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 21, where a member institution or special unit of the System may not engage the services of an independent entity or person to perform lobbying services within the State of Nevada without obtaining prior Board approval. Regent Derby seconded.

Mr. Newhall asked about the faculty representative referred to in the 6th bullet. Dr. Nichols replied that the Nevada Faculty Alliance had always had a faculty representative designated as a lobbyist. Regent Seastrand asked whether not being able to hire a lobbyist (without Board approval) would hamper the presidents' ability to perform their duties. Dr. Crowley recalled occasions when lobbyists were used for particular issues (event centers, construction approaches) and did not feel that waiting for Board approval would have been an unworkable delay. He acknowledged that things happen quickly, especially near the end of the session, adding that it was conceivable that a problem could occur with a delay in waiting for Board approval, but it would not happen often. He suggested entrusting the Chancellor with making the decision and advising the Board. Regent Gallagher felt the requirement for Board approval should be deleted.

Regent Sisolak addressed the following:

- A definition for 'may not engage ' in the suggested Handbook language.
- Whether a lobbyist working for no fee would be allowed.
- Whether a public relations (PR) firm could be used for lobbying at no charge.

General Counsel Ray replied that 'may not engage ' implied entering into a contract for hire. He stated that lobbying firms operating for no fee would not be allowed (without Board approval), adding that an individual could speak on their own behalf, but not in official representation of a campus. Dr. Nichols stated that the policy addressed engaging in a contract for the purpose of lobbying. She clarified that the intent of the action was to establish that the institutions should not use firms on their behalf with the legislature in addition to the approved activities. Regent Wiesner asked whether institutions hired public relations firms. Regent Sisolak replied that CCSN, UNLV, and UNR did, adding that he believed they all did. He noted that those firms also ran political campaigns. Regent Wiesner stated that he was trying to avoid campus representatives from arguing against the System lobbyist and other institutions. Regent Kirkpatrick established that firms could be used for public relations efforts, but not for lobbying.

Dr. Crowley observed that it would clearly violate the spirit of the policy if a PR firm were used to lobby on behalf of an institution. President Moore observed there were several lobbyists on advisory committees at CCSN. He asked the Board to be cautious about prohibiting lobbyists from having conversations with the institutions. Ms. Cheryl Radeloff asked about inclusion of student alliances. Dr. Nichols replied that the language referred specifically to registered lobbyists, adding that were the students to get one, it would also apply. Mr. Newhall reported that the faculty senate chairs concurred that the faculty senate chair coordinator should be included in the weekly meetings with the System lobbyist. Dr. Nichols related that it was intended for weekly meetings/coordination at the legislature and on the floor. Regent Wiesner observed a huge difference between lobbying, testifying, and being an advocate. He related that he was trying to avoid paid firms from representing an institution. Regent Sisolak agreed with Regent Wiesner and President Moore, adding that he did not want to put the presidents in a bad position.

Regent Wiesner stated that there was nothing wrong with asking people to be advocates for you and/or your institution. He was trying to prevent hiring a professional firm. Regent Gallagher stated that she would be unable to support the motion without removing 'without obtaining the prior approval of the Board of Regents '.

Regent Alden amended the motion to allow for determination by the Chancellor for the hiring of a lobbyist firm. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick established that the Board could hold the Chancellor responsible for any exceptions. Regent Gallagher stated that the System could hire a lobbyist, but not the individual campuses. Regent Derby supported the motion as it read with the necessary flexibility and agreed that assigning the responsibility to the Chancellor was appropriate.

Mr. Carlos Ledon felt there should be specific acknowledgement of student representatives in the 6th bullet. Dr. Nichols indicated that language would be added to the 6th bullet to specifically include students in the communication process.

Mr. Newhall expressed his appreciation for bringing the students into the 6th bullet. He related that the NFA was not the representative for the faculty, and requested the wording also include the faculty senate chair coordinator. Dr. Nichols stated that she would work with those who have concerns and bring back revised language to the next meeting.

Motion carried. Regent Wiesner voted no. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

5. Information Only-Handbook Change, Regents ' Bylaws, Quorum - An amendment to the Regents ' Bylaws, Title 1, Article V, Section 13, Quorum, was presented for information with action likely to be taken at the September meeting. The proposed amendment would reduce the number of members that must be present in order to have a quorum for Board committee meetings. (Ref. B on file in the Board office)

Regent Derby related that the Board addressed this same proposal a few years ago and voted it down because the Board did not feel that two members of the committee were representative of an entire committee. She related that the Board relied heavily on committee recommendations being a representative sampling of Regents in attendance for the committee. Regent Kirkpatrick felt the same way until he realized that, no matter what a committee did, it still required full Board approval. He felt the change would be acceptable so long as notice was provided to the Board that only two people participated in the committee recommendations. Regent Gallagher expressed a problem with the change, adding that she did not want a 2-person committee recommendation. She suggested that it could result in having everything presented to the committee also presented to the Board because the Board would lack confidence in the recommendation.

Regent Alden returned to the meeting.

Regent Seastrand asked how the item was brought to the agenda. Chair Rosenberg replied that a Regent had requested it. Regent Sisolak asked about policy regarding when a Regent could participate on a committee to make a quorum. General Counsel Ray replied that the chair/vice chair could appoint another Regent to sit in to make a quorum. He related that it had been the practice of the Board to fill vacancies in a committee with another Regent. Regent Gallagher stated that she had hurried to meetings to help make a quorum in the past. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether Regent Sisolak disapproved of one Regent substituting for another. Regent Sisolak replied that he did not know. He was under the impression that substitution was for purposes of reaching a quorum, not for adding additional voting committee members. Regent Derby related that it was best to have all committee members present. When only three members had been available, the Board had allowed the appointment of non-members in order to obtain a better representation for the committee. Regent Gallagher asked whether appointed committee members could vote. General Counsel Ray replied that they could in place of an absent committee member. Regent Wiesner observed that the committee only provided a recommendation, while the full Board made the final decision. Regent Derby felt more comfortable with a 5 - member committee recommendation. Regent Wiesner observed that it was the responsibility of a committee member to be present for the meeting or to notify someone in advance of his or her absence.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved to table the item. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick indicated that he did not want the item returning for action at the next meeting. Regent Alden expressed a preference for not tabling the issue.

Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

6. Information Only-Handbook Change, Regents ' Bylaws Standing Committees - An amendment to the Regents ' Bylaws, Title 1, Article VI, Section 3, Standing Committees and their Duties, was presented for information with action likely to be taken at the September meeting. The proposed amendment would change the Legislative Liaison, Board Development and Health Care Education committees from standing to special ad hoc committees.

Regents Alden, Derby, and Gallagher agreed with the proposal. Regent Derby observed that, since the Board was

struggling with so many committees, it would provide the means of activating a committee when a need exists, and allow it to lie dormant when not needed. She asked about the affect to the Health Care Education committee, which was called into existence to meet a very important need. Dr. Nichols replied that ad hoc committees were named and specified at the discretion of the chair. She advised the Regents to convey their concerns about a specific committee 's necessity to the chair, who could then place the committee into action.

Regent Gallagher clarified that ad hoc committees could be appointed by the chair at any time, so there was no need to list them in the Bylaws or establish membership. Regent Seastrand agreed. He expressed his appreciation to those who participated on the Health Care Education committee, adding that incredible progress had been made. He noted there could be a future need for that committee.

Regent Derby suggested the Board Chair and Vice Chair adopt the vital functions of the Board Development committee. General Counsel Ray clarified that, under the Bylaws, the Board would decide that an ad hoc committee was necessary and the Chair would appoint the committee members.

Regent Gallagher suggested that the Chair should be made aware there are certain reports the Board needs from the campuses. She suggested yearly campus reports be given to keep the Board apprised of activity normally handled by the inactivated committees.

Regent Seastrand observed that, since the ad hoc committees were already created, the Chair could reactivate the committees whenever necessary. Regent Gallagher suggested that listing the inactive committees was cluttering the Bylaws. Regent Rosenberg stated that the university had the habit of reviewing courses, adding that courses remaining inactive for 5 years were dropped. Prior to being dropped they could be reactivated without additional approval from Courses & Curriculum.

7. Information Only-Handbook Change, Code, Acting Chancellor or President - An amendment to the Regents ' Code, Title 2, Section 1.5.5, Acting Chancellor or President, was presented for information with action likely to be taken at the September meeting. The proposed amendment would provide that an individual who is appointed interim Chancellor or President may not be considered as a candidate for that respective position. This proposed amendment would not be applied retroactively. (Ref. C on file in the Board office)

Dr. Nichols reported that System Administration researched practices of other systems and institutions across the country:

- Minnesota - Policy stating that an acting or interim president shall not be considered as a candidate in the search process for the presidency. The policy was not always followed.
- New York - An interim or acting president may not be a candidate for the presidency unless the Chancellor of the system specifically allows it in writing.
- Oregon - The board decides whether to conduct a national search or to move an interim president into the permanent status prior to the beginning of the search.
- Florida and Georgia - No policy.
- Most states do not have a policy on this. No clear pattern across the country.

Regent Alden asked about California 's practices. Dr. Nichols related that she did not receive any information indicating what they did. Regent Alden asked whether national search firms had been consulted. Dr. Nichols replied that she had not. Regent Derby was uneasy about adopting an absolute policy, preferring instead to work on a case-by-case basis, providing flexibility for the Board. She suggested that one approach might be better than another in

different circumstances. Regent Seastrand agreed. Regent Gallagher asked about the fairness of doing things differently with different institutions. She suggested that, with a smaller institution, it was conceivable that an interim could be the logical choice. She acknowledged that it was a tough call, and asked for a feel from the Board about fairness. Regent Phillips stated that, at the rate at which the institutions were growing, he could not support the policy. Regent Kirkpatrick indicated his support of the policy; adding that interested candidates would not allow themselves to be appointed as an interim. He observed that, in some instances, considering an interim/acting candidate could discourage qualified candidates from applying. Regent Wiesner stated that it would depend upon many variables (fairness, the candidate, political climate, number of letters to the editor, newspaper editorials), adding that he would not like to be locked into one method. Regent Derby suggested that the Board should also discuss who would make the decision. Regent Gallagher asked whether the Board (or someone else) could nominate an interim with this policy. Regent Rosenberg stated that the intent of the Board would need to be observed.

8. Approved Observatory/Science Park, WNCC - The Board approved a proposed observatory/science park for WNCC. The Jack C. Davis Observatory will be a one-of-a-kind facility in Carson City and northern Nevada designed for the advancement of an active and investigative astronomy curriculum as well as the community at large. Future plans include an exploratorium/planetarium and other science-related items shown on the science park master plan (on file in the Board office). Non-state funds would be used for this project.

President Lucey reported there had been an outpouring of community support and introduced Vice President of Institutional Advancement, Ms. Helaine Jesse. Ms. Jesse reported that the observatory was the brainchild of Dr. Robert Collier, a Physics and Astronomy professor at WNCC. Community donations include:
Nevada Gaming Foundation for Educational Excellence - \$100,000.

- Nevada Bell Foundation - \$25,000.
- Hershenow & Klippenstein Architects - architectural services.
- The Builders Association of Western Nevada - labor and materials.
- Sierra Pacific Power Company - delivering power to the project.
- Harley-Davidson Financial Services - \$17,000 motorcycle for raffle.
- PolyPhaser Corporation - lightning protection systems.
- Cubix/Ormsby - donating computer server.

She reported that the project began as a 5-meter dome with a 600-sq. ft. classroom and has evolved into a 10-acre regional science park with a planetarium and exploratorium. The ceiling will consist of retracting doors to display the southeast horizon with multiple telescopes. Elementary and secondary schools will have access from their classrooms via the Internet. A planetary walkway will connect the observatory with the campus.

Regent Derby moved approval of an observatory/science park for WNCC. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Phillips questioned the use of non-state/special funds. Ms. Jesse replied that the facility would be built with private funds, adding that the state would be asked to maintain it once it was built. She stated that it would cost money to maintain (i.e. water, power) and eventually add staff. Regent Phillips asked about future plans. Ms. Jesse replied existing adjunct and full-time faculty would teach classes initially, but eventually the planetarium and observatory would require a staff. President Lucey related that the project was designed to make science available to young people, encourage future college careers, and be used as a recruitment measure (high school preparation). She reported it would also provide instruction, which would generate FTE revenue and would offset the costs of staffing. Ms. Jesse estimated maintenance costs of \$7,000/year (not including future staff). Dr. Lucey distinguished between operating costs associated with maintaining a facility and operating costs associated with running an academic program. There would be some costs associated with running an academic program, no different from any

other academic program.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Kirkpatrick indicated that he shared some of the same concerns as Regent Phillips and requested a 'ballpark figure ' for operation/maintenance. Dr. Lucey replied it would cost approximately \$7,000/year for the 2,500-sq. ft. facility.

Regent Seastrand asked whether the property had been donated. Ms. Jesse explained that it was existing WNCC property in the northwest corner of the campus, abutting four private residences and state public lands. Regent Derby stated that the major investment was all private funding and supported the mission of the college and what could be offered in the future. She acknowledged that, once the programs were in place, FTE would generate revenue to support it. Regent Phillips clarified that he had no problem with science projects, but did have a problem with the claim for 'no state funds ' when the Board would be called upon later for support.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Dondero and Hill were absent.

The meeting recessed at 2:55 p.m. and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. with all members present except Regents Dondero and Hill.

9. Approved Soccer Facility Development, CCSN/City of Las Vegas - The Board approved CCSN to develop a proposal to define City of Las Vegas participation in the construction of a lighted soccer facility and small public park on the Charleston campus. The soccer facility would be dedicated primarily to CCSN 's intercollegiate men 's and women 's athletic programs. A secondary benefit would be to afford the City of Las Vegas and Opportunity Village use of the soccer facility and park resources when the college is not utilizing them. The proposal was intended to define CCSN 's partnership with the City of Las Vegas as well as financial and in-kind resources that the City would provide to CCSN 's project. A final partnership proposal for this project will be brought to the Board for approval.

Dr. Silverman reported it was a new program to enhance programming at the college, with the intent to incorporate athletics across all of the campuses.

Regent Wiesner moved approval of the development of a proposal to define City of Las Vegas participation in the construction of a soccer facility/small public park at CCSN. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Mr. Mike Meyer, CCSN Athletic Director, described the project, which would utilize 3.5 acres on the 80-acre Charleston campus. He reported that the women 's soccer complex had received a \$1.4 million pledge for lights, landscaping, and the soccer/baseball fields.

Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the Charleston campus was the population center of Clark County and expressed concern for losing the 3.5 acres. He asked about the possibility of acquiring adjacent BLM land. Dr. Silverman replied that it was his intention to recommend acquisition of the rest of the available land, adding that he would prepare a proposal for the expansion of the Charleston campus. He related there was no plan for that land at this point. He displayed a 20-year projection of buildings depicting that the soccer facility would not be encroached upon until 2020 without acquisition of the BLM land. Regent Kirkpatrick felt it was a tremendous project and asked whether the deal had already been made. Mr. Meyer replied that it was pending Board approval, adding that the college hoped to pursue this for women 's sports to equalize what is offered for men 's sports. He related that the women were currently practicing on a dirt field, adding that many were recipients of millennium scholarships. He felt the program was in the best interest of the college and the System.

Regent Sisolak voiced his support for the program, adding that he appreciated the work of Dr. Silverman and Mr. Meyer, adding that it would entice young people to the campus to watch the games and further the interest of young women in the city.

Regent Seastrand felt it was a good partnership and asked about an operational cost estimate. Mr. Meyer replied that the project (full-time field and practice field) would cost approximately \$15,000-18,000/year state obligation. The one-acre park would be maintained by Opportunity Village.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

10. Approved Bill Drafts for 2001 Legislature - The Board approved the submission of the following Bill Draft Requests for the 2001 legislative session: (Ref. E on file in the Board office)

Amendment to Millennium Scholarship.

Statute revision to provide eligibility for GBC and NSC for funds for education student financial aid.

Request to carry-forward particular revenue during the biennium.

Dr. Nichols reported that the amendment included \$60/credit for GBC upper-division and NSCH campus courses. It also included GBC and NSCH in a program that provides scholarships for students pursuing teaching degrees and a request to carry-forward 50% of unexpended state funds from one year to the next.

Regent Alden moved approval of submission of Bill Drafts for the 2001 legislative session. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Dr. Moore asked for a change in the language from 'he ' to 'student '. Dr. Nichols replied that it reflected the language currently in the statute. She indicated they would attempt to make the change.

Regent Gallagher felt that it was good timing to address carry-forward balances with the new Governor. Regent Seastrand commented that at the end of each year unused funds were returned to the state. He felt it poor policy to encourage spending everything appropriated and provided the opportunity to keep half and split the return with the state to help with one-shot funding.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

11. Rejected Repeal and Reestablishment of Capital Budget Priorities 2001-2003 - The Board considered the repeal of prior Board action, which approved capital improvement project priorities for 2001-2003, reviewed capital improvements for the 2001-2003 budget years, and established a priority listing for the 2001-2003 capital budget. (Ref. F on file in the Board office)

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the repeal and reestablishment of capital budget priorities for 2001-2003. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick felt the system of developing capital improvements was flawed with each institution developing a list of priorities, which were then submitted to the Chancellor for prioritizing with the presidents for presentation to the legislature. He felt that, based on need, CCSN should get 2-3 of the top priorities. After the last meeting, he reconsidered Board action, which approved 2 buildings for a college in the planning stages at a higher priority than the student services upgrade for UNLV. He noted that the current UNLV structure was built to service 5,000 students and UNLV now has 25,000 students. He did not want to hurt NSCH, but felt the priorities should be reevaluated. He

felt that NSCH could initially accommodate student services in the classroom building.

Regent Alden noted the work performed by the Equity Space committee that determined findings for use of space and how to submit a capital list based on needs. He asked whether any of those findings had been applied to the capital priority list. Dr. Nichols replied that the Governor had asked the same question. There were a number of difficulties with the timing of the study and the capital process beginning in February. The System now has an accurate audit and common agreement of space. There is still no agreed-upon formula for setting future priorities, but there is a proposed formula that forms the basis for one aspect of the capital list. It was agreed that the Chancellor, presidents and Regents would assess the formula. She stated that it could not be accomplished solely with the use of numbers, adding that the information was not available when the capital list was created. She felt there would be changes in the future in the manner in which the lists were developed. Regent Gallagher commented that when the committee determined the guidelines it was intended for future application and not for this biennium, because more work was required. Regent Sisolak commented that he was under the impression that the input would be used this biennium if possible. He asked whether Regent Kirkpatrick wanted priority #8b moved. Regent Kirkpatrick clarified that he wanted to split the 8th priority by removing the student services building to ensure that student services at UNLV was a higher priority than the student services building at NSCH.

Chair Rosenberg reminded the Board they were considering the repeal of capital budget priorities and asked them to limit the discussion to that subject. Regent Derby observed that it was difficult to separate the two subjects, adding that she would not support the repeal because she felt the process the Chancellor and presidents went through was a tough one. She observed that UNLV 's president was not a shy, timid creature incapable of defending her institution, adding that the Board should support their consensus.

Regent Alden questioned whether the prioritized list (agreed upon by the Chancellor and presidents) met the needs of higher education today (students/faculty). He felt that, if it could be revised to improve access, it should be and felt he needed more information.

Regent Seastrand asked Dr. Moore how he would service students with one building. Dr. Moore replied that he would then have to accommodate registration and classrooms in whatever space was provided. He felt that appropriate-sized facilities were proposed for the next 4-5 years. He was not aware of any college that could operate without student services. Regent Seastrand asked how they could accommodate him with Regent Kirkpatrick 's plan. Dr. Moore suggested decreasing the square footage, but not eliminating any buildings.

Regent Gallagher observed that the list had been sent to the Public Works Board. She was not opposed to addressing the Space Equity recommendations with the next priority list, but felt it was too late for the current biennium submission. She acknowledged that the presidents had already agonized over the list and was hesitant for the Board to second-guess their recommendation.

Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the UNLV student services complex was the 8th priority last biennium and had slipped to 11th this biennium. He was concerned for the number of students that do not have the facilities they need and was upset that Dr. Moore felt he could not accomplish his task with only one building. He believed that most of the funds for the college were supposed to be private donations and felt one building could be modified to accommodate staff, student services, and classrooms, adding that UNLV 's need was essential. Chair Rosenberg again cautioned about moving away from the subject motion.

Regent Sisolak stated that he would like to use the Space Equity recommendations, if possible, this time. He observed that the Regents were elected to make tough decisions and advocate for their constituents.

Dr. Moore observed that each president submitted their priorities and UNLV did not submit the student services building as their first priority. Two other priorities were submitted ahead of their student services building. He observed that NSCH 's priorities were ranked behind both of UNLV 's and all of the other institutions except GBC. He noted that the presidents had arrived at a list of what they felt was most important. Regent Kirkpatrick clarified that he did not want to move UNLV 's student services ahead of NSCH 's buildings, rather only one of the buildings. He felt it did not make sense that an institution with more students was not a higher priority, and that the system used to determine priorities was lacking.

Regent Alden urged the need to incorporate the Equity Space recommendations into the prioritization process.

After a roll call vote the motion failed. Regents Alden, Derby, Gallagher, Phillips, Rosenberg, Seastrand, and Wiesner voted no. Regents Kirkpatrick and Sisolak voted yes. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

12. Approved Consent Agenda - The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of items 1,3,7,11,12,14. Item 13 was withdrawn.

(2) Approved Provost Transition, UNLV - The Board approved, in accordance with Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 21, a request for reassignment for Dr. Douglas Ferraro to a teaching position in the College of Liberal Arts, following his 4½ years of service as Provost. Terms and conditions of the transition were presented at the meeting. President Harter further recommended approval of Dr. Ferraro's request for a professional development leave in which to assume the duties of a full-time academic faculty member. The duration of the leave was to be one semester (Fall 2000). No other expenses related to the leave were recommended.

(4) Approved Tenure on Hire, UNR - The Board approved tenure on hire for Dr. G. Cornelis van Kooten, who will become chair of the Department of Applied Economics and Statistics within the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, effective August 1, 2000. (Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office)

(5) Approved Second Year of Leave Without Pay, UNR - The Board approved a second year of leave without pay (2000-2001) for Dr. Jeanne Wendel to care for an ill parent. (Reference material on file in the Board office)

(6) Approved Appointments, Foundation, GBC - The Board approved the following GBC Foundation appointments:

Foundation Trustees:

Marcia Bandera, Superintendent, Elko County School District

John Ellis, Retired CEO, Anglo Gold

Linda Ritter, City Manager, City of Elko

Tana Gallagher, Owner/CFO, Gallagher Ford

Jim Meeks, Owner, Vogue Laundry and Dry Cleaners

Ben Guenther, COO, Anglo Gold

Lew Eklund, Owner, Eklund Drilling

Jim Winer, Real Estate Agent, Coldwell Banker

Margaret Puccinelli, Nursing Faculty, Great Basin College

Jean Sloan, Trust Department, Great Basin Bank

Foundation Officers:

Russell McMullen, Chairman

Chuck Briggs, Vice Chairman

Richard Barrows, Vice Chairman
Ronald Remington, Secretary
John Pryor, Treasurer

(8) Approved Handbook Change, Amendments, Student Conduct Code, UNLV - The Board approved amendments to the UNLV Student Conduct Code. The amendments were proposed by an ad hoc committee and were also reviewed by System legal counsel. (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office)

(9) Approved Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CCSN - The Board approved the use of Capital Improvement Fee funds for the following projects:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Fire Hydrant Repair, Western High Tech Center | \$3,000 |
| Radiowave/Wireless Communication System | <u>\$10,000</u> |
| TOTAL: | \$13,000 |

(10) Approved Additions to UCCSN Endowment Pool - The Board approved the following new accounts added to the UCCSN permanent Endowment Pool for the period October 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000:

Campus Endowment Name Amount

CCSN D. Groome-Peterman Dental \$11,645.00

TMCC John & Kristin Richardson \$1,275.00

TMCC Junior League of Reno \$5,000.00

Total TMCC: \$6,275.00

UNLV Juanita White - Library \$349,677.19

UNR Daniel & Edith O 'Keefe \$325,000.00

Total Additions:\$692,597.19

President Lucey requested removal of Consent Agenda item #13, (Letter of Intent, Carson City).

12.Approved Consent Agenda - (Cont 'd.)

Regent Derby moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items 1, 3, 7, 11, 12, 12, 13, and 14.

Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

(1)Approved Minutes - The Board approved the minutes from the meeting held June 22-23, 2000.

Regent Sisolak requested a correction to the minutes, page 224 by substituting the word 'ponds ' in place of 'props '.

Resent Seastrand moved approval of the June 22-23, 2000 minutes with the change requested. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

(3)Approved Appointment, Interim Provost, UNLV - The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Raymond Alden III as Interim Provost, effective August 16, 2000, at a salary of \$153,500. (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office)

Regent Sisolak asked how the salary was determined and how much of an increase in pay it represented. Vice President Fain replied that the salary was within the minimum of the first quartile of the executive salary schedule approved by the Board in April and represented a 12.7% increase in salary.

Regent Derby moved approval of the appointment. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

(7)Approved Appointment, Interim Vice President, DRI - The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Roger L. Jacobson as Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs at an annual salary of \$135,900 effective July 17, 2000.

Regent Sisolak asked how the salary was determined and how much of an increase in pay it represented. President Wells replied that the salary was near the minimum of the first quartile of the executive salary schedule approved by the Board in April and represented a 10% increase in salary.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the appointment. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

(11)Approved Contract, Cell Site Antenna, UNR - The Board approved a contract, which would allow installation of six cell site antennas with auxiliary equipment on the rooftop of the new residence hall building on the UNR campus. (Ref. C-11 on file in the Board office)

(12)Approved Easement, Nevada Bell, WNCC - The Board approved an easement requested by Nevada Bell to allow them to install a fiber optic litespan cabinet on the northeast corner of the WNCC Carson campus. The cabinets are part of Nevada Bell 's project to provide Carson City with high-speed ADSL fiber optic telecommunication service. Nevada Bell will pay the college \$5,000 for this easement. (Ref. C-12 on file in the Board office)

(14)Approved Lease Agreement, Nextel Communications, CCSN - The Board approved of a communications site lease agreement between CCSN and Nextel of California, Inc. This agreement would allow Nextel to lease approximately 300-sq.ft. of roof and rooftop equipment room space at the Henderson campus for the purpose of installing a communications antenna and associated equipment. Nextel will pay UCCSN a fee of \$1,750 per month for use of this space for a term of five years. The lease agreement was reviewed and approved by UCCSN legal counsel for consideration by the Board.

Regent Alden asked whether the contract/easements infringed upon the missions or educational objectives of the institutions. Dr. Nichols related that SCS was involved with a study to ensure the campuses were receiving a fair market price. President Crowley replied that UNR would receive \$11,000/year in rent and that the money would be used for the residence hall association (programming and small officer stipends) and the residence hall reserve (maintenance and upgrade). President Lucey explained that the easement was similar to one approved at the June meeting. The switch will be located next to existing easements (drainage & SPPCO) and represented no problem for the campus plan. The \$5,000 sum is the same as the Nevada Bell easement approved in June and would be used for campus beautification. President Silverman reported that the antenna would be located on top of one of the buildings and had no negative impact to the students or the college, and would enhance communication on campus and could play a role in the wireless operation in the future.

Regent Sisolak asked how the best deal was determined. SCS Director Van Weddle replied that a formula and process was used to determine the value of land relinquished. Regent Sisolak asked whether the formula was used. President Crowley related that the firm approached UNR with a proposal. UNR had some experience with this with another company in the past and received a better deal with this offer. He assured the Board that UNR performed due diligence with the manner in which these proposals are compensated and the market rate was appropriate. He added that UNR was not using the space anyway. President Silverman related that CCSN did not accept the initial offer, and after researching the proposal, received more money than originally offered. He added that General

Counsel also reviewed the documents for compliance. President Lucey stated that WNCC did not accept the first offer either, adding that she insisted on the same amount afforded the university.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether esthetics had been considered. Presidents Crowley and Silverman replied that they had.

Regent Alden moved approval of Consent Agenda items 11, 12, and 14. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Mr. Bill Newhall asked whether locating the antenna on top of the residence hall could have any negative health effects. President Crowley replied there were none. He added that there were claims, but UNR found no literature to support those claims. He indicated that someone came before the Reno planning commission with that claim and was asked to provide scientific literature, and could not. He related Mr. Steve Zink had researched the Internet and could find no supporting information, as UNR did not want to expose students to a health risk. Regent Seastrand asked whether the contracts for these sites had an indemnity clause in case a health risk was presented in the future. President Crowley did not know. General Counsel Ray related that he also did not know since another attorney reviewed the contracts. Regent Sisolak observed that it appeared the institutions had

(14)Approved Lease Agreement, Nextel Communications, CCSN - (Cont 'd.)

performed due diligence. Mr. Mike Meyer related that he met with eight different organizations in hopes of providing income for the baseball field. Most contracts are 5-year terms for \$1500-\$2000/month, with some money received up front and yearly percentage increases. He offered to provide the information to the Board.

General Counsel Ray related that the agreement addressed indemnity and required liability insurance.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

13.Approved Partnership: Nevada Community Enrichment Project, CCSN - The Board approved CCSN to negotiate an agreement with the Nevada Community Enrichment Program (NCEP) to lease 5 acres of land on the Charleston campus. On this site NCEP would build a full-service rehabilitation facility and eight residential apartments. (Ref. D and Business Plan on file in the Board office))

Dr. Mike Harter reported that he reviewed the proposal and spoke with Dr. Silverman and several partners in the project. Mr. Bob Hogan invited him to review the current Nevada Enrichment Program facility. The primary emphasis is on day treatment and a short-term transitional program. The average length of stay is 88 days. The services are for people with brain or spinal injuries. A third area of service involves in-home assistance, home and vehicle modification and vocational retraining. Clients leave an acute care facility and enter this program as part of their rehabilitation. The Assistive Technology Center has technicians working with each referral. CCSN 's involvement would consist of providing 5 acres of land, which should not interfere with strategic plans for 15-20 years. The on-site laboratory would be used for Occupational Therapy Assistant, Physical Therapy Assistant, and Mental Health/Development Disabilities Technologies programs. 3200-sq. ft. of space would be dedicated for laboratories, offices, and a classroom/conference room. Opportunities would be provided for students to have hands-on experience with this population. Students and faculty would interact with practicing clinicians and state-of-the-art technology. He noted that 60% of the people coming out of the program in California sign up for classes at the campus. Nevada Community Enrichment and its parent company (Accessible Space, Inc.) received \$5 million in tobacco settlement funds and would be responsible for building the facility and managing and paying all related costs of operation. CCSN would be responsible for scheduling its dedicated space and for negotiating the clinical integration with the rehabilitation clinicians. Future plans include a Phase II to be built on top of existing space and co-location of several additional related community agencies on-site.

Chair Rosenberg asked whether it was possible to separate the residential apartments out and not negatively impact the program. Dr. Harter replied that it could be separated. There are so few transitional facilities in Nevada that many people go out of state or end up in nursing homes, which do not have the appropriate equipment or care. The proximity of the transitional housing makes it possible for clinicians to work with the people more easily. Existing transitional housing has 24-hour coverage by staff with no additional security. He did not feel that additional security staffing would be necessary.

Dr. Silverman reported the proposal was a request to enter into a negotiation, adding that he wanted to incorporate Regent concerns into the negotiation. Training programs would

13. Approved Partnership: Nevada Community Enrichment Project, CCSN - (Cont 'd.)

be greatly enhanced with the addition of this program. Should the business plan not work, the \$5 million building would revert to CCSN/UCCSN. A plot plan was prepared addressing future CCSN growth, based on acquiring a new building every 2 years. Capacity exists, even with the addition of future buildings. The program would provide training to CCSN students and meet a critical need of the community.

Ms. Christine Presson, Program Director for the CCSN Occupational Therapy Assistant program, stated that the health programs faculty felt it was a wonderful idea. The provision of 3200-sq. ft. would enhance a curriculum so CCSN students would be better prepared to work in the community. It would also provide an opportunity to strengthen the bridge between academia and clinical practice. She related that on-site presence of specialists in spinal cord injury and traumatic brain injury would be an excellent resource for CCSN programs. She reported there were no specialized programs that offer this package of services with this level of expertise. It would allow creation of a challenging curriculum, strengthen faculty skills, and provide continuing education to graduates. She acknowledged that it represented a step beyond the traditional with the residential housing facility. Training clients to reenter the community and live independently would expose students to community-based practice. The program would also address weekend and evening class requests. She related that the faculty saw an opportunity to use clients for guest lectures and would provide the opportunity to meet a critical need in the community.

Assemblyman Goldwater provided several anecdotes about Las Vegas citizens who could utilize the program, adding that he felt there was a need in the community for preparing clinicians. He related that ASI was a non-profit organization initiated as the result of a friend's accident. In providing tobacco settlement funding, the legislature wanted to help provide quality accessible disabled services in Las Vegas. He felt the partnership with clinical programs would provide that.

Regent Alden established that dedication of the 5 acres did not impinge on the academic mission of the campus and that CCSN would not put any money into the project.

Regent Derby observed that the program possibilities were very good. She noted that other institutions offering these programs had access to facilities not on the campus and had reservations about dedicating 5 acres of campus that could be used for other academic ventures. She asked whether there were other possibilities with the city or county to provide the land. Assemblyman Goldwater replied that the city, state and county all showed great willingness to dedicate even more than 5 acres. CCSN was engaged due to the type of services to be provided. He noted that money for the building and program were already approved and they only needed the land. He felt there were compelling arguments for the use of the 5 acres for this program.

Regent Gallagher expressed concern for System vulnerability for other groups asking for space on campus as well. She felt the facility, as well as others of this type, would need to expand and would be better-located off-campus.

She urged him to look across the street at vacant BLM land that could be acquired for health and education purposes. Assemblyman Goldwater replied that the state would likely suggest the use of CCSN property across the street. Regent Gallagher expressed concern for future expansion at CCSN.

13. Approved Partnership: Nevada Community Enrichment Project, CCSN - (Cont 'd.)

Chair Rosenberg established that ASI was a non-profit organization. Regent Rosenberg asked about the space required and suggested 2-acres as an alternative. Dr. Mike Harter reported that the proposal consisted of:

Building - 37,000-sq. ft.

Parking and drive areas - 67,000-sq. ft.

Therapeutic recreation area - 20,000-sq. ft.

Landscaping - 76,000-sq. ft.

Undeveloped area - 17,500-sq. ft.

Total Space - 217,800-sq. ft.

Dr. Silverman related that he did not believe the land across the street was BLM land, but rather state-owned land as part of the Department of Health & Human Services. Dr. Moore affirmed that it was state-owned land.

Regent Sisolak emphasized that the program fit with the synergy on campus and benefit to faculty and clients. He noted that they would face a land-lock situation at all of the campuses. He felt the Board should not pass up this opportunity.

Regent Kirkpatrick stated that the presentation convinced him the program would enhance the opportunity to work on a meaningful problem and CCSN programs. He felt the Board should ask for the land across the street, making the point that part of UCCSN property was used for a health care facility. Assemblyman Goldwater stated that using campus land for this purpose would be a compelling argument to state officials.

Regent Wiesner asked about using the property across the street if the state would provide it. Dr. Silverman related that acquiring the land would be a lengthy process. Regent Wiesner asked about the urgency to identify the land. Assemblyman Goldwater replied that \$5 million was received two years ago and they wanted to build a building soon. He indicated that negotiations with CCSN had appeared most fruitful for the program.

Regent Alden moved approval of CCSN to negotiate an agreement with NCEP for the lease of 5 acres at CCSN. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Seastrand established that, should something go wrong, the System would take over the building, and added his support for the program as well as the pursuit of the vacant property.

Regent Alden felt it was a bold move that enhanced the academic mission and was part of higher education. He was glad to provide 5 acres for this purpose.

Regent Gallagher observed that the Regents ' vote would provide permission to negotiate and asked when the results of the negotiation would be presented. Dr. Silverman related that the negotiations would be based upon Regent concerns expressed and could likely be presented at the September meeting.

Regent Sisolak agreed with pursuing acquisition of the other property, but felt using this portion of land for a health-related venture could make a compelling case.

13.Approved Partnership: Nevada Community Enrichment Project, CCSN - (Cont 'd.)

Regent Derby agreed with Regent Wiesner, adding that she wished they had the opportunity to look at the land across the street as a possibility. She stated she would feel better about the project located across the street. Assemblyman Goldwater related that the committee engaged the state, the city, and the county for available land for this project. The best offering was found with CCSN.

Regent Phillips asked whether Dr. Silverman supported the proposal. Dr. Silverman indicated that he did. Regent Phillips felt the program was a worthwhile use of the property, and encouraged the Board to vote in favor.

Regent Wiesner suggested that the negotiations include pursuit of the land across the street.

Regent Sisolak asked for Assemblyman Goldwater 's assistance in working with the legislature and Governor in acquiring the land. Assemblyman Goldwater related that he had been very supportive of the UCCSN during his three terms. He added that it would be helpful to see the need.

Dr. Moore observed that it was a nice piece of property that would fit with the clinics already on campus.

Dr. Nichols related that she met with the Health Program faculty in the Spring. Their enthusiasm convinced her to advise them to move forward. She asked Dr. Mike Harter to research the risk. She felt the only reason not to approve would be if the land were needed for other purposes.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

Chair Rosenberg stated that it was 5:10 p.m. and asked about the Board 's desire for continuing or recessing.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of continuing the meeting. Regent Phillips seconded. Motion failed. Regents Derby, Gallagher, Rosenberg and Wiesner voted no. Regents Alden, Kirkpatrick, Phillips, Seastrand, and Sisolak voted yes. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

The meeting recessed at 5:15 p.m. and reconvened at 8:10 a.m. on Friday, August 11, 2000 with all members present except Regents Dondero and Hill.

14.Rejected Presidential Compensation - The Board rejected salary adjustments for the institution presidents: (White Packet #15/16 on file in the Board office)

·5% merit increase recommended for Presidents Richardson and Remington.

·3% merit increase recommended for President Harter.

·2.5% merit increase recommended for Presidents Lucey and Wells.

Regent Derby asked whether freezing presidential salaries fell within the scope of the agenda item. General Counsel Ray indicated that freezing all salaries was broader in scope and preferred a specific agenda item naming the individuals that would be affected.

14.Rejected Presidential Compensation - (Cont 'd.)

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of salary adjustments for the institution presidents. Regent Phillips seconded.

Regent Sisolak offered a friendly amendment for consistency amongst the presidential increases (5% for Presidents

Harter, Remington, and Richardson and 2.5% for Presidents Lucey and Wells). Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick observed that former Interim Chancellor Anderes had specific reasons for the recommendations. Interim Chancellor Nichols related it was difficult to comment since she was not part of the evaluation process. Regent Sisolak indicated that he had unanswered questions and felt that with UNLV 's great strides President Harter also deserved a 5% increase. Regent Derby expressed her belief in process and the Chancellor 's recommendation, adding that it would be difficult to make such a change without benefit of an explanation for his decision. Regent Seastrand observed that the percentage increases were based on different base salaries and were not fair. He suggested instead using a specific dollar amount. Regent Alden stated that the Board was facing a tough budget session and that a line must be drawn. He stated that the faculty was the heartbeat of higher education putting in long, dedicated long hours. He felt the faculty was not compensated fairly and did not get enough last time. He urged the need to send a clear message to the Governor and legislature that the UCCSN was holding the line on executive salaries and being conservative. He indicated that he would not support presidential salary increases, with no disrespect intended to the presidents who were doing an excellent job. Regent Phillips agreed that faculty and staff should receive increases as well, but recalled that a lot of thought went into the recommended increases. He expressed concern for changing the recommendation, adding that faculty and staff should be given equal treatment. Regent Gallagher felt the Board did not have sufficient information to justify changing the recommended percentage increases.

Motion for a friendly amendment failed. Regents Alden, Derby, Gallagher, Kirkpatrick, Phillips, Rosenberg, Seastrand, and Wiesner voted no. Regent Sisolak voted yes. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

Regent Kirkpatrick agreed that percentage increases were unfair, adding that he would like the Board to follow-up on the suggestion for a flat dollar amount. Dr. Nichols clarified that cost of living increases had not been received for two years, while faculty were eligible for 2.5% merit per year and had been eligible for the past two years. She related that the presidents had not received salary adjustments in two years (unless recently hired). Chair Rosenberg asked when it would be appropriate to make a motion to freeze all presidential salaries, if not all executive salaries. General Counsel Ray related that it would be a bit of a stretch to include in items 15 or 16, preferring a separate agenda item be presented in September for that purpose. He indicated that they could freeze the specific individuals named on the agenda.

14.Rejected Presidential Compensation - (Cont 'd.)

After a roll call vote the motion for approval of salary adjustments for the institution presidents failed. Regents Alden, Derby, Gallagher, Kirkpatrick, Rosenberg, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted no. Regent Phillips voted yes. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

15.Approved UCCSN Cabinet Contracts - The Board approved the following UCCSN Cabinet Contracts, with Dr. Nichols reporting that the recommended salary adjustments represented the first salary increase in two years (except for those who changed positions in the last year). She indicated that General Counsel Tom Ray, SCS Executive Director Van Weddle, and Director of the University Press Ron Latimer had not received any adjustment last year.

A.The Board approved a request of 5% merit salary adjustments for General Counsel Tom Ray and Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst.

B.Request is made for approval of a 10% merit salary adjustment for Executive Director of System Computing

Services Davan Weddle and a 4% merit salary adjustment for Director of the University Press Ron Latimer.

Regent Phillips moved approval of 5% merit salary adjustments for General Counsel Tom Ray and Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst, a 10% merit salary adjustment for Executive Director of System Computing Services Davan Weddle and a 4% merit salary adjustment for Director of the University Press Ron Latimer. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Alden observed that the adjustments were not really merit but equity for increased responsibilities on the job. Dr. Nichols replied that it would be difficult to characterize these recommendations as equity adjustments in relation to similar positions. Regent Derby expressed her support for the recommended increases, adding that it had been an extraordinary year for System staff and they had supported the Board at many junctures. She expressed her gratitude for the extra effort exhibited. Regent Phillips indicated his support for the motion, adding that he felt the Board had outstanding staff. He noted the number of changes and numerous searches, adding that the staff had been very supportive of the Board. He felt it appeared more of an equity increase to bring salaries in line with the private sector. Regent Sisolak asked why discussion of percentage increases for System staff was acceptable and when it was not for presidents. Chair Rosenberg observed that the dollar amounts were provided in the White Packet material. Regent Sisolak stated that he had great respect for the staff, but felt the Board was sending a mixed message to the presidents. He asked whether increases had been received recently for the recommended individuals. Dr. Nichols clarified that Mr. Weddle was previously awarded a housing allowance, but he had elected to relinquish it as of July 1st. She noted that when Ms. Ernst's position was changed she received a 10% increase for the additional responsibilities. Regent Sisolak asked how the recommended percentages were determined. Dr. Nichols replied that the Board committee (Chair Derby and Vice Chair Dondero) administered the evaluation and provided the recommendations for Ms. Ernst and Mr. Ray, and former Interim Chancellor Anderes made the recommendations for Mr. Weddle and Mr. Latimer,

15. Approved UCCSN Cabinet Contracts - (Cont 'd.)

based upon a performance evaluation. Mr. Weddle's increase also included an equity adjustment for comparable positions. Regent Sisolak was troubled by the lack of consistency. Regent Kirkpatrick stated there was no doubt that these people worked very hard and deserved an increase in salary, but felt the presidents did as well. He felt that if they were going to deny salary adjustments for the presidents they should do the same with the staff. He noted that many faculty did not receive an increase in the past two years, adding that he might abstain from voting.

Regent Gallagher observed that with Mr. Weddle was actually sustaining a decrease in pay by foregoing the \$12,000 housing allowance and only receiving an \$11,000 increase.

Regent Alden stated that it was not an equal comparison. While he acknowledged that the presidents worked hard, he observed that Mr. Weddle saved the accounting system that was in such bad shape six years ago. He noted that a comparable position in the private sector would be much more than what was recommended. He noted that General Counsel Tom Ray performed phenomenally, and that Mr. Ron Latimer had made great progress with the University Press. He stated that Ms. Ernst had combined two positions and saved the System \$70,000. He felt the positions warranted the recommended increases. Regent Derby noted that she and Regent Dondero conducted the evaluations for Mr. Ray and Ms. Ernst, and received great support from the Board for their performance. They both received excellent evaluations. She noted that when the Board approved several interim positions, the other increases were 15% while Ms. Ernst only received a 10% increase, which was also a consideration in the recommendation.

Motion carried. Regent Kirkpatrick voted no. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

Regent Derby requested a review of flat dollar increase recommendations as opposed to percentage increases for executive salaries as well.

16. Approved Community College Faculty Salary Schedule - The Board approved the community college faculty salary schedule recommended by the Blue Ribbon committee and amended by Interim Chancellor Jane Nichols. The Board approved salary schedules for other faculty and staff at the May meeting. (Ref. G on file in the Board office)

Dr. Nichols reported that finding equity and raising the salary schedule for community college faculty was a difficult issue. The PricewaterhouseCoopers salary study identified some equity and benefit package issues with the community college faculty salaries when compared with other systems. The Blue Ribbon Committee, established to review the issues and make recommendations, also identified a problem: Community colleges work in areas of high-skill/high-demand and System salaries cannot compete nationally. The committee recommended:

Keep the schedules as a tool.

Create alternate schedules for vocational/technical positions.

Adjust current schedules 1-1.5% per year over a 6-9 year period.

Revise the Board Handbook to clarify the presidents' authority to make exceptions to the schedules for those positions in high demand areas.

Ongoing study of alternative schedules by the System Compensation Committee.

16. Approved Community College Faculty Salary Schedule - (Cont 'd.)

Dr. Nichols reported that the issue was withdrawn from the June meeting because the planned recommendation had been a 1.5% increase for all community college faculty this fiscal year. Subsequent problems have arisen. A clear message from the legislature and formula committee was received that the System could not use vacancy savings for salary increases that the state would then be responsible for in the base budget. So there was no guarantee that a 1.5% increase would be funded by the state. It was felt that the 1.5% increase could jeopardize the System's success of approaching the legislature regarding the lack of a cost of living adjustment (COLA) over the past two years. Dr. Nichols proposed an alternative recommendation:

Step 0 eliminated.

Step 30 added.

She related that it would not offer relief for any community college faculty at this time. It was a cosmetic change, since few faculty are actually working at step 0. Over time though it would change the salary schedule. Dr. Nichols stressed the importance of a 3% COLA adjustment for professional salaries for each year of the next biennium. The 3% COLA would also raise the steps. She asked the Board to commit to a 9% adjustment by FY 2005 and assure the faculty of this plan. The recommendation also provided the presidents' authority to select a place for new hires on the schedule for new hires in selected areas of critical need/high demand, in consultation with their faculty. She proposed a System wide definition of areas of critical need and high demand and suggested the System Compensation Committee should study the benefits package and other methods of community college faculty compensation. There has been discussion of an alternate scale that would tie community college salaries to university salaries with a process in place for regular review, as well as the state potentially picking up part of the retirement.

Regent Alden asked whether the budget incorporated this salary schedule. Mr. Miles replied that it did not. Regent Alden established that the budget would be presented without these recommendations, but adoption of the recommendations would allow the System to move forward to compensate community college faculty fairly.

Regent Alden moved approval of the community college faculty salary schedule. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the 9% to be received by 2005 was in addition to the COLA. Dr. Nichols stated that it would need to be adjusted each year as an actual cost of living was determined. Regent Kirkpatrick expressed concern for faculty morale when new hires come in at a higher salary than an existing faculty member. Dr. Nichols replied that it would be important for the presidents and faculty to track that and see whether equity adjustments should be made.

Regent Sisolak asked for an explanation of the Board commitment by 2005. Dr. Nichols replied that it was a sense of the Board's desire to do the right thing, adding that it would, of course, require legislative approval. Regent Sisolak asked whether the Board could commit to money that was not theirs. Dr. Nichols suggested the term 'to seek' would have the same effect. Regent Sisolak was more comfortable with that. He felt it was long overdue but did not want to obligate the future Board to something the legislature would not be able to fund.

16. Approved Community College Faculty Salary Schedule - (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak suggested a friendly amendment to change the wording from 'commit' to 'to seek' at least a 9% adjustment. Regents Alden and Derby accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Perry Johnson questioned whether it would have the same meaning. Dr. Nichols replied that any COLA would increase the salary schedule. Mr. Johnson stated that the study revealed that community college faculty were 9% behind not counting any COLA's. Dr. Fred Jackson agreed that the 9% increase and COLA were separate issues, adding that he felt it critical to keep the two issues separate. The Blue Ribbon committee recommended 9% not counting COLAs. He felt it imperative to remember that the salary schedule was one of the biggest tools for equity. He felt it important to treat all faculty the same, and was worried about hiring on the schedule at higher levels. He felt it difficult to define a critical need area, which may differ from one institution to another. He encouraged it to be used on a case-by-case basis with faculty input to avoid creating real inequities. Dr. Derby felt that faculty morale was important, but did not want to limit the presidents' authority in the area of new hires.

Mr. John Rice stated that the discussion began because salaries were not competitive and institutions were having difficulty hiring. He felt the difficulty was in hiring sufficient faculty to handle the influx of students from the Governor's priority (millennium scholarships).

Motion carried.

The meeting recessed at 9:03 a.m. and reconvened at 9:20 a.m. with all members present except Regents Dondero, Hill, and Phillips.

17. Approved Report on Administrative Practices and Handbook Change - Interim Chancellor Jane Nichols summarized and reviewed administrative practices at UCCSN related to equipment and inventory. The Board approved recommendations to UCCSN Handbook language, Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 20.9. An update on the complete review of CCSN administrative practices was provided. (Ref. H on file in the Board office)

Regent Seastrand left the meeting.

Dr. Nichols provided a handout (on file in the Board office) regarding administrative practices for equipment located off-site. Her intent was to stop allegations in the press against CCSN practices. She listened to the people who felt there were issues and brought the information to the Board, with the intent to fix any problems and move ahead. The

report centered on loaned equipment and furniture. Other allegations will be addressed at the September meeting, since faculty will return to campus the last week in August. She stated she would be available to listen to any further concerns and hoped to address all of the concerns in a responsible manner.

She reported that CCSN personnel were very helpful in the review process. Her review did not consider computer equipment located at K-12 sites, since all institutions have partnerships with K-12 entities. She reviewed non-K-12 organizations that had computers as a result of federal programs and grants including: the Salvation Army,

17.Approved Report on Administrative Practices and Handbook Change - (Cont 'd.)

the Cambridge Center, the Family Link Center and the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce. Other organizations where computers were located included: the NAACP, the AARP, the Latin Chamber of Commerce, and the Rafael Riviera Community Center. Property movement forms on equipment were found for all sites except the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce and the Rafael Riveria Community Center. In response to recent publicity, some of these computers have been returned to the college, although their age limits any current use by the college.

Regent Seastrand entered the meeting.

Dr. Nichols reported that off-site furniture was identified as located at Foothills High School and at the NAACP office. The furniture is in the process of being returned. There were no property movement forms completed for the furniture. She indicated that CCSN has a process and forms in place for equipment loans, but this is used for equipment loaned for college purposes to college faculty and staff. She cited the following conclusions:

Complete inventory of all equipment off-site or on loan was not kept in one location. Inadequate coordination with Controller to ensure that all computers or equipment were on the Controller 's list.

Property movement forms completed in all but two instances of computer equipment located off site. Forms sometimes incomplete, lacking date and president 's signature. No indication that UCCSN policy was not followed in relation to surplus equipment.

No memorandums of agreement located, but none required under current UCCSN or CCSN policy.

Actual practice included location of computers at sites where CCSN programs occur, the 'loan ' of equipment to partners with similar goals, and the donation of equipment under Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 20.8.

Policy in place at CCSN to track all computers and equipment of value even if it falls below the definition of inventory established at \$2,000.

Dr. Nichols reported that each institution provided a summary of their practices and policies related to inventory control, as well as whether or not they had any equipment or furniture loaned to other entities. Other than CCSN, the institutions indicated that they do not loan equipment or furniture to non-UCCSN entities. However, during a recent internal audit, one loan agreement for a piano placed at an off campus site was found at UNR. Both parties signed a loan agreement for the piano. She reported that all institutions have equipment located at sites off-campus where college or university programs are located. Different practices exist related to the inventory of equipment and the tracking of sensitive items. All campuses track computers, either at the campus level or at the department level.

Key issues:

Does the Board wish to create policy in relation to all inventory located off-campus, even if it is for campus programs and under institutional control '

Does the Board wish to create policy in relation to equipment 'loaned ' to other entities '

Does the Board wish to supplement current policy in relation to equipment that is of less value than the official 'inventory ' definition '

17.Approved Report on Administrative Practices and Handbook Change - (Cont 'd.)

Dr. Nichols met with interested CCSN employees to discuss their concerns and asked for documentation and evidence of administrative practices about which they have questions:

Personnel practices, particularly related to hires, promotions, and salary practices.

Contracts and the completion of work for which the contract is written.

Expenditure of funds within budget guidelines.

FTE enrollment counts.

False registration or grades in particular classes.

Regent Gallagher moved acceptance of the Chancellor 's report. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked about the value of the loaned furniture. Dr. Nichols replied that she did not have that information. Regent Sisolak requested the information. He expressed concern that loaned equipment when returned was obsolete and no longer useful to the institution. He felt it sent a mixed message to the legislature and to the students. Dr. Nichols commented that he framed an argument for not loaning equipment. Regent Sisolak asked whether the piano was an isolated incident. Dr. Crowley related that it was. The person lives on Franktown Road and, in collaboration with the music department, periodically holds concerts. He felt it a good outreach program for the Fine Arts, helped to build the reputation of the department and university, as well as had the potential for making money. Under the proposed policy amendment, it would be forbidden. He felt that loans should be allowed when there was clear benefit to the institution documented. Regent Sisolak established that the System was requesting furniture on the capital improvement list to complete some buildings, while loaning new furniture to a high school. Dr. Moore replied that the high school was CCSN 's educational partner. They completed a building simultaneously with CCSN. The high school opened one week ahead of CCSN when Dr. Moore was made aware that the high school principal had little furniture in his office. Since the Charleston campus had administrative offices that were not going to be used, he agreed to loan the furniture from the un-used office until the principal got his new furniture. Regent Sisolak asked about the duration of the loan and who monitored the return of the furniture. Dr. Moore indicated that he was unsure of the time period and that it was likely Mr. Orlando Sandoval knew. General Counsel Ray cautioned against conversation moving toward any alleged misconduct and encouraged the Board to maintain general discussion. Mr. Sandoval reported that it was a short-term loan for the principal until he received his own furniture. He did not know when the principal 's furniture arrived. CCSN was also opening buildings and receiving furniture at that time. He indicated that it was his responsibility and he did not oversee the return. When he left the college, the furniture had not been returned. Regent Rosenberg asked whether the furniture had been returned now. President Silverman related that he sent letters to each organization asking what equipment they had and why it was located off-site. The high school furniture was in the process of being returned. Regent Sisolak was amazed at a short-term loan in excess of one year with the furniture still not returned and no paperwork. Dr. Nichols related there was no paperwork on the furniture. Regent Sisolak stated that taxpayers would tire of these loans with institutions asking for more money for more computers/furniture. He felt the loan of this property and shoddy record keeping was unacceptable. He felt it was taxpayer equipment and not the college 's to give/loan. He asked how one organization was selected over another. Regent Rosenberg stated that the problems could be fixed, adding that he thought no one was trying to do anything wrong.

17.Approved Report on Administrative Practices and Handbook Change - (Cont 'd.)

Regent Alden asked about proposed Handbook language included in Ref. H. Dr. Nichols related that it was in addition to the handout provided. Usually Handbook language is presented so feedback can be received from the institutions. She suggested the Board might wish to consider the key issues at a future meeting, keeping in mind Dr. Crowley 's caution about the loan of equipment. He commended the thorough report, adding that more time to review the handout prior to the meeting would have been appreciated. He suggested the Board postpone action on the Handbook change until a meeting prior to the end of the year when proper language could be adopted to address this

area. He requested feedback from the presidents, financial officers, and System Finance & Administration.

Dr. Derby agreed. She felt it important to establish some clear policy and hoped that the conversation and review revealed that things were done for the clear benefit of the institution. She felt that sloppy practices should be tightened but flexibility for the presidents and their institutions was necessary for the institutional leaders to advance their institutions' mission and should be supported by the Board. Regent Rosenberg noted that a policy could have a major impact to DRI.

Regent Kirkpatrick expressed extreme concern for this issue. He felt it went beyond agreements with outside agencies and lack of record keeping. He felt the Board had a duty to the taxpayers to spend their money wisely. He felt that wasting money and equipment made it difficult to approach the legislature for additional funds. He suggested waiting until Dr. Nichols completed her investigation, and expressed appreciation for her thorough investigation of this matter.

Regent Seastrand commended the report, adding that arguments had been presented indicating that a policy was necessary. He agreed with waiting to make a decision and felt a distinction should be made for appropriate loans. He felt that sharing on a short-term basis and sharing high schools and community colleges was a good idea, adding that there were also inappropriate times to loan when it should not be allowed.

Regent Gallagher stated that it was important to review the policy in place regarding donations of surplus or no longer useful equipment. Regent Kirkpatrick noted that policies were in place that were not followed. He observed that the Clark County school district received more per pupil than higher education and there was no need to loan to them.

Regent Sisolak stated that the legislature funded certain items to be used for specific purposes. He was unsure about the appropriateness of loaning something for another purpose, since it was not what the legislature intended when the money was provided. He felt that some of the items listed were very questionable.

Dr. Moore related that high school property was also sitting on UCCSN property. He felt it was the Board's goal for more people to go to college (especially people who would not ordinarily attend). He thought it was an excellent outreach program to lend older computers to the NAACP and the Latin Chamber to provide information about classes at CCSN.

Mr. Carlos Ledon felt there was a difference between loaning equipment appropriately and providing computers to the Jean prison. He commented that students were charged \$4/credit in technology fees with pre-1990 computers provided in the student union. Dr. Silverman replied that those computers were used as outreach to the prisoners for classes offered at those sites.

17. Approved Report on Administrative Practices and Handbook Change - (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak requested a report from the Chancellor regarding the computers at the NAACP, AARP, Latin Chamber of Commerce, and Rafael Riviera Community Center and how much enrollment was realized as a result of those loans. He also requested a list of all CCSN equipment that was salvaged and/or donated over the last two years including the recipient, value, date, decision-maker.

Dr. Fred Jackson felt the faculty and staff were suffering from this issue. He asked the Board to distinguish between procedural errors and management decisions made at a level over which the faculty/staff had no control.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked why the Las Vegas Chamber was using System equipment. Dr. Silverman stated that the equipment was bought with federal money for a school-to-careers grant.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

18.Information Only-Update on Redistricting, UCCSN - Drs. Keith Schwer and Pat Goodall provided a report on progress to date and a future calendar for recommendations on the Board of Regents ' redistricting.

Dr. Schwer reported on Nevada 's growing population and alternative Board sizes and population estimates per district:

Board Size 1999 2000

9217,385 to 240,267

10195,646 to 216,240

11177,860 to 196,582

12163,038 to 180,200

13150,497 to 166,339

He reported that the Board would recommend the size of the Board as well as district boundaries. He noted that the 1990 average population was 110,000 per district. The LCB has provided information for Clark County regarding voter registration by precinct. The growth in Clark County has occurred primarily in Regent Sisolak 's district. Information for Washoe County and the remainder of the state has been delayed.

Current Status:

GIS and redistricting software received 08/08/00.

Currently available information provided by LCB:

·Voter registration counts by precinct (Clark County only).

·Voter registration counts by precinct (all of Nevada) expected by early Sept.

Actual population data not available until March/April 2001. U.S. Department of the Census official benchmark data for all redistricting.

Dr. Schwer stated that the Board recommendation for the size of the board could be made at anytime. The Board recommendation for district boundaries must be based on the 2000 population census. Current estimates would be used to draw alternative boundaries for Board consideration.

18.Information Only-Update on Redistricting, UCCSN - (Cont 'd.)

Regent Derby stated that asking the Board to make a decision about size prior to reviewing a projection of the district sizes was tough. She felt it critical for the Board to see the projections laid out on a map of Nevada. Dr. Schwer agreed, but stated they could not provide the maps with incomplete information. The growth has been in Clark County so maintaining reasonable district sizes would involve increasing a regent position in the south and decreasing one in the north if they were to remain at the current size of 11 Regents. He felt the districts could be depicted once the remaining figures were provided (September). He felt they would be ready by the October meeting. Dr. Derby asked about time constraints. General Counsel Ray stated that the Board would be unable to introduce a bill until the final numbers were available in March/April. He suggested working on tentative maps with current population figures. Dr. Nichols stated that, historically, the UCCSN had shared their recommendations with the State Department of Education, adding that it was best to move as quickly as possible so they had a chance to review it as well.

Regent Gallagher remembered that the Board had decided the districts based on the projections, making small adjustments when the final numbers came in. She commented that, last time, had they not increased in size there

would have been 7 Regents in Clark County and 2 for the rest of the state, which made it tough for an elected position.

Regent Phillips stated that he wanted to ensure that the minority community was adequately represented. He asked who would approve the recommendation. General Counsel Ray related that the Board's decision would be submitted to the LCB as a bill draft. The legislature would ultimately decide what the districts would be, however, anyone could bring a lawsuit that challenged the constitutionality of the districts. Regent Phillips stated that increasing the number of regents and making districts smaller, provided the opportunity for an additional minority individual on the Board. He wanted to ensure that consideration was given to heavily populated minority areas. Dr. Schwer stated that they wanted to avoid any legal problems with issues as identified (civil rights, one person one vote). Regent Phillips stated that he would ask the Justice Department to review the recommendation to ensure adequate representation.

Regent Sisolak asked how an eliminated district would be handled. General Counsel Ray stated that it raised difficult legal questions. The senior legal counsel at the LCB also did not have an answer. It was General Counsel Ray's opinion that the person would be allowed to finish the term and then the position would be eliminated. He indicated that when someone was elected for a specific term of office, they could not be eliminated. He stated it would be a delicate issue with the length of Regent terms.

Regent Seastrand asked whether the Board could grow to 13 members and drop back to 11 or 9 when terms expire. General Counsel Ray stated they could not. Regent Phillips stated that the Board would need to grow in order to ensure adequate representation of all groups in the state. Dr. Schwer indicated that districts were driven by certain parameters: geography, area, population, and other characteristics. He stated that the Board could have less members as well.

Regent Gallagher recalled that previously Regents on the Board dictated streets of inclusion to include existing seats. She felt that some accommodation should be made for Regents currently sitting.

18. Information Only-Update on Redistricting, UCCSN - (Cont 'd.)

Mr. Carlos Ledon asked about other systems having student regents and why it hadn't been considered. General Counsel Ray replied that the Board of Regents was a constitutional body, with laws that apply to anyone wanting to run for public office. Mr. Ledon asked about other systems including students on their boards. Regent Rosenberg observed that they were appointed. General Counsel Ray related that this was an elected board established by the constitution. Changing the makeup of the Board would require a constitutional amendment.

Regent Kirkpatrick left the meeting.

Mr. Ledon observed that each district represented approximately 110,000 people and asked why there wasn't a seat to represent the 90,000 students. Regent Phillips replied that it would involve a constitutional change. General Counsel Ray related that the constitutional framework for this Board was elected positions, adding that anyone could run.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Sisolak observed that students had run as candidates. President Crowley observed that students had served as regents. Regent Derby stated that each Regent was elected from districts that included students in the constituency. She noted that the Board included the student body leaders in each of its meetings to ensure the students had a voice. Regent Rosenberg encouraged the consultants to return with maps depicting districts for

varying number of Board members to the September meeting.

Regent Kirkpatrick reentered the meeting.

The meeting recessed at 10:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:00 a.m. with all members present except Regents Alden, Dondero and Hill.

19.Information Only-Fire Science Academy, UNR - President Crowley provided an update on the status of the Fire Science Academy.

President Crowley reported that UNR was in a serious and complicated legal situation regarding the Fire Science Academy (FSA). He noted that it was difficult to report on the financial situation until the legal issue was resolved. He stated that he was not in a position to provide a forecast of enrollments. He noted there were construction deficiencies, adding that while working to better understand the problems they discovered additional problems. The water/oil separation process is undersized and inadequate for the purpose and has been under discussion for months. The design and construction of ponds is questionable and will need to be double lined with a leak detection system. A liner is required to capture the over spray and runoff from the prop pad. This will be discussed with the owner and contractors. A containment leak question exists in the fuel storage area, which is not yet completed. The wastewater treatment capacity and ability to meet discharge standards is also an issue. Ground water sampling revealed elevated levels of benzene, which have been reported, near the firewater pump house. It appears to be confined to that area. Soil sample testing on the prop field revealed no detectable hydrocarbon contaminations. Additional ground water sampling occurred in July to identify the extent of benzene contamination, which is isolated to the area around the pump house. Additional soil sampling revealed elevated levels of diesel, which is not as serious as benzene and can be

19.Information Only-Fire Science Academy, UNR - (Cont 'd.)

contained with a proper liner. No detectable hydrocarbons were found in the domestic water well. There has been routine testing of monitoring wells. Hydrocarbons were noted in one well near the third pond. Firewater used during training exercises does not meet standards for full body contact. The academy has halted burn classes after a discussion with the EPA until March 2001. Counsel Ray has notified All Star Investments in writing of the need for corrective action. A meeting is scheduled for August 16th. All hydrocarbon contamination has been reported and a remediation plan has been developed. One pond was left empty to preclude any further contamination.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

Dr. Crowley related that WSPA (Western States Petroleum Association) had been very supportive and would continue training at the facility once it reopens. Discussions have been held with DRI, CCSN, GBC, and TMCC regarding potential opportunities. Discussions have also been held with the Department of Energy/Test Site regarding potential future business. Other fire science academies have been helpful in placing students already enrolled in classes from August-November that were cancelled.

General Counsel Ray related that the design and construction problems have resulted in a constructive eviction. UNR was forced to cancel fire suppression classes due to environmental and health issues. UNR could not, with reasonable assurance, meet the requirements of the Division of Environmental Protection or health standards for humans. The developers ' legal counsel has been advised and rent payment has been suspended. They are trying to resolve this short of litigation by: having all problems fixed and reserving right to seek redress for any damages the university has suffered. If the developers agree, the university would stay on the property until the problems are fixed at a reduced rent. Delicate negotiations are underway.

Regent Sisolak asked whether there was a leak in one of the ponds. President Crowley replied that there was in the liner. Regent Sisolak recalled that he asked that specific question at the June meeting and Ms. Baclawski replied there was not. President Crowley replied that the leak was only discovered when they drained the pond. Regent Sisolak asked about the classes being conducted and the enrollment. Dr. Crowley related that burn classes were 85% of the enrollment and the only classes being held were those that could be conducted in the classroom. Projected enrollments of 800 were expected for August-November, with only 100-125 students currently enrolled. Regent Sisolak asked about the staff and its cost. Dr. Crowley replied there was a staff of 30 people at a cost of \$100,000/month. Regent Sisolak observed there would be a staff at \$100,000/month with no income for the next 8 months. Dr. Crowley related that they could not make any decisions about the staff or financing until a response was received from All Star. He indicated that there was a considerable backlog of work that could be accomplished in the interim. Regent Sisolak asked when negotiations would be complete. General Counsel Ray replied that all of the issues raised related to damage claims intended to be served against the owner/developer. He felt it premature to lay off employees until negotiations were complete. He related that the university had been put in a precarious position due to the failures on the part of the owner/developer. Regent Sisolak asked about a timeframe. General Counsel Ray indicated that he did not know. Regent Sisolak observed that the System could not continue to absorb the losses. General Counsel Ray related there were difficult decisions regarding System employees. Regent Sisolak asked when he felt negotiations might be complete. General Counsel Ray replied that he did not know.

19. Information Only-Fire Science Academy, UNR - (Cont 'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked about the estimated cost of litigation if had to be outsourced. General Counsel Ray replied that there had not been a decision to outsource. He intended to handle the litigation. If it were outsourced, it could be very expensive, as much as \$1 million. General Counsel Ray related that if the System prevailed, they would be entitled to recover attorney fees and damages, adding that he could not predict the future. Regent Sisolak asked for a report at the next meeting.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked about putting the unpaid rent in a special account and penalties for not paying. General Counsel Ray felt it would be advisable to do so. If the finding was that All Star committed no breaches, UNR would owe the rent, plus interest and attorney fees. Regent Sisolak asked where the money was coming from if they were operating at a loss. Dr. Crowley replied that they had not made a decision to put it in a special fund. The determination was to just stop paying the rent. General Counsel Ray related there had been no specific discussion, but it would be prudent to prepare for an adverse decision.

20. Approved Finance & Planning Committee Recommendations/2001-2003 Budget Request Chair Dorothy Gallagher reported the Finance & Planning committee met August 10, 2000 to review and recommend the Biennial Budget Request to the Board for approval and submittal to the Governor and the legislature. By law, the request is due in the state Budget Office no later than August 15, 2000. The requested budget follows the instructions of the Governor and consists of three parts: the operating budget for 2001-2003, a list of proposed enhancements for the Governor's consideration, and a list of one-shot requests. The main budget uses the new funding formulas developed by the study commissioned under Senate Bill 443 and includes adjustments to base and enrollment growth. The overall biennial increase over the current budget is 15%. Resources required to fund the proposal reflect an 18.2% increase in student fee income and a 19.1% increase in state funds. Other funds available for the budget declined from the current biennium because of a reduced level of estate tax expenditure. She requested Board action to approve the following recommendations of the committee:

- Biennial Budget Request 2001-2003 - The committee reviewed the biennial budget request, including the operating budget, list of enhancements for consideration of the Governor and the proposed one-shot appropriations list.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the committee recommendations and the 2001-2003 Budget Request. Regent

Alden seconded.

Dr. Nichols emphasized the importance of sending the budget forward and agreeing to perform a fundamental review to meet the Governor's expectations. Areas for further study include:

Student fees and tuition; especially out-of-state and tuition breaks including Good Neighbor Policies, WICHE and Children of Alumni.

Effective and efficient use of space building on tools developed in space study.

Search and recruitment costs for new professional positions.

Examination of efficiencies possible through clearer transfer policies and admission policies for the universities.

Collection of data on faculty workload and system wide examination of all issues surrounding faculty workload and pay.

20. Approved Finance & Planning Committee Recommendations/2001-2003 Budget Request - (Cont'd.)

Re-examination of system wide economies such as business functions, purchasing, personnel, software/hardware purchasing and distance education.

Class scheduling and summer school with a goal of finding the most effective and efficient means of offering classes and maximizing use of all resources with no additional state funding.

Vice Chancellor Miles reported that the budget incorporated the new funding formulas for equity and enrollment growth. The 2001-2003 total System request of \$1,029.2 million represents a 15% increase over the present biennium. A 50% increase for DRI was due to inclusion of facilities operating and maintenance expenses in the formula budget. The previous budget reflected a 45% increase in overall funding while the proposed budget reflected only a 15% increase over the previous biennium. Not included in the budget is the 3% COLA recommendation due to the Governor's desire to address the salary package after all base budgets are submitted.

Funding Sources:

| Source | 1999-2001 | 2001-2003 | % Change |
|--------|-----------|-----------|----------|
|--------|-----------|-----------|----------|

| | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| State | \$622.6 | \$741.4 | 19.1% |
|-------|---------|---------|-------|

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Student | \$182.2 | \$215.3 | 18.2% |
|---------|---------|---------|-------|

| | | | |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| Other | \$90.0 | \$72.5 | -19.4% |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|

| | | | |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-------|
| Total System | \$894.8 | \$1,029.2 | 15.0% |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-------|

Mr. Miles related that the total adjusted base budget was \$958.2 million in addition to \$71.0 million in maintenance. A detailed listing of allocation of resources by appropriation area was provided. UCCSN Special Projects reflected the reduction in Estate Tax spending over the next two years. Annualized FTE enrollments were reviewed and he reminded the Board that a 3-year rolling average of actual enrollments would be used for the funding formula. A list of tuition and fees (approved at the May meeting) reflected increases for 2002 and 2003. He indicated that non-resident tuition and the Good Neighbor policy would be reviewed.

Mr. Miles reviewed special priorities for additional funding totaling \$15,530,677 consisting of a priority list for consideration of projects that could not be included in the base budget. The Law School Clinical Program topped the list (accreditation issue). Also included were the Great Basin College baccalaureate degree program enhancements, School of Medicine initiatives, and cooperative extension and agriculture experimental station.

Dr. Nichols related that the Board would be setting the priorities for the Governor to consider. The third priority consisted of the combination of five programs and the fourth priority included research priorities for UNLV, DRI, and UNR. She explained the System Administration support positions included two auditors and one attorney.

One-Shot Dollar Request for Funding:

Hold Harmless - formulas \$1,400,000

System Computing Services - equipment 2,604,063

EPSCoR Research Grants - (UNLV, UNR, DRI) 4,000,000

Applied/Basic Research - (UNLV, UNR, DRI) 3,000,000

Workforce Development Grants (Community Colleges) 3,000,000

Equipment 6,530,000

20. Approved Finance & Planning Committee Recommendations/2001-2003 Budget Request - (Cont 'd.)

Planning for Summerlin Campus 1,000,000

Start up - Redfield 1,870,000

Nevada State College - Start up costs 3,000,000

Total One-Shot Request: \$26,404,063

Regent Alden commented that two of the biggest shortages in Clark County were teachers and nurses and asked President Silverman if he was comfortable with the funding proposed for CCSN's nursing and education programs. Dr. Silverman expressed his comfort with the proposed levels of funding. He expressed his gratitude to Sunrise Hospital for their partnership efforts. Regent Alden asked Dr. Fain if UNLV was satisfied with the request. She indicated that UNLV realized there were funding limitations, adding that they could use more money for their teaching effort. Regent Alden requested a breakdown of revenue sources for the dental school and school of pharmacy.

Regent Derby asked about the percentage change in student contribution vs. the state appropriation. Mr. Miles replied that it was up a half percent over the biennium.

Motion carried. Regent Dondero and Hill were absent.

The meeting recessed at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 12:15 p.m. with all members present except Regents Dondero and Hill.

21. Approved Estate Tax Committee Recommendations - Regent Tom Kirkpatrick reported the Committee on Estate Tax met July 17, and August 7, 2000 and reviewed the Estate Tax fund projection for 2001-2005. The committee discussed the potential of federal government elimination or phasing out the federal estate tax and the potential impact to Nevada higher education. Discussion regarding the relative size of the UCCSN endowment pool compared to other public higher education endowments occurred, with a conscience goal of establishing a permanent estate tax endowment being developed. The committee discussed the types of expenditures to be funded by the Estate Tax fund and decided to formulate a resolution to express the need to establish the permanent estate tax endowment and clarify the investment and expenditure funding process. The 2001-2003 biennium request eliminated those 1999-2000 items, which should be funded by the new formula model reducing the expenditure by \$17 million. He requested Board action to approve the following recommendations of the committee:

- Policies and Procedure Revision - The committee discussed adoption of an expenditure guidelines resolution for the estate tax fund, Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 22.2. (Ref. 1 on file in the Board office)
- Recommendation on Allocation of Estate Tax for 2001-2003 - The committee reviewed a recommendation for allocation of the Estate Tax funds for 2001-2003.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Alden acknowledged that Regent Hill and the committee had done a good job, but felt that estate tax expenditures should be reduced to 50% of the earnings.

21.Approved Estate Tax Committee Recommendations - (cont 'd.)

Regent Kirkpatrick explained that the committee did not want to adversely affect existing programs. Regent Derby was pleased that the expenditures had been reduced, and asked what percentage of the income was being spent. Mr. Miles replied that the projection assumed \$20 million/year pay out with slight endowment growth, but was dependent upon revenue income estimates, which were highly unpredictable.

Regent Seastrand agreed with a goal of growing the endowment. Regent Kirkpatrick noted that the federal government was in the process of phasing out the estate tax. Regent Alden desired an endowment fund that would allow expenditures of \$30 million/year.

Dr. Crowley asked about a proposal to transfer programs now funded by the estate tax to other sources. Dr. Nichols related that the estate tax committee recommended that an attempt be made over the next three biennia to move all programs that could be characterized as on going and operational, which would include several programs. She noted that it could not be done this time with the budget directions without making it an enhancement. The recommendation is to attempt to limit estate tax expenditures to non-operational programs. She indicated that a question was raised whether the practice plan could absorb SOM costs, but currently those programs are funded from the estate tax.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

22.Approved Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations - Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic Research & Student Affairs committee met August 10, 2000 and requested Board action to approve the following recommendations of the committee:

·New Program Proposals - The committee reviewed the following new program proposals: (References on file in the Board office)

üMaster of Public Health, UNR (Ref. J)

üBachelor of Technology, Construction Sciences, UNR (Ref. K)

üAssociate of Applied Science, Biotechnology, CCSN (Ref. L)

üAssociate of Applied Science, Graphic Design, WNCC (Ref. M)

üAssociate of Applied Science, Geographic Information Systems, (Ref. N)

Regent Derby moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Derby noted that a report on new programs introduced over the past two years reported only 29 new programs.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

23.Approved Audit Committee Recommendations - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Audit committee met August 10, 2000 and received an update from Mr. Tom Judy, Associate Vice President and Controller-UNR, on the status of the University of Nevada School of Medicine practice plan. Director of Internal Audit, Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, reported that the institution bank reconciliations are up to date. Regent Sisolak requested Board action to approve the following recommendations of the committee:

23.Approved Audit Committee Recommendations - (Cont 'd.)

·Internal Audit Reports - The committee reviewed the following Internal Audit Reports: (Ref. O on file in the Board office)

- üTransportation Technology Transfer Center, UNR
- üNevada Small Business Development Center, UNLV
- üPersonnel Services, BCN
- üSystem Computing Services Personnel, UCCSN
- üVending Services, TMCC
- üTesting Center, CCSN
- üCounseling Center, CCSN

- Audit Exception Report - The Audit Exception Report for the six months ended June 30, 2000 was presented.
- Internal Audit Department Work Plan - the work plan for the year ending June 30, 2001 was presented. He work plan was amended to include an internal audit of Nevada State College at Henderson.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked how the practice plan was doing. Mrs. Cardinal replied that the practice plan had repaid all borrowed funds to the university and made approximately \$300,000. President Crowley related that the line of credit debt still needed to be better managed than in the past.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

24.Approved Campus Environment Committee Recommendations - Chair Tom Kirkpatrick reported the Campus Environment committee met August 10, 2000 and heard a brief overview of work accomplished by the committee since its founding and discussed possible topics to be addressed during the upcoming year. During the past year, the committee passed the policy on dual-career couples. Business yet-to-be finished includes setting diversity goals for 2001-2005 and hearing a SHEPAC presentation. The committee requested that each president appoint a representative from the institution to work with the committee in creating a list of topics to be addressed during 2000-2001 and that the representatives meet with the committee at the September meeting to establish a list. He requested Board action on the following recommendation of the committee:

- Review of Actions and Schedule of Topics to be Discussed - The committee reviewed prior actions and unfinished business, and requested that each president appoint a representative from the institution to work with the committee in establishing a schedule of topics to be discussed during the upcoming year.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

25.Approved UNR Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - Regent Jill Derby reported the UNR Presidential Search Committee met August 1, 2000 with General Counsel Tom Ray providing presentations on the open Meeting Law and procedures required in the UNR presidential search process. President Joe Crowley then shared his

25.Approved UNR Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - (Cont 'd.)
perspectives on challenges UNR would face in the years ahead and some potential characteristics that the next president might need. The committee discussed the option of hiring a consultant versus the committee doing the entire search procedure and determined that, at the September 20 meeting, they would hear from 2-3 consultants with proposals to handle the presidential search. The committee also discussed whether they wished to prohibit the Interim President from applying for the permanent position. She requested Board action of the following recommendations of the committee:

- Consultant - The committee recommended hiring a consultant for the UNR Presidential Search.

Regent Derby moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

26. Approved CCSN Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - Chair Doug Seastrand reported the CCSN Presidential Search committee met July 14, and August 5, 2000. At the July 14th meeting the Regents' committee and the Institutional Advisory committee met jointly to resume presidential search activities related to selection of semi-finalists and adoption of procedures for reference checking and notifying applicants. New member Mr. Cipriano Chavez, CCSN Director of Students Services, was introduced, replacing Ms. Chris Chairsell. The suitability of the 61-member pool was discussed with concern expressed for the small size of the pool and confidence expressed in the 10 preferred candidates listed for further consideration. The committee was advised that they could not discuss the individual qualifications of applicants without proper notification, but could discuss selection procedures. The committee reviewed candidate selection results, considered various cutoff points, and ultimately narrowed the field to 13 semi-finalists. After feedback is obtained from references and background checks, the committee will proceed to select finalists August 5th or at a rescheduled date if necessary. He requested Board action to approve the following recommendations of the committee:

- Thirteen candidates will be considered as semi-finalists for the position of CCSN President.
- The remaining 48 candidates will be notified they are withdrawn from consideration.
- All semi-finalists will be contacted by staff to ascertain their interest in continuing as applicants, to obtain a signed waiver for open discussion of their qualifications, and to submit to a full background check by a professional screening service.
- The chair will assign reference calls to members.
- Staff will provide members with a form for reference calling and reporting.
- Expenses incurred with checking candidates' references and backgrounds will be covered by the search budget.
- The search calendar will be revised as necessary to accommodate completion of reference calls and background checks.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

26. Approved CCSN Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - (Cont 'd.)

At the August 5th meeting the committees met jointly and were notified there were 12 semi-finalists since one applicant had accepted another presidency. Infolink, a professional screening service, completed the background checks. The committee met in closed session to discuss the qualifications of the twelve semi-finalists. In open session, members selected their top five candidates. In a separate vote, the Institutional Advisory committee selected six candidates with two sets of tie votes. Following discussion, the Regents committee selected five candidates by separate vote. After review of the selections, discussion, voting and reconsideration, the Regents committee approved six candidates to be interviewed:

- Dr. Robert A. Anderson-President, Colorado Northwestern Community College.
- Dr. Deborah L. Floyd-Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, University of Kentucky.
- Dr. Stephen C. Head-Executive Vice Chancellor for Education Student & Community Development, North Harris Montgomery Community College.
- Dr. Shirley A. Reed-President, South Texas Community College.
- Dr. Diana Sloane-Vice Chancellor, Education & Technology, Los Rios Community College.
- Dr. Frank Viveló-President, Wharton County Junior College.

Chair Seastrand emphasized the difficulty of determining the best fit for the college with such excellent candidates. The committee established strategies for interviewing finalists, developing questions, hosting tours and receptions.

Staff was directed to develop a tentative schedule of activities to provide interview times for each candidate and also make arrangements for candidates' spouses to visit the community. The chair was to call each finalist and determine their continued interest in the position. An official letter regarding the status of the search and appreciation for their efforts was to be sent to those not selected. Finalist interviews/activities were scheduled for the weeks of September 18 and/or September 25. October 6th the Regents committee will receive the Institutional Advisory committee report and prepare final recommendation for the CCSN President to be presented at the October 19-20 full Board meeting. He requested Board action to approve the following recommendations of the committee:

- Six candidates to be considered as finalists for the position of CCSN President.
- Remaining six candidates to be notified they are withdrawn from consideration.
- Committee chair to contact finalists for official notice and to ascertain continued interest as applicants.
- Staff to develop a tentative schedule for finalists (with the approval of the chair) including interviews, tours, campus meetings, spouse activities/receptions.
- Interviews scheduled for weeks of September 18 and/or September 25, 2000.
- The search calendar was revised to include October 6, 9:00 a.m. for receiving the Institutional Advisory committee's final report and preparing a final recommendation for the CCSN President for approval by the full Board at its October 19-20 meeting.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

26. Approved CCSN Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak was unhappy with the outcome of the candidate selection. He mentioned that he missed the meeting due to a family commitment. He was concerned for Interim President Silverman, adding that he had been deluged with letters of support for him.

He felt that Dr. Silverman was entitled to an interview by the Board (as opposed to the selection committee). He expressed great respect for the committee and their work, but felt he could not support moving forward without consideration of Dr. Silverman. He noted that Dr. Crowley had also not been on the short list 22 years ago, yet someone recommended providing an interview for him. He hoped the Board would take similar steps.

Regent Phillips agreed with Regent Sisolak. He felt it would be a tragedy not to include Dr. Silverman in the interview process, adding that he was very valuable to the System. He felt Dr. Silverman had provided great leadership on an interim basis. He noted that he too had been deluged with letters/calls from the public in support of Dr. Silverman. He was unhappy with the suggestion in the paper that it was done intentionally so as not to discourage outside candidates. He felt the Board should make an exception and have the authority to provide him an interview.

Regent Rosenberg noted that the discussion was exceedingly uncomfortable for Dr. Silverman. He stated that decisions were not made capriciously, adding that the decision was not reflective of his current performance.

Regent Kirkpatrick indicated that he substituted for Regent Sisolak, who now proposed overturning the many hours invested by the committee. He noted that all candidates were reviewed objectively in consideration of their background and experience to lead CCSN in the future. He acknowledged that Dr. Silverman was very talented, adding that the competition had been stiff. He did not believe the Board should undermine the efforts of the committee.

Regent Seastrand noted that candidate strengths and weaknesses were discussed, and nothing negative was attributed to Dr. Silverman. He agreed that Dr. Silverman had done a wonderful job and the vote was no reflection of his performance. The committee attempted to determine the best fit for the college. He was also surprised by the decision, but felt ample opportunity was provided to discuss the merits and this was the committees' decision.

Dr. Fred Jackson (a member of the advisory committee) stated that the advisory committee was not entirely pleased with the overall list, adding that inclusion of Dr. Silverman would have been in closer keeping with their recommendations. Mr. Thomas Brown, Interim Vice President Student Services-CCSN, concurred. He mentioned his 29 years of CCSN service, adding that he had served on every presidential search committee. In the past, every interim was given the opportunity to interview. He noted that Dr. Silverman was a good man and that the Board was missing a great opportunity.

Regent Sisolak stated that he was not trying to invalidate the committee's work, but felt that Dr. Silverman was worthy of the position and deserved an opportunity to be interviewed by the entire Board and not just by the search committee. He disagreed that Dr. Silverman did not rise to the vision for CCSN, adding that he had been appointed as interim because of his attributes. He implored the Board to add Dr. Silverman to consideration.

26. Approved CCSN Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg took exception to Dr. Jackson's comments, adding that six finalists were selected at the recommendation of the advisory committee. He noted that four of six advisory committee recommendations made the list. He stated that this was further justification for having a policy, which prevented interims from applying for the job. Regent Alden noted that he had consistently not voted for an interim candidate during the past six years and agreed that a policy was necessary. Regent Sisolak noted that the subject of interims being/not being candidates did need to be debated, but observed that the Board had received good service from Dr. Silverman's interim appointment. Regent Phillips recalled that when Dr. Silverman was appointed he wanted assurance that his interim appointment would not adversely impact his chances as a candidate and that everyone agreed it would not hurt to provide an interview.

Regent Kirkpatrick established that not once during the deliberation was the term 'interim' referred to except in regard to his term as Interim President at CCSN.

Regent Seastrand did not see a reason why he could not be put on list, but did not know procedure and asked whether it was possible. General Counsel Ray explained that a special committee existed until their business was complete, adding that this report was a progress report. It would not be proper to add someone to the committees' list, but the Board could accept or reject the report. He stated that when the committee submits its nominee(s), the Board could reject or start over at that time, and that it would take a suspension of the Bylaws.

Regent Phillips moved approval of suspension of the Bylaws. Regent Alden seconded.

Mr. Joseph Linnert stated that he has worked at the college for a number of years. He noted that the college had sustained many changes and felt a good team had been put in place. He noted that the hotel industry asked him to speak to the Board to convey their appreciation of the level of communication between CCSN and the hotel industry attributed to Dr. Silverman. He felt the interview process was not fair since search committee membership had changed. He was unconcerned with the newspaper article that expressed concern for other candidates feeling that Dr. Silverman was a 'shoe-in', adding that if he was doing such a great job, why wouldn't he be considered. He implored the Board to allow Dr. Silverman to interview. Ms. Anne Johnson (a member of the advisory committee) felt that Dr. Silverman deserved the opportunity to interview and should be included on the committee list.

Regent Gallagher noted that when President Crowley was appointed a different process was in place. The faculty reviewed all applications and made a recommendation of three names to the Board. The faculty wanted someone they could run and the Regents wanted someone who could run the faculty. The faculty did not want President Crowley's name on the list, but it eventually got there and he had good support from the Board. She noted that a

different process was now in place and asked General Counsel Ray whether the committee could add another name. General Counsel Ray indicated that the task lay with the committee. Regent Gallagher clarified that she was not recommending the committee should do this, but merely stating that the Board could not. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether other candidates could also ask for the same treatment. General Counsel Ray acknowledged that it could open that door, but the committee had the right to do what they felt best. He clarified that the Board was voting on whether to accept or reject the

26. Approved CCSN Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - (Cont 'd.)

report, and noted that the Board could also suspend its Bylaws and Code. Regent Phillips asked whether accepting the report would preclude the committee from reconvening. General Counsel Ray indicated that the committee could reconvene if they chose. Regent Seastrand asked whether the Regents who were not present before would be present at such a meeting. Regent Phillips stated that those named to the committee would attend for the sole purpose of adding another name. Regent Seastrand felt it was not fair to the other 12 candidates since those Regents would not have heard their references.

President Crowley clarified for the record that when he was appointed, a committee primarily comprised of faculty did the job of carrying out the search. They sent their recommendations to the Board. He was acting president and his name was not on the list. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Board met with the committee and his name was added to the list. He indicated that he had strong support from the faculty, but the committee did not support him, adding that it was an entirely different process from that in place now.

Motion to approve the committee report carried. Regent Sisolak voted no. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

27. Approved Chancellor Search Committee Recommendations - Chair Jill Derby reported the Chancellor Search committee met July 19, 2000 and consultant Dr. Shirley Chatter presented the names and resumes of six semi-finalists and proceeded to provide a brief overview of each candidate. After discussion on the schedule and number of candidates to be brought in for interviews, the committee decided to interview all six semi-finalists and that a background and reference check would be conducted on all of the semi-finalists. It was determined that candidates would be interviewed at two meetings to be held August 16 and August 19 in Las Vegas. She requested Board action on the following recommendations of the committee:

- Review of Candidates - The committees reviewed and evaluated the resumes of candidates as provided by Dr. Chater.

- Selection of Final Candidates by Advisory Committee - The Institutional Advisory Committee recommended retaining all six candidates for personal interviews.

- Selection of Final Candidates by Chancellor Search Committee The committee reviewed the recommendation of the Institutional Advisory Committee and determined that all 6 candidates were semi-finalists.

- Interview of Final Candidates - The committees determined that all 6 candidates would be interviewed.

Regent Derby moved approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Hill were absent.

28. Public Comment - Regent Kirkpatrick expressed his dismay that the Board chose not to change the October meeting to accommodate attendance at the ACCT conference. He felt it would have done for an AGB meeting and represented a slight to the community colleges.

28. Public Comment - (Cont 'd.)

Mr. Paul Gowins expressed his pleasure with the Board 's decision to move forward with the transitional living center,

adding that it would be extremely beneficial to citizens of the state.

Mr. Carlos Ledon stated that the students were led to believe that the Board would send a request to the legislature to match the \$4 technology fee paid by the students. Dr. Nichols replied that the item was addressed with the impact of the formula. Technology is included within the formula so it does not need to be a separate line item.

Regent Derby stated that the Board had moved meetings in the past to accommodate major national meetings, adding that Board members should have the opportunity to attend both conferences. Ms. Ernst stated that the 2000 calendar was set before ACCT announced their dates.

29. New Business - Regent Sisolak requested an agenda item addressing joint purchasing for all institutions (especially equipment) to explore savings from bulk orders. Additionally, he requested a list of obsolete equipment to be shared with all institutions and students who could benefit from use of the equipment.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst

Chief Administrative Officer to the Board