

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
Cheyenne Campus Gymnasium
Community College of Southern Nevada
3200 E. Cheyenne Ave., Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, September 7-8, 2000

Members Present:

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

Others Present:

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
President Ron Remington, GBC
President John Richardson, TMCC
President Carol Lucey, WNCC
President Carol Harter, 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; Mr. Bill Albright, 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. Shannon Schilling, CCSN; Ms. Melissa Dechert, UNR-GSA; Ms. Cheryl Radeloff, GSA-UNLV; Ms. Leslie Carlen, WNCC; and Ms. Michelle Lacerda, TMCC.

Chair Thalia Dondero called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. with all members present except Regents Seastrand and Wiesner.

1. Introductions – Interim President Silverman introduced CCSN student body president Mr. Shannon Schilling.

President Wells introduced faculty senate representative, Mr. Bill Albright. Regent Sisolak introduced Regent candidates Mr. Jim Ratigan and Ms. Linda Howard.

2. Chair's Report – Chair Dondero thanked Dr. Silverman and CCSN faculty, staff and students for the welcoming gifts and for hosting the meeting during the busy start of the new semester. She thanked everyone for their thoughts and prayers following the passing of her mother, and commended Vice Chair Rosenberg for handling the meeting in her absence.

She reminded the Board that the students were counting on them for a chance at a brighter future.

3. Chancellor's Report – Dr. Nichols recognized the efforts of the EPSCoR office and introduced Dr. Jim Coleman, Statewide Director for NSF-EPSCoR. She reported that during fiscal year 2000, NSF (National Science Foundation) made a total of 43 awards in Nevada totaling over \$13 million, including \$4 million in co-funding. She related that it was a highly competitive program within EPSCoR, adding that Nevada ranked 3rd in the nation with EPSCoR co-funding initiatives. Regent Kirkpatrick requested a list of the projects and the amount of money allocated. Dr. Nichols stated that CCSN received an NSF grant this year for changes to the chemistry curriculum. She then called for selected presidential reports.

President John Richardson, TMCC – Dr. Richardson introduced TMCC's Assistant Dean for Career and Workforce Development, Mr. Wirt Twitchell. The American College Testing Company (ACT) has designated TMCC as one of two hundred nationally recognized ACT centers, and the only center in Nevada. The center will be a key component to the college's efforts in workforce development working in conjunction with the Department of Employment & Training's one-stop center at Old Town Mall (OTM), as well as the Regional Technical Institute at the Edison campus. Mr. Twitchell reported that the center would provide an exceptional opportunity in workforce development with services including:

- Computer-delivered certification and licensure tests for trades and professions.
- Workplace skills assessment.
- Continuing education courses in a broad array of disciplines.
- Skill-specific training in selected fields.
- Distance learning with state-of-the-art technology.
- Computerized educational and career guidance counseling.

The center, one of 200 opening in the country in the next 8 weeks, will provide TMCC the opportunity to develop partnerships with the business community, state agencies and other institutions in the state. It will also provide TMCC the opportunity to assist their business partners with identifying the best candidates for open positions. The center will provide forty server-based training modules and unlimited web-based training modules at the OTM site, the Regional Technical Institute, as well as at the employer's place of business. Mr. Twitchell reported that he was developing a business plan with ACT, adding that the program would benefit everyone in northern Nevada. He stated that TMCC was committed to providing workforce development and assisting the state with economic diversification.

Interim President Bob Silverman, CCSN – Dr. Silverman reported that sixty-three new/replacement faculty had been hired. Fifty percent of the new hires are women and 25% come from minority groups. Distance education has proven a revolution in education, with teachers acting as guides to information, education focusing on learning and the learner, and student success/learning as the outcome. In response to the health care crisis in southern Nevada, CCSN has increased enrollment in the health fields and expanded the nursing programs to the Cheyenne and Henderson campuses. Engineering Technology is the largest and fastest-growing discipline in the Applied Technologies division. CCSN is one of the largest training academies in the country for Cisco Systems and the

primary trainer for Sprint. The Charleston campus now offers drop-in childcare services. CCSN is also expanding and evaluating its teaching methods. Dr. Silverman mentioned that the Green Valley Technical Center would break ground the following Monday.

4. Approved Presidential Resignation – The Board accepted the resignation of TMCC President John Richardson, effective January 5, 2001.

Regent Hill moved acceptance of President John Richardson's resignation with great regret. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Derby expressed appreciation for Dr. Richardson's service to the UCCSN as a Vice Chancellor, Interim Chancellor and TMCC President. Regent Hill was appreciative of his loyal and tireless work, and wished him great success in the future. Dr. Moore stated that Dr. Richardson's departure was a great loss. He felt Dr. Richardson made a positive contribution to the college and was also a phenomenal role model. Regent Phillips hoped Dr. Richardson would have stayed longer, adding that the System would miss his experience and contribution. He felt Dr. Richardson had invigorated TMCC and that he would be hard to replace. Dr. Lucey expressed appreciation for his guidance and was very unhappy that he was leaving. He taught her that students and their success were his primary goal. Discussion ensued regarding whether the Board could prevent his departure. Dr. Nichols stated that Dr. Richardson had the right to resign and that Board action could not limit him.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion failed. Regents Derby, Dondero, Gallagher, Hill, and Rosenberg voted yes. Regents Alden, Kirkpatrick, Phillips, and Sisolak voted no. Upon reconsideration, Regent Sisolak changed his vote to yes. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

Chair Dondero announced the members of the Regents' TMCC Presidential Search Committee:

- Dr. Jill Derby, Chair
- Mr. Mark Alden
- Mrs. Dorothy Gallagher,
- Mr. Douglas Roman Hill
- Mr. Howard Rosenberg

5. Approved Appointment, Vice President and Tenure on Hire, UNR – The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Linda Brinkley as Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, effective December 1, 2000, at a base salary of \$157,000, with tenure upon hire. President Crowley reported that the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology was in agreement with the appointment, adding that Dr. Brinkley had been the overwhelming choice of the campus. (Ref. A on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden moved approval of the appointment. Regent Hill seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked about determination of the base salary and whether the faculty senate had approved tenure upon hire. Dr. Crowley replied that she had significant experience as an administrator, Vice Provost and Associate Dean. The recommended salary was at the midpoint of the executive salary scale. Tenure upon hire is a decision made by departmental consultation and no objections were raised.

Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

6. Approved Handbook Change, Regents' Bylaws, Standing Committees - The Board approved an amendment to the Regents' Bylaws, Title 1, Article VI, Section 3, Standing Committees and their Duties. The proposed amendment would change the Legislative Liaison, Board Development and Health Care Education committees from standing to special committees with specific ad hoc purposes, as provided under Title 1, Article VI, Section 4 of the Regents' Bylaws.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook change, Title 1, Article VI, Section 3, Standing Committees and their Duties. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner were absent.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

7. Rejected Handbook Change, Code, Acting Chancellor or President – The Board rejected an amendment to the Regents' Code, Title 2, Section 1.5.5, Acting Chancellor or President. The amendment provided that, unless otherwise approved by the Board of Regents, a person who is appointed Acting Chancellor or President may not be considered as a candidate for the respective position. (Ref. B on file in the Board office)

Regent Derby expressed opposition to the policy, feeling that maintaining flexibility for the Board to rule on a case-by-case basis was a better method. Dr. Nichols felt the language allowed sufficient flexibility for the Board to make exceptions. Regent Derby asked about the purpose of having such a policy. Dr. Nichols replied that the policy forewarned anyone accepting an acting position. Regent Gallagher felt it was ambiguous and would not be fair to potential candidates. She felt notice should be provided at the beginning of each search. Regent Phillips expressed opposition to the policy.

Regent Alden requested modification to the proposed policy for interim appointments: (1) Interim candidate would hold the System harmless from the result of the search and (2) Appointment would be 'at-will', which could be terminated at any time.

Regent Hill (chair of UNR Search Committee) related there was consensus from the committee not to allow the interim appointment to be a candidate for the permanent position. He asked to make a motion specific to the UNR search. General Counsel Ray replied that the policy made clear that it would not have a retroactive effect. Since no Interim President had been appointed, should this motion pass, the appointment would be subject to the policy. Regent Hill asked whether he could make a motion regarding the UNR Presidential Search. General Counsel Ray asked about the nature of the motion. Regent Hill replied that the motion would state that the Interim President of UNR could not apply for the position. General Counsel Ray replied that it was not on the agenda and would not be appropriate at this time.

Regent Sisolak asked about the item's origin. Ms. Ernst replied that two Regents had requested it. Regent Sisolak asked for an explanation.

Regent Alden had no objection to an interim appointment as a candidate, but felt it appropriate to hold the Regents harmless and clarify the 'at-will' appointment. General Counsel stated that, if it were clear that an interim appointment could apply for the position or the interim appointment agreed that as part of accepting the position they would not apply for the permanent position, a hold harmless agreement would not be necessary. Regent Derby did not believe there was support from the Board for such a policy. Regent Kirkpatrick asked about Regent Alden's concerns for an interim appointment applying for the position. Regent Alden stated that he did not object to an interim appointment applying for the permanent position, but felt the System should be held harmless from the results of the search and clarify the 'at-will' appointment. Regent Sisolak asked what the System would be held harmless from. General

Counsel Ray felt there was no basis for a hold harmless agreement.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the Handbook change Title 2, Section 1.5.5, Acting Chancellor or President. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Rosenberg explained his support for the policy. He felt that allowing interim candidates to apply discouraged the pool of applicants. He felt the policy clarified the issue and provided sufficient flexibility for the Board to make an exception. Regent Sisolak asked about the timing of Board approval (i.e. an interim appointment who did not wish to be a candidate, but later changed their mind). General Counsel Ray stated that it would have to be clear at the time of accepting the interim appointment. Regent Gallagher felt it should be noted that exceptions would be made prior to the inception of the search. Regent Sisolak asked whether the policy could pose difficulty for a smaller institution. Regent Rosenberg felt it would not. Regent Phillips did not see the need for the policy. Regent Gallagher observed that searches were difficult enough without making them more complicated. President Harter related that the institution presidents discussed this item and urged the Board not to adopt a policy that would limit their authority.

Regent Derby called for the question. Motion to vote on the question carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

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

8. Rejected Ombudsman, UCCSN – The Board rejected a review of the need for an office of UCCSN ombudsman. The ombudsman would report to the Board through the Board chairperson. Appropriate action would have been taken to study the establishment of an ombudsman with full details to be developed for future action by the Board.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval to study the establishment of an Ombudsman. Regent Alden seconded.

Dr. Nichols provided background for typical ombudsman duties:

- Investigate reported complaints, report the findings, help achieve equitable settlement.
- Serve the institutional community by hearing and investigating complaints or problems brought by members of the community who felt the institution had treated them unfairly, or who need help in resolving a problem.

She asked that the presidents be provided an opportunity to report on current campus practices. President Crowley stated that professional staff utilized a grievance policy. An office of mediation was also provided for students to express their concerns. Dr. Crowley indicated that UNR had not experienced sufficient demand to justify an ombudsman at the campus level, adding that it was difficult to envision having one at the Chancellor's office. President Harter reported that she was an ombudsman at Ohio University, adding that one could be very effective at the campus level. She indicated that most System institutions had a variety of individuals available for faculty, students, general, professional, and classified staff to express their concerns. She felt that problems should be resolved at the campus level.

Regent Derby commented that she failed to see the need for such a position. Regent Kirkpatrick stated there had been complaints from an entire UNLV department regarding failure to follow the bylaws. He related that the Board had also violated their own bylaws. He felt there was no one to properly investigate the allegations at CCSN, adding that it was the General Counsel's job to mitigate. He felt that Dr. Nichols should not be charged with the CCSN investigation. He stated that the question was to study whether an ombudsman was necessary. He felt a resource

was required for those who were afraid to come forward on their own campus.

Regent Sisolak asked for an example of the position's duties. Regent Kirkpatrick replied that students, faculty and Regents could approach the position with an unsatisfied complaint. The ombudsman would investigate the complaint and bring a recommendation to the Board Chair, and he felt the possibility should be explored. Regent Sisolak asked whether the ombudsman would investigate a faculty member complaint at the campus. Regent Kirkpatrick replied that an investigation would be initiated, but was unsure of the specific method. Regent Rosenberg commented that, in many cases, faculty members felt they were not given a fair hearing on their campus. He mentioned a number of on-going suits due to faculty perception of unfair treatment. He expressed a desire for someone who could mitigate the situation prior to it going to litigation. Regent Alden expressed his support for investigating the possibility. He felt an ombudsman would provide an independent review and would re-establish public integrity in higher education. He felt the Board should explore the potential and improved Board support of a study.

Regent Phillips established that the motion involved exploring the need for such a position, and not to hire anyone. He questioned whether the Board was attempting to micromanage the institutions, adding that he understood there were mechanisms in place on the campuses to handle such complaints. Regent Kirkpatrick did not feel it constituted micromanagement. Regent Derby felt that taking such action would. Regent Gallagher asked whether the Chancellor would investigate the need for this position. Dr. Nichols suggested involving System staff to review options at the same time as they review the System Administration budget, types of positions required, and Board priorities. She felt that defining why an ombudsman was required, with the involvement of faculty and students, would be part of the recommendation.

Regent Derby expressed concern for undermining campus procedures already in place. She felt there was a good grievance process affording opportunity for individuals to be heard. She felt that establishment of a System position would circumvent the institutional process, and acknowledged that some faculty felt intimidated against speaking in dissent. Regent Hill was willing to consider it, but wanted to be convinced of the real need. Regent Gallagher was not opposed to studying the need after it was established that money was available for such a position. Regent Rosenberg asked about litigation due to faculty feeling they were not treated fairly. General Counsel Ray felt the System was in good shape now with fewer suits, adding that the suits that received publicity were older cases.

Dr. John Filler agreed that studying the possibility would be good, adding there were pros and cons for having an ombudsman, and expressed concern for having one controlled by the Board. He felt the study would provide an opportunity to voice those concerns. Regent Gallagher agreed. Mr. Perry Johnson felt that WNCC's procedure was a good one, adding that any grievance sent to the Board Chair should be returned to the campus for resolution.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

Mr. Bill Newhall agreed with Regent Derby, feeling that it was important for the campuses to work out problems with the policies in place.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Mr. John Rice agreed there could be campus concerns with having a System ombudsman.

Mr. Shannon Schilling advocated in favor of the study in spite of existing grievance procedures. He felt that the process easily intimidated students and that it was required at some level, if not at Board level. He urged Board review of the matter. Mr. Carlos Ledon stated that a good student grievance policy was already in place at UNR and did not want it diminished by a higher-level position. He felt it would constitute micromanagement. Ms. Michelle

Lacerda felt the study should be conducted, adding that Sierra Pacific Power Company utilized an ombudsman and that one could be useful.

Regent Kirkpatrick stated that an ombudsman would ascertain whether the procedures in place had been followed and, if not, could determine the proper action required. Regent Phillips stated he would prefer the money be used for a daycare facility for faculty and students, rather than creating another level of administration. He observed that if someone had a problem they would sue anyway. He was open to review/study if it could be done at no cost. Regent Sisolak asked whether it would be one person or a department. Regent Kirkpatrick felt it could be assigned as an additional duty to someone already on the Chancellor's staff. Regent Rosenberg reminded members they were only asking to study the feasibility. He felt it would provide a point of last resort prior to involving the Regents. He felt the Board should review the feasibility. Regent Derby was opposed to and appalled at the level of micromanagement being considered. She felt that students could take advantage and completely bypass campus procedures. Regent Sisolak observed that the position could be inundated with complaints and that proper channels would not be utilized. Regent Rosenberg replied that the ombudsman could return the matter to the campus, as it should only be used after exhausting all existing mechanisms.

Regent Phillips called for the question. Upon a roll call vote the motion to vote on the question carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

Upon a roll call vote the motion to study the establishment of an ombudsman carried. Regents Alden, Hill, Kirkpatrick, Phillips, Rosenberg, and Sisolak voted yes. Regents Derby, Dondero, and Gallagher voted no. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

The meeting recessed at 2:40 p.m. and reconvened at 2:50 p.m. with all members present except Regents Seastrand and Wiesner.

Regent Sisolak moved to reconsider action on the ombudsman. Regent Phillips seconded.

General Counsel Ray clarified that a simple majority of those present would be required to pass the procedural motion to reconsider, but official action required six votes.

Regent Rosenberg felt it ludicrous to refuse to study a new idea. Regent Phillips objected to the study at a cost, which could be used for scholarships, books, and/or daycare. He felt the position would negate campus procedures already in place and that the money would be better spent on students and faculty.

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

Regent Sisolak requested a 5-minute recess. The meeting recessed at 2:57 p.m. and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. with all members present except Regents Seastrand and Wiesner. General Counsel Ray clarified that a motion to reconsider was a parliamentary procedure requiring 5 votes to pass. He stated that, according to Regent bylaws, six votes were required for official Board action.

Regent Gallagher moved to reconsider action on the ombudsman. Regent Phillips seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Derby, Dondero, Gallagher, Phillips, and Sisolak voted yes. Regents Alden, Hill, Kirkpatrick, and Rosenberg voted no. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

Regent Phillips moved approval to rescind approval of the study for an ombudsman. Regent Gallagher seconded.

General Counsel Ray clarified that a 'yes' vote would reject action previously approved.

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

9. Information Only-Fire Science Academy, UNR - President Crowley provided an update on the status of the Fire Science Academy. Dr. Crowley reported that the matter was in litigation, adding that Regent Sisolak would report the principal Board concerns in his Audit Committee report on Friday. The Board agreed.

10. Information Only-Common Course Numbering - In October 1999, the Regents adopted a policy directing the development of common course identifiers on a System-wide basis for those courses that were common across UCCSN institutions. Board action required that a report on this program be presented at the September 2000 Board meeting.

Dr. Sherwin Iverson introduced the Common Course Numbering Committee (CCNC) co-chairs, Dr. Ken Lucey and Mr. Marion Littlepage. Mr. Littlepage reminded the Board of their resolution to establish a uniform numbering system for all baccalaureate degree courses and to report the new numbering system to the Regents by September 2000 for adoption and implementation in Spring 2001. Community college courses equivalent to upper-division university courses were to be evaluated and dropped from the community college curriculum if determined to be appropriately upper-division. Lower-division courses determined appropriately lower-division were to be identified. Any unresolved issues were to be reported to the Regents at the September meeting and decided at the October meeting. The committee consisted of: Dr. Garry Heberer, GBC; Mr. Marion Littlepage, CCSN; Dr. Ken Lucey, UNLV & UNR; Mr. Dan McClure TMCC; Dr. Cheryl Pawluk, WNCC; and Dr. Tony Calabro and Ms. Lori Tiede, ad hoc advisory members.

Regents Derby and Sisolak left the meeting.

Mr. Littlepage reported the committee would:

- Identify courses that are comparable or share a common content in the discipline.
- Identify courses unique to an institution.
- Bring common courses into alignment by implementing a process ensuring they are clearly identified as the same course and have a smooth transfer between institutions.

Mr. Littlepage related that the committee engaged in the following tasks:

- Develop a process that would separate common courses from unique courses in a cost-efficient and practical manner.
- Incorporate into the outcomes general Board policies, stressing the importance of having academic faculty play the pivotal role in determining articulation, curriculum, and transfer agreements.
- Implement process as early as possible in order to begin review of existing courses.
- Provide a means for ensuring future courses would be articulated using this process.

Mr. Littlepage referred to catalog preparation dates (Ref. 10 on file in the Board office), which would become the implementation dates. A retreat was held in August with key academic and registration staff responsible for implementing common course numbering throughout the System. Each institution was invited.

Progress:

- Developed proposed guidelines that provide for common course identifiers and titles.
- CCNC assumed responsibility for facilitating academic discipline committee meetings.
- Established process for implementing common course numbers and identifiers.
- Modifying course identifiers to reflect common course numbering guidelines.
- Successes include: anthropology, biology, international languages, and philosophy.
- Scheduled to meet 2000-2001:
 - Fall 2000: criminal justice, electrical engineering, geology/earth science, health care administration, management, political science.
 - Spring 2001: communication, finance, international business, marketing, women's studies.

Regent Derby entered the meeting.

Implementation:

- Letter to be sent to all curriculum committees to act within 45 days of common course solutions.
- Copy to be sent to each discipline committee member, department chair, and academic vice president.
- Letter will stand in lieu of standard forms used by the institutions.
- Admissions & Records staff to input into the Student Information System (SIS).
- Curriculum committees to report implementation status as well as catalog year of appearance.
- Should a curriculum committee not support the decision of the discipline committee, a written reason must be submitted to the liaison.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Future Directions/Recommendations:

- System-wide database.
- Common course committee web page.
- Major-specific transfer guides.
- Create self-perpetuating process for common course numbering to continue as a viable academic principle.

Regent Gallagher established that the math departments developed the first common course numbering. Mr. Littlepage acknowledged that it was done in 1988-89. Regent Alden stated that this would facilitate transfer of core curriculum requirements (i.e. English, political science, math). He felt that latitude was required for unique subjects and specialized programs at UNR and UNLV. Dr. Lucey replied that a detailed set of guidelines was developed for unique courses. He related that the primary emphasis was on freshman and sophomore courses, although junior- and senior-level courses were considered when corresponding courses were offered at the community colleges. He stated that the goal was for common courses to have common titles, prefixes and numbers. Mr. Littlepage stated that the community colleges also offered unique courses.

Regent Hill asked about the courses and numbers. Dr. Lucey replied that the courses would be listed in each institution's new class catalog upon its reprinting, adding that the full process would be implemented with the arrival of the new SIS in July 2001. He stated they were trying to create a self-perpetuating system, adding that an essential element was the software to establish a common database for all courses in the UCCSN. Currently the courses are noted in the discipline reports that were circulating through the individual curriculum committees. Regent Hill asked about roadblocks to the process. Mr. Littlepage replied that it was a matter of bringing the discipline

committees back together to work out their differences. Regent Hill asked whether there were departments that did not have common course numbering. Dr. Lucey replied that there were disciplines that had not reached agreement. Should the faculty members be unable to resolve it, it would be resolved at a higher level that could include the Regents. Regent Hill asked whether common course numbering for all of the institutions would be in the fall catalogs. Dr. Lucey replied that it was not that simple because not all institutions would release new catalogs this fall. The schedule for new catalogs (listed in Ref. 10) would become the implementation date, adding that it was an on-going, dynamic process. Regent Hill lamented that the System did not have common course numbering throughout the System and requested a list of courses, departments, and subjects not in agreement. Dr. Lucey referred him to (Appendix A), which provided the projected meeting dates for each discipline. He stated it was now the highest priority of the discipline committees, adding that it should be a faculty decision where it could be. He felt it unreasonable to assume it could all be done at one moment, because not all of the disciplines would have met. Regent Hill reminded him that it was a Regent top priority, adding that he felt the faculty should have viewed it as such, since it was fairly clear that unresolved issues were to be decided at the October meeting. Dr. Lucey replied that the committee tried to interpret the spirit of the resolution by not being unreasonable, but getting a process in place for the students of Nevada. Regent Hill felt his position was not unreasonable and that the spirit of the resolution had not been recognized. He expressed displeasure with the lack of success and requested a meeting with Dr. Lucey and Mr. Littlepage, and asked them to provide a list of every course that did not have common course numbering prior to the October meeting. Dr. Lucey felt the committee attempted to comply with the resolution. Regent Hill invited other Regents to meet with them as well, and requested an action item for the October meeting.

Regent Rosenberg stated that the two university art departments had been in discussion, but still required a little help. He asked to meet with Dr. Lucey and Mr. Littlepage to discuss the issues, adding that he felt they could be resolved relatively quickly.

Regent Derby thanked them for their report, adding that she felt there had been a giant step forward towards achieving common course numbering. She acknowledged that Dr. Lucey had traveled extensively in trying to accomplish the task. Chair Dondero thanked them for the report and encouraged them to meet with Regents Hill and Rosenberg and to report back at the October meeting. Regent Kirkpatrick congratulated them on their achievements. Regent Hill asked whether each course intended as pre-baccalaureate at a community college had been common course numbered with the universities and listed in the catalogs. Mr. Littlepage replied that they had not because the disciplines had not reached agreement. Regent Hill was very concerned by that. Dr. Lucey replied that each institution had its own catalog schedule, adding that once the catalogs were printed subsequent to the discipline meetings those courses would be listed. He related that the catalog was the contract under which each student was enrolled. Regent Hill was concerned with the lack of articulation between institutions. Mr. Littlepage stated that there were also courses that did not match number and designator that actually did transfer. Regent Hill replied that the resolution was intended to address that as well.

8. Rejected Ombudsman, UCCSN – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak requested a point of clarification. He asked whether (agenda item #8, Ombudsman) was nullified by the motion to reconsider. General Counsel Ray replied that it was. Regent Sisolak clarified that according to Robert's Rules of Order, 'the effect of adopting the motion to reconsider was to put the original question before the assembly in the exact position it held before it was voted on' and that no action had been taken on item #8. General Counsel Ray agreed.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval to study the establishment of an ombudsman. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Hill felt that the motion to reconsider was substantive action requiring six votes. Regent Sisolak replied that it

was a parliamentary procedure taking place within the confines of the meeting. General Counsel Ray agreed with Regent Sisolak's interpretation. Regent Phillips asked about the cost of the study. He felt that money was scarce and there were mechanisms already in place to handle the task. He stated that the presidents and faculty senate were not in favor of the position, and felt the money could be put to better use. Regent Kirkpatrick stated that the presidents and other opponents did not know the outcome of the study. He felt there was a need to look at the possibility because there were some institutions where faculty and students did not have proper recourse. He reminded the Board that the ombudsman would not become involved until all remedies had been exhausted. Regent Alden felt the Board should perform the study.

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

11. Approved Legislative Relations, Role & Responsibilities – The Board reviewed and considered action on the proposed UCCSN lobbying structure. (Ref. C on file in the Board office)

Dr. Nichols reviewed changes made to the language and process, which described the role of the System Lobbyist (title to be determined) with the Chancellor and campus government relations individuals acting as lobbyists during the session. Highlights included:

- The System Lobbyist shall keep the presidents informed and be in regular conversation with them.
- Activities of campus representatives with the Governor and Legislature shall be coordinated through the System office, particularly if they are representing Board priorities and funding requests. The Chancellor and the president of each institution should be informed of any such activities by campus faculty, staff, or students.
- The use of contracted services (external lobbying) to support institutional legislative activities within the State of Nevada is prohibited unless used for a critical System-wide initiative and approved in advance by the Chancellor.
- The Chancellor and the System Lobbyist shall keep the full Board apprised of current legislative activities and seek input on issues or positions that may be affected by legislation.

Regent Alden felt it was a good policy to provide a coordinated effort under the leadership of the Chancellor and would prevent renegade appearances. Dr. Nichols stated that it was not intended to take away anyone's right to speak to the legislature on an individual basis.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Legislative Relations' role and responsibilities. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

Regent Derby asked about suggestions for a position title, with Dr. Nichols promising to bring back a recommendation.

12. Information Only-Joint Purchasing of Equipment - A report was provided with discussion regarding the joint purchasing of equipment and technology for all institutions.

Vice Chancellor Miles referred to information in the White Packet (White Packet #12, on file in Board office) and introduced Mr. Ray Moran as spokesman for the committee. Mr. Ray Moran reported that current practice encouraged the benefit of joint purchasing activity when possible. The purchasing departments of UCCSN, BCN, UNLV, CCSN and SCS continually work together to discover and take advantage of all possible joint purchasing opportunities. He noted that, often, individual regions, campuses or departments had different needs. He provided a

list of current practices, examples of joint purchasing initiatives, and use of State contracts (on file in the Board office). He noted that singular bids were sometimes advantageous when trying to meet time constraints. He stated that System purchasing departments freely share information with one another, adding that contracts/pricing agreements were regularly reviewed to determine whether pricing terms/conditions could be improved by including other institutions. Pricing is often determined by the size of the market. For several years, SCS has facilitated System-wide initiatives aimed at defining needs and ascertaining the best solutions. SCS supports the purchasing operation by maintaining the Advantage Financial System and Purchasing links.

Regent Sisolak asked why the System was not taking advantage of the best price and drop-shipping to individual institutions. He felt that combining the purchasing departments would increase buying power. Mr. Moran cautioned that multiple shipments to end-users could actually increase the cost of items. Regent Sisolak made a comparison to Wal-Mart bulk purchases. Mr. Moran replied that contracts were negotiated with vendors based on the anticipated volume. Regent Sisolak felt that, since the System had grown to such a vast size, a coordinated purchasing effort would decrease overall costs. He commended Mr. Van Weddle's efforts with computer hardware/software purchases. Mr. Weddle stated that SCS had eight software agreements that saved the System a tremendous amount of money. Mr. Moran stated that Purchasing was pursuing similar efforts (i.e. furniture, State contracts). Purchasing requests are sent out for bid in an attempt to achieve competitive pricing on singular purchases as well.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the reduced state airline rate could be extended to students and families to facilitate recruitment efforts north and south. President Crowley replied that he would investigate the matter.

13. Approved Resolution, Sale of Bonds, Parking Structure & Cox Pavilion, UNLV – The Board approved a request for authority to proceed with the sale of bonds totaling up to \$31.3 million toward the construction of a 1,593-space parking structure on the UNLV campus and conversion of the bank loan for the Cox Pavilion as approved by the Board in January 2000. The request included all site improvements as required. (Ref. D/Resolution No. 00-7 on file in the Board office). President Harter requested an increase to \$31.3 to provide a cushion for the parking garage, since quotes continually increased.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Resolution for the Sale of Bonds for the parking structure and Cox Pavilion at UNLV. Regent Phillips seconded.

Regent Gallagher asked whether this was a blanket request for both projects. President Harter replied that the increase was intended to provide a cushion for the parking garage, since increased cost estimates were being received.

Regent Alden asked for chair recognition of Mr. Ken Mahall. Mr. Ken Mahall reported that he brought his parking concerns to the attention of several Regents about one year ago. He felt an attempt should be made to keep auto traffic off campus, and expressed concern in watching the campus growth/master plan. He felt that mixing traffic on campus was not a good idea, adding that traffic should be peripheral. Since the parking structure had not been built, he advised reconsideration of the location. He suggested that Swenson Street was an ideal location, since it was a one-way street, adding that using a campus trolley system could save land for more buildings. He was not in favor of splitting the campus to West Charleston, adding that the Maryland Parkway location was ideal. He suggested that Maryland Parkway already had heavy traffic. He felt that a campus was for learning and not parking, and that the space could be better utilized with learning facilities for the students.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether it was permissible to increase the request from \$26.3 to \$31.3. General Counsel Ray replied that the Open Meeting Law required proper notification of the topic to be discussed. He felt that, even

with the change to the amount requested, the topic had been adequately described. Vice Chancellor Miles explained that the request authorized proceeding with the sale of bonds. The next step would be to engage bond counsel and bond consultants to assemble a proposal. UNLV would need to finalize the numbers prior to the release of the bid package. The item would come back to the Board for final approval once the bids were received.

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

14. Approved EPA Lease, UNLV – The Board approved a lease for real property between the Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada, acting on behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the United States of America. The lease encompassed 72,778-sq. ft. of rentable laboratory and related space located in four existing contiguous buildings on the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus at 944 East Harmon Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. President Harter reported that the space no longer suited UNLV's requirements without massive renovation. The EPA was willing to negotiate the lease at a much higher rate (\$1.8-1.9 million/year), which would be contributed toward construction of the planned new Science and Engineering Complex.

Regent Hill asked whether it was a reasonable commercial property rate and about the length of the lease. Dr. Harter replied that it was a good rate, adding that the lease would be renewed for another 15 years. Regent Hill asked whether a price index was included. Dr. Harter replied that it was a flat lease rate until the fifteenth year (\$1,789,000 for 14 years and \$1,900,000 for the fifteenth year). Regent Hill asked whether that was a reasonable rate for the 15-year period. Dr. Harter replied that UNLV believed that it was, adding that it was the largest amount the EPA could approve without re-approaching Congress.

Regent Alden asked whether this was included in the master plan. Dr. Harter replied that it was in addition to the capital budget. UNLV hopes the state will provide \$50 million for the new complex, with UNLV providing \$25 million. She indicated that UNLV would eventually like to have the land back, adding that they had a good relationship with the EPA and that they had been a good neighbor and client.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether it included the four older buildings currently occupied by EPA. Dr. Harter replied that it did. Dr. Fain replied that EPA had occupied the buildings since 1985.

Regent Dondero asked whether it included the super computer too. Dr. Harter replied that the super computer belonged to UNLV. Regent Dondero asked about the operation and maintenance costs for the building. Dr. Harter replied that it was provided by UNLV at less than half the income from the lease. UNLV also has an investment fund for the science and engineering facility.

Regent Alden expressed concern that the campus was already landlocked. He urged Dr. Harter to take Mr. Mahall's comments (item #13) under advisement.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the EPA lease for UNLV. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

The meeting recessed at 4:50 p.m. and reconvened at 8:15 a.m., Friday, September 8, 2000 with all members present except Regents Phillips and Sisolak. Chair Dondero thanked President Silverman and CCSN staff for hosting the meeting.

15. Approved SNSC Update and Loan, DRI – President Stephen Wells' provided an update on the SNSC Phase II project, with information regarding lease negotiations with the GSA/DOE for space. The Board approved DRI to

negotiate a bank loan as a portion of the project financing (previously approved by the Board) and to request the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for a change in scope from the original proposal. (Ref. E on file in the Board office)

President Wells related they were requesting permission from the IFC for a change in scope. The project provided a unique opportunity to join with the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nevada Test Site Historical Foundation (NTSHF) for a facility focusing on scientific research and development in cultural resources, archaeology, and arid lands. The facility would house 350,000 Cold War documents and guarantee their long-term preservation, as well as provide a museum area for people to view the history of the Nevada Test Site. The initial project included 48,000-sq. ft. on four floors with 38,000-sq. ft. for DOE and NTSHF and 10,000-sq. ft. for DRI archaeologists, with an initial budget of \$10.9 including a \$1.0 million bank loan.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Dr. Wells reported that design efficiencies proposed by the State Public Works Board and DRI's architect resulted in a revised plan including 60,000-sq. ft. on three floors: (20,000-sq. ft. NTSHF museum, 20,000-sq. ft. DOE curation facility and Cold War documents, and 20,000-sq. ft. for DRI archaeologists and CALEM [Center for Arid Lands Environmental Management]). The additional space also provided the opportunity for an affiliation with the Smithsonian Institute. He related he was seeking authorization to seek change of scope approval from the IFC and authorization to proceed with a \$1.0 million bank loan.

DRI Vice President for Finance and Administration, Mr. Alan Austin, related that the initial request had been \$2.5 million for the Nevada contribution to the joint venture. As a result, \$1.5 million was identified on the budget request, with the remaining \$1 million to be obtained by DRI. DRI was seeking approval to investigate funding sources for the \$1 million. The loan would include a \$1 million principal for a term of 20 years at an estimated 8% interest rate, with an annual payment of \$100,280 to be paid with indirect cost recovery funds. It would give DRI an opportunity to: expand research on arid lands, assure the archaeological heritage and artifacts of southern Nevada remain in the state, and accommodate a Smithsonian-affiliated museum in southern Nevada.

Regent Gallagher moved approval for DRI to request IFC approval for a change in scope from the original proposal. Regent Hill seconded.

Regent Alden asked about parking and whether the building would become a System property. Dr. Wells replied that parking would be moved in a manner which would not be intrusive to the environment and that the building would become System property in 20 years. Regent Alden asked whether DOE would make lease payments. Dr. Wells replied that they would. Mr. Austin explained that the payments would cover the revenue bond. Regent Alden requested additional information regarding amortization and cash flow.

Regent Dondero asked whether they would refinance if interest rates changed. Mr. Austin replied that they would, adding that it was a condition of the loan. Regent Dondero asked whether the partnership would obligate/endorse placement of a nuclear waste site. Dr. Wells assured her it would not, adding that it was only to be used for historical value.

Motion carried. Regent Phillips was absent.

Regent Gallagher moved approval for DRI to negotiate a bank loan. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regent Phillips was absent.

16. Accepted Report on CCSN Administrative Review – The Board accepted Interim Chancellor Jane Nichols'

continued review of concerns that have been raised at CCSN. Dr. Nichols reported there had been a lack of time to finalize the report at this meeting. She noted that CCSN faculty had returned to campus and she wanted to provide them an opportunity to share their concerns. She stated that the purpose of the review was to face media allegations, provide an objective review, and propose any necessary policy changes. She related that she worked closely with President Silverman and his staff, who had been very helpful, adding that President Moore had also shared information.

Value of Furniture Loaned to Foothill High School Principal – The equipment was valued at \$15,963.67. She related there was no process/policy in place that allowed the sale of state property. The furniture is being picked up and will be used as originally intended.

Phone Lines – In addition to computers at the Latin Chamber of Commerce, AARP, and NAACP there were phone lines (paid for by CCSN) to service the computers, provide Internet access, as well as access to the school registration process. This has been confirmed. Information was provided regarding equipment that has been retrieved by the college.

Rafael Riviera Community Center – The computer equipment is no longer at that site and is not of any value due to the age of the equipment. The college provided no phone line.

Value of Phone Lines - \$109/month. The lines have been cancelled and charges have ceased. The business officers are working on policies that have been forwarded to the presidents for comment. She anticipated that a policy would be presented at the October meeting. She felt that partnerships and financial responsibilities should be clearly outlined, adding that many of these issues occurred due to the lack of proper documentation.

Bonus for Performance – Dr. Nichols stated that a bonus could be a good management tool, and was used in non-state funded programs (i.e. performance incentives for football/basketball coaches). She had no argument about the effectiveness of bonuses as a management tool, but felt it was not good policy as a tool for regular employees, since there was no provision for it under the salary schedule and policy. She noted that a merit pool serves as the performance incentive. She discovered a small number of bonuses were granted for state-funded positions for reaching specific goals. She recommended development of policy that clearly addressed not using bonus measures. She noted that a merit increase becomes part of the base pay, while bonuses did not. Overloads are provided for faculty performing work over/beyond their contract for regular work. Position adjustments are made when the nature of the duties/job description change. There is no provision for giving bonuses for achieving certain goals.

Automobiles – There were allegations from several individuals regarding employees who were given automobiles, purchased by the college, for personal use. Dr. Nichols related there was no evidence to support the allegations. There is a current practice of providing a car to people who are on 7-day/week, 24-hour call to fulfill their duties. There are clear state policies allowing this and IRS rules that must be followed. Three individuals currently have vehicles assigned to them, which are owned by the college motor pool.

Dr. Nichols stated there would likely be allegations in the press regarding personnel practices and salaries, which revolve around questions related to hiring and emergency hires. She related she would provide a more intensive review of hiring practices at the college, the use of emergency hires, and promotions in the future.

Regent Alden asked whether approved Board policy was in place addressing outreach in enrolling students and distance education needs at sites other than the campus. Dr. Nichols replied there was, particularly with recruiting minority students. Dr. Nichols related that Board policy included an expectation for interlocal agreements and memorandums of understanding to protect System interests with the use of resources with non-System entities.

She felt that Board intent was for institutions to form partnerships with other entities. Regent Alden observed that CCSN's enrollment had drastically increased to 35,000 within the last five years. He asked about the impact the loan of equipment/outreach had on enrollment and whether it could be measured. Dr. Nichols replied that they did attempt to answer that question. She thanked Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Internal Audit, and the General Counsel's office for their assistance. An attempt was made to correlate the source/site of registration to those loans. It was not technically possible to determine the exact number of students who may have used the equipment/phone lines in relation to campus business. Dr. Silverman noted a difference between distance education and outreach. The computers were used for outreach not distance education.

Regent Derby commented that it appeared that CCSN followed a broad policy and administrative practices not supported by a specific policy. She felt there was opportunity to review CCSN's success with outreach to minorities to determine whether the Board wished to endorse such practices. She agreed that, while bonuses may be an effective management tool, there were no policies in place to support their issuance. She asked whether merit was given to everyone and whether it was an adequate incentive tool. Dr. Nichols clarified that community college faculty merit was earned by steps for performance. Administrators are awarded merit differentially for performance.

Dr. Moore stated that, during his term, some managers at CCSN did not receive merit increases. If a person was not performing well, he attempted to remove them. He noted that bonuses were used for specific performance. Merit increases were used when an incentive for extraordinary performance was recognized.

Regent Sisolak noted that he spoke with Ms. Susan Bragger and Mr. Carlos Garcia with the school district, adding that they intended to pay for the loaned furniture. Dr. Nichols replied that the original discussion involved selling the furniture at its current value. Dr. Silverman felt it would set a precedent for selling equipment that belongs to the state and decided to retrieve the furniture and use it for its intended purposes. Mr. Sisolak noted that the System would then get used furniture and the school district would get new furniture. Dr. Nichols agreed. Dr. Silverman clarified that negotiations were in progress regarding the return of the equipment as-is or to sell it and buy new furniture. He believed the furniture to be in good shape, adding that the school district was prepared to buy it. He requested the Board's preference, adding that he received comments from the press and community about the appropriateness of selling state property. Regent Sisolak commented that, if it wasn't needed, they should take the money. He asked whether the computers were used exclusively for outreach. Dr. Nichols stated that it was difficult to ascertain how they were used. Regent Sisolak asked about provisions for lending equipment for other purposes. Dr. Nichols replied that there was no provision for lending equipment for any purpose.

Regent Sisolak asked how the organizations were selected. Dr. Moore replied that in 1988 the Board adopted Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 2.1, regarding participation by members of minority groups, women, and members of other protected classes in higher education being a priority of the Board of Regents. It advocated innovative and diverse approaches for recruitment, admission, and retention. Each institution was encouraged to devote significant resources to support the recruitment and retention of students from those groups. When opportunities were presented to lend equipment to the NAACP, AARP and Latin Chamber he felt it qualified as an innovative approach. He noted that the college population grew 108% (African American participation-145%, Hispanic-195%, Asian-153%, Native American-141%). He was proud that college growth was not only attributed to an increase in Caucasian or upper-middle income. He felt the phone lines were justified to provide access to registration, course information, and financial aid. He regretted that loan agreements were not properly completed. Regent Sisolak asked about the number of computers provided to seniors/minorities that justified the increased minority enrollments. Dr. Moore did not know the answer, but offered to provide the information. Regent Sisolak asked who requested the computer loans. Dr. Moore replied that Mr. Orlando Sandoval made the request. Regent Sisolak asked whether Mr. Sandoval was a member of the Latin Chamber. Dr. Moore did not know. Mr. Sisolak asked whether computers were supplied to

those who requested them. Dr. Moore replied that Mr. Sandoval approached him on their behalf. He viewed these organizations as partners and felt he was reaching out to the community. Regent Sisolak expressed concern for not providing similar opportunities for other organizations.

Regent Kirkpatrick felt that outreach efforts would only have required one computer. He did not believe they were solely used for outreach. He lamented that many outstanding CCSN faculty, staff, and administrators were tainted by the scandal. He felt the Chancellor lacked time and resources to handle the investigation. He expressed concern for unauthorized movement of equipment, loans without agreements, false statements, academic dishonesty, grading scandals, equipment theft, enormous salary increases, favoritism and intimidation of employees. He suggested hiring an independent investigator. Dr. Nichols agreed that she was pressed for time and that it was an awkward and inappropriate System role. She suggested allowing time for completion of the Attorney General's investigation. She stated that it would normally be handled by the institution president, adding that the Board was in the process of hiring a new president for the institution. She felt the Board should have confidence that a president would handle the situation equitably and fairly, and did not want to reduce the president's role in running an institution with integrity. She suggested waiting until the October meeting when she would bring forward allegations and complete her report. Regent Kirkpatrick indicated he wished to meet with the Attorney General to provide further information.

Regent Seastrand was saddened that CCSN faculty and students were being hurt by the conversation. He noted that the accreditation report had been overlooked, adding that it had been a very good report. The college was praised for being responsive to community needs. He felt there was much to be proud of, adding that the faculty was one of the finest in the nation. He felt there were appropriate times for the use of merit and bonuses and requested policy be considered regarding bonuses, particularly in light of the Legislature's negative view of merit.

Regent Alden reminded the Board that people were innocent until proven guilty. He had no question about Dr. Nichol's integrity. He felt that all information should be sent to the Attorney General and that the Board should live with that decision. He felt that they should not overlook CCSN's contribution to the community.

Regent Phillips entered the meeting.

Regent Hill observed that education provided the power for improvement of the human condition. He felt that CCSN was a shining star in the nation due to the efforts of a great number of people, including Dr. Moore. He felt that the 108% growth in 6 years and increase in minority participation was amazing work. He acknowledged that paperwork was important, but felt that humans made errors. He agreed that computers in the community generated interest in education. He felt the Board spent too much time on minor paperwork errors and expressed support for the use of bonuses. He supported policy in favor of bonuses and commended Dr. Moore for his efforts.

Regent Phillips stated that he reviewed CCSN's mission statement, which included provision of community service and outreach to a certain segment of the community. He felt that the loaned computers had provided an important outreach mechanism to certain segments of the community. He expressed concern that only three organizations were criticized, which were the most deprived segments of the community (AARP-seniors, NAACP-African Americans, Latin Chamber-Hispanics). He felt the community college followed their mission, adding that it should be done more often.

Chair Dondero thanked CCSN faculty and administrators for their recruitment and education efforts.

Regent Kirkpatrick noted that the Hispanic population of Clark County had grown faster than that of the community college and that the college population grew under Dr. Moore's predecessor. He felt that Dr. Moore sometimes took credit for things on which he had no impact.

Regent Gallagher felt it would take years to overcome the damage done to CCSN, in spite of many faculty doing an outstanding job. She agreed that the investigation had gone beyond the point of usefulness. She felt the issues did not warrant the press attention and level of investigation. She felt the Board should concentrate on correcting policies/procedures, encouraging enforcement, and allowing the presidents to run their institutions. She encouraged the Board to consider the impact to the college.

Regent Alden moved acceptance of the report.

Regent Hill seconded. Motion carried.

17. Approved Audit Committee Recommendations - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Audit committee met September 7, 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. The plan ended last fiscal year with revenues exceeding expenses by about \$600,000. President Crowley reported on the status of the UNR Fire Science Academy (FSA). There currently is a deficit at the FSA of about \$3.9 million, including \$1 million received from the UNR Foundation. The university accounts are still in balance overall due to reserves in non-state funded accounts such as indirect cost recovery funds, property acquisitions funds, and self-supporting activities. UNR has not established a separate reserve for possible FSA payments. UNR is monitoring the overall reserve balances of the university instead. Grant funds will be used to support a minimal staff level during litigation. The university will need to fund maintenance and security personnel of approximately \$48,000/month while the facility is closed. The current policy on hosting activity and a listing of authorized host accounts and expenditures for FY 1999-2000 was reviewed. Approximately \$2.5 million was expended System-wide on hosting activities. President Crowley explained that these funds were expended for fundraising and friend-raising to generate donations to the institutions. It was also noted that the funds were used for recruiting purposes. The committee requested further information by expenditure for those funds. A report will be prepared by the institutions that will indicate the category for each expenditure and a summary of fundraising results for discussion at a future Audit committee meeting. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit, reported that the institution bank reconciliations were up to date. He requested Board action to approve the following committee recommendations:

- Internal Audit Reports – The committee reviewed the following Internal Audit Reports: (Ref. I on file in the Board office)
- Music Department, UNR
- Center for Economic Education, UNLV
- Disability Resource Center, UNLV
- Desert Garden Center, CCSN

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried.

General Counsel Tom Ray reported two lawsuits were pending regarding the FSA (System filed against All-Star and All-Star filed against the System). The suits were filed in Elko County. Regent Sisolak stated that General Counsel Ray indicated he would discuss the pending lawsuits privately with any of the Regents.

Regent Alden felt the audit methods should be changed to concentrate on major issues and allow the campuses to audit smaller departments. Regent Sisolak stated that the committee discussed audits performed on relatively small departments with very little risk or exposure. It was suggested that audits concentrate on larger areas with greater risk. Regent Hill felt that if departments knew they would not be audited, it would increase the risk of impropriety. Regent Alden clarified the audits would be conducted at the campus level.

The meeting recessed at 9:55 a.m. and reconvened at 10:05 a.m. with all members present.

18. Information Only-ADA Facilities Planning – In response to a Regent request to continue review of access of the disabled to educational facilities, a brief report from each institution regarding the planning process for ADA compliance was provided. (Ref. F/White Packet #17 on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden thanked the campuses for their reports and asked whether federal 504 reporting requirements were being met. Vice Chancellor Miles replied that each campus had been very active in meeting compliance requirements. President Crowley stated that each institution was aware of requirements regarding ADA facility planning and implementation. UNR underwent a full review in the mid 1990's and made the necessary adjustments. He felt that each institution exhibited diligent attention.

Regent Seastrand asked whether System Administration had also undergone a study of their facilities. Dr. Nichols did not know, but agreed to provide the information.

Regent Kirkpatrick noted an article complimenting the Thomas & Mack facility for its ADA improvements. He asked whether more improvements were required. Mr. Pat Christenson, Director of Thomas & Mack, replied they were completing the renovation that would ensure 100% compliance. He felt that UNLV went beyond the legal requirements. Directional signage had been installed, 18 additional seats were added at floor level, and parking was brought closer to the building. Regent Alden requested annual reports be required of the institutions and System Administration. Regent Sisolak felt that UNLV had been responsive to the criticism and made positive changes.

The meeting recessed at 9:55 a.m. and reconvened at 10:05 a.m. with all members present.

19. Accepted Reapportionment Update – The Board accepted an update provided by Drs. Pat Goodall and Keith Schwer regarding census information and redistricting as it pertains to the Board of Regents.

Dr. Pat Goodall reported that no other states were facing the same level of growth as Nevada. Maps need to be drawn based on the 2000 census, and results are expected by next spring. Currently only Clark County data is available. They expect the remainder of Nevada data by November and should be able to draw the maps once the data is received. He suggested a workshop to discuss movement of district lines. If the Board agreed to 9 members, there would be one less seat in both the north and the south. If the Board remained with 11 members, Regent Gallagher's district would pick up rural Clark County.

Dr. Schwer reported on Nevada population and registered voter estimates for 2000:

- Clark County 68.7% of state population
- Washoe County 16%
- Rest of State 15.3%

Alternatives for Board size and number of registered voters per district were provided. Current district boundaries (from 1991 redistricting) were reviewed. Current Clark County districts were reviewed with street detail. General principles included: maintaining Regent residence within their district, one person/one vote (+ or – 5%), Voting Rights Act of 1965, maintaining contiguous district boundaries, and using voter precinct boundaries. A software demonstration was provided moving/changing districts/sizes for Clark County. Current limitations include: no population data available at the precinct level and no voter registration data available for counties outside of Clark. The implications of reapportionment to the Regents' districts were discussed, including changes in population

concentrations and the impact on current district boundaries. With 11 Regents, each would represent 9% of the population. If Washoe County population was 16% of the state, then 2% of rural Nevada's population would go to Regents Hill and Rosenberg. The 2% shift of rural population would leave the rural Regents with 13% of the state's population. Regents Derby and Gallagher would add 5% of Clark County population to meet the one person/one vote requirement.

Board size remains at 11 - 4 Regents-Washoe County/Rural Nevada; 7 Regents-southern Nevada:

- Rural district (Regent Gallagher) would include most of rural Clark County.
- Regents Dondero's and Phillips' districts would increase in population.
- Two districts mainly in Washoe County.
- One district mainly in Carson/Tahoe area.

Increase Board size to 12 – 4 Regents-Washoe County/Rural Nevada; 8 Regents-southern Nevada:

- Add one new district to Clark County.
- Regent Gallagher's seat would add some of rural Clark County (but less than with 11 districts).
- Two districts mainly in Washoe County.
- One district mainly in Carson/Tahoe area.

Increase Board size to 13 – 4 Regents-Washoe County/Rural Nevada; 9 Regents-southern Nevada:

- 2 districts added to Clark County.
- 2 districts mainly in Washoe County.
- 2 districts mainly in the rest of the state.

Regent Phillips observed there was a large Hispanic population that would be better served by a separate Board representative. Dr. Schwer replied there was a fairly even Hispanic population distribution with the projections provided. Regent Seastrand stated that the Legislature used the same districts for the Regents and the State Board of Education. He observed that their addresses should be depicted as well. Dr. Schwer stated that adding that constraint would make the job more difficult. Regent Gallagher noted that the Regents usually determined the districts and the State Board of Education adopted them as well. She felt that the next Regent for her district might not own an airplane to cover the great distance. She also felt that a Regent from Clark County elected to cover her district would not be fair for the northern Nevada population. She was willing to split the district with Regent Derby, but felt it was not feasible with districts of this size for a non-paying job. Dr. Schwer reported that Nevada was both urban and rural and one-person/one-vote seriously constrained the size/shape of the districts. He noted that with 70% of the state's population in Clark County, 70% of Board representation would also be in Clark County. Mrs. Gallagher asked whether the 13-member proposal would eliminate having the rural representatives cover Clark County. Dr. Schwer replied that it would.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether maps would be easier to draw if current districts were eliminated. Dr. Schwer replied that it would, dependent upon the Board size. He indicated that boundaries were more even and contiguous than in previous redistricting. Regent Kirkpatrick requested a map completely redrawn without consideration of current districts.

Decrease Board size to 10 – 3 Regents-Washoe County/Rural Nevada; 7 Regents-southern Nevada:

- Clark County remains with 7 districts.
- 1 district in Washoe County.

- 1 district in rural areas.
- 1 district from Washoe/rural areas.

Decrease Board size to 9 – 3 Regents-Washoe County/Rural Nevada; 6 Regents-southern Nevada:

- Clark County loses one district.
- 1 district in Washoe County.
- 1 district from the rural areas.
- 1 district from Washoe/rural areas.

Study Schedule based on April 1st Census Results:

- Washoe and rural registered voter data available mid-November.
- Redistricting workshop at November 30-December 1 meeting with possible action on the number of Regent districts and tentative boundaries.
- U.S. Census data available by April 2001.
- Final redistricting adjustments made after census data is received and before bill draft is sent to the Legislature.

Regent Alden moved acceptance of the reapportionment update. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

20. Approved Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda:

(1)Approved Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the meeting held August 10-11, 2000.

(2)Approved Tenure on Hire, UNLV – The Board approved tenure on hire for Dr. Susan Silverton, Professor of Biology, effective September 1, 2000. The faculty of the Department of Biological Sciences voted unanimously on her hire with tenure at a faculty meeting in August 2000.

(3)Approved Honorary Doctorate, UNR – The Board approved granting an honorary doctorate to Ms. Jeanne Botts at the December Commencement ceremony. (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office)

(4)Approved Handbook Change, Amendments, ASCCSN Constitution, CCSN – The Board approved the amended ASCCSN Constitution. (Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office)

(5)Approved Handbook Change, School of Medicine Dental Resident Salary, UNR – The Board approved stipend recommendations for dental residents for 2000-2001, Title 4, Chapter 7, Section 3. These stipends are reimbursed by the affiliated hospital but are determined separate from the medical residents. No increase is being proposed for dental residents, but SOM has established a new rate to accommodate the first class of second-year dental residents.

Recommended

Post-DDS Year 1999-2000 Salary 2000-2001 Salary

1 \$40,000 \$40,000

2 ----- \$41,650

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

Greenhouse Wind Damage Repair (Henderson Campus)\$12,000
Ceiling Repairs (Cheyenne Campus-Rooms 1238 & 2222)19,500
Module 4 Remodel (Cheyenne Campus)25,000
CNA Lab (Cheyenne Campus)16,500
Remodel Rooms 1088 & 1089 (Cheyenne Campus)1,000
Remodel Room 1100 (Cheyenne Campus)21,900
Roof Repair (Boulder City Site)1,800
Remodel Room C214 (Charleston Campus)11,200
TOTAL:\$108,900

(7)Approved System Office Lease, UCCSN – The Board approved an addendum to the present southern Nevada office lease agreement to acquire additional space and exercise the option to extend the lease to June 30, 2004.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Consent Agenda. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Alden asked whether modification of the lease (Item #7) would accommodate a greater presence in southern Nevada. Dr. Nichols replied that it was proposed due to the belief it was critical to provide more space for additional staff. She noted that they should also consider long-term planning beyond expiration of the lease at this site.

CCSN student body president Mr. Shannon Schilling reported a revision to the constitution (Item #4). Article IV.8B should reference Article IV.8A.

Motion carried.

Regents Phillips and Sisolak left the meeting.

21. Approved Chancellor Search Committee Recommendations - Chair Jill Derby reported the Chancellor Search committees met August 16, August 19, and September 1, 2000. In August, the ad hoc Chancellor Search Committee and the Institutional Advisory Committee interviewed five candidates for the Chancellorship. Consultant Shirley Chater reviewed their references and provided a list of suggested questions for the meeting. After the interviews were completed the committees agreed to name Dr. Jane Nichols, Dr. Richard Rush, and Dr. Tad Perry as finalists. The finalists were invited back the week of August 28th to meet with interested constituencies. On September 1st the committees met again to discuss the candidates. Dr. Rush withdrew his name from consideration, feeling he was not the right 'fit' for the position. The committees considered comments and e-mail submitted by faculty members concerning the finalists. The Institutional Advisory Committee made a strong endorsement for Dr. Nichols and recommended her nomination to the Regents' Committee. The Regents' Committee considered and discussed the candidates and recommendations and voted unanimously to nominate Dr. Jane Nichols as the Chancellor. Dr. Derby requested Board action on the following recommendations of the committee:

- Selection of Finalists – The committees discussed the six candidates and selected three finalists.
- Recommendations - The Institutional Advisory Committee discussed the three candidates and made their recommendation to the Regents' Committee. The Regents' Committee considered and discussed the three candidates and the Advisory Committee's recommendation. The ad hoc Chancellor Search Committee recommended Dr. Jane Nichols for UCCSN Chancellor.

Regent Alden moved approval of the committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regents Phillips and Sisolak were absent.

22. Approved UCCSN Chancellor Recommendation - The Chancellor Search Committee presented their recommendation of Dr. Jane Nichols for the position of UCCSN Chancellor. The terms and conditions of employment included:

- 3-year contract effective upon Board approval.
- Annual Salary - \$195,000.
- Two annual housing allowances - \$12,000 each.
- Automobile allowance - \$6,000/year.
- Host Account - \$10,000/year for UCCSN business.
- Upon transition from the Chancellor position, tenure at either UCCSN university, following consultation with the appropriate academic unit, with a salary equivalent to that of a senior professor in her field at either institution.

Regent Phillips entered the meeting.

Regent Alden moved approval of the recommendation for Dr. Jane Nichols as Chancellor of the UCCSN with the terms and conditions as presented. Regent Derby seconded.

Regents Alden and Derby stated that the System was lucky to have Dr. Nichols as a candidate, adding that she exemplified great leadership.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether most presidential terms ended June 30th. General Counsel Ray explained that, unless the Board approved otherwise, all contracts expired at the end of the fiscal year.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of extending the contract 9 months, 22 days (June 30, 2004).

Regent Hill asked whether they could approve a contract for longer than 3 years. General Counsel Ray replied that they could. He clarified that Regent Kirkpatrick was proposing a 3-year/9-month/22-day contract. Regent Phillips asked why the contract should be extended. Regent Rosenberg explained that it would then coincide with the end of the fiscal year. Regent Sisolak questioned the reasoning. Regent Seastrand asked whether it was important. Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the Code provided for all contracts to end with the fiscal year, but acknowledged that the Board had the authority to end the contract whenever they desired. He asked whether anyone objected to the extended term. Regent Derby stated she was not against the extension, but was reporting the negotiated recommendation. Regent Seastrand observed that contracts and evaluations were due at the same time, adding that he preferred to stagger the evaluations.

Regent Alden agreed to accept the extension if Regent Derby did and it was the will of the Board. Motion to extend contract failed for lack of second.

Regent Sisolak asked about Dr. Lucey's contract (the last president hired). Dr. Lucey indicated that it began August 1st, but was unsure about the length of the term. Regent Rosenberg suggested voting on the original motion and then discussing extension. Regent Seastrand stated that Dr. Nichols was a good choice and asked about the compensation level. Regent

Derby explained that the salary was below the median salary schedule. She noted that it had been practice to set the Chancellor's salary above that of the highest-paid president.

Upon a roll call vote the original motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Nichols expressed her gratitude for the Board's support and for those who supported her through the process. She noted that she hoped to lead the System forward and work well with everyone, and encouraged people to notify her if she was not being effective.

23. Approved Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations - Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic Research & Student Affairs Committee met September 7, 2000 to review and recommend approval for a UNR/UNLV School of Pharmacy. The program involves a System-wide cooperative effort with the universities and the community colleges to meet the growing demand for pharmacists in Nevada. There will be multiple points of entry into the program, which offers a professional doctorate of pharmacy (PharmD.) and qualifies students to pass the Nevada State Board examination in pharmacy and practice pharmacy as highly competent practitioners in all areas of pharmacy specialization. The committee also reviewed and recommended approval for a Bachelor of Arts in Afro-American Studies at UNLV. The program will be offered under the auspices of the Department of Anthropology & Ethnic Studies and is an administrative reorganization of resources already in use. The degree fulfills an academic need that cannot be satisfied adequately through the traditional disciplines at the undergraduate level. She requested Board action to approve the following committee recommendations:

- New Program Proposals – The committee reviewed and recommended approval of the following new program proposals:
 - School of Pharmacy, UNR/UNLV (Ref. G on file in the Board office)
 - Bachelor of Arts in Afro-American Studies, UNLV (Ref. H on file in the Board office)

Regent Derby moved approval of the committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Faculty Senate representative Perry Johnson thanked the universities for including the community colleges in the PharmD. program. Regent Phillips encouraged Board support.

Motion carried.

24. Approved Campus Environment Committee Recommendations - Chair Tom Kirkpatrick reported the Campus Environment Committee (CEC) met September 7, 2000 with representatives from each UCCSN institution to discuss issues to be addressed for the remainder of the year. Suggestions were made to discuss campus climate surveys, diversity, female mentoring programs, smoking, campus safety, childcare and campus beautification issues over the next year. The committee recommended that CEC members and System Administration staff develop an agenda proposal for the October meeting. General Counsel Ray presented a review of UCCSN, state and federal statutes, regulations, case law, and policies that govern the release of materials, documents and reports to the public. All records generated by a public agency are open to the public, unless there is an exception provided by law. Exceptions include: Family Education and Rights of Privacy Act (FERPA); attorney-client privilege; personnel records related to the performance, conduct or disciplinary actions of the employee; proprietary information; and criminal investigations that may/may not be confidential depending on whether the investigation is distinguished as a criminal investigation or a personnel investigation. A request was made for an additional report in October from the Chancellor's office regarding the UNLV police investigation, which addressed the processes followed, but eliminates personnel names. An additional request was made for examination of policy related to disarming the UNLV police officers. Regent Kirkpatrick requested Board action on the following committee recommendations:

- Round Table Discussion of Actions and Schedule of Topics to be Discussed with Campus Representatives – The committee reviewed previous actions and unfinished business of the committee and proposed that a schedule of topics for the remainder of the year be developed for the October meeting.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Alden asked Dr. Harter to request the Nevada Division of Investigations (NDI) provide a report for the Regents. Dr. Harter referred the question to General Counsel Ray. General Counsel Ray explained that, normally, an internal review would have been conducted. Due to the number of people involved and the size of department, they were unable to do so. NDI conducted the investigation and was not paid for the service. He acknowledged that they might be willing to re-write the report, but he advised against the request. He stated that UNLV administration or the General Counsel's office could make the attempt if the Board so desired. Dr. Harter stated there was virtually nothing in the report that was not personnel-related. She offered to make the request. Regent Hill felt the report could be re-written with no name identification. He suggested the Chancellor ask NDI to rewrite the report withholding information that could identify or violate confidential informants. If that could not be done, he felt it should be done in-house, but preferred it be done by NDI to avoid questions in the future. General Counsel Ray indicated he could make the request, but would be surprised if they agreed. Dr. Nichols agreed to make the request and to work with Dr. Harter and General Counsel Ray to achieve the result. Regent Sisolak was not aware of any informants and expressed concern for individuals' right of confidentiality.

Regent Seastrand left the meeting.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Regent Seastrand entered the meeting.

Regents Hill and Kirkpatrick left the meeting.

25. Approved Finance & Planning Committee Recommendations - Chair Dorothy Gallagher reported the Finance & Planning Committee met September 7, 2000 to review UCCSN Self-supporting Budgets for FY 2000-2001, the FY 2000-2001 Accountability Report and to review and recommend an addition to the 2001-2003 Capital Improvement Request, which was not included in the initial proposal. She requested Board action to approve the following committee recommendations:

- FY 2000-2001 UCCSN Self-Supporting Budgets – Self-supporting budgets are non-state appropriated accounts established for specific activities/programs that are approved annually by the Board. These accounts typically generate revenue through the sale of goods/services, student fees, investment income and indirect cost recovery funds. Accounts include: motor pools, resident halls, central stores, athletics, bookstores, continuing education programs, and childcare centers. With no state funding, these accounts depend upon the revenues they generate to cover the cost of their operations.
 - Total revenue sources budgeted for all UCCSN self-supporting accounts for FY 2000-2001 is \$192.7 million. Budget revenues for FY 2000-2001 of \$192.7 million exceed last year's total of \$169.9 million; 13.4% increase.
 - FY 2000-2001 budget has 796 accounts compared to 743 last year and supports funding of 1,222.53 professional and classified positions compared to 1,077.22 positions for FY 1999-2000.

Regent Kirkpatrick entered the meeting.

- FY 2000-2001 UCCSN Accountability Report – This report is prepared to meet the reporting requirements outlined by a letter of intent from the Legislature on the issue of budgetary accountability. The letter of intent requires two accountability reports every fiscal year. The first, reconciles the legislatively-approved budget to the operating budget approved by the Board at the beginning of each fiscal year. The second, submitted at the end of the fiscal period, reconciles the Board's approved budget-to-actual expenditures. The letter of intent also requires explanation of any transfers between functional areas within an institution's budget. These transfers are reported and justified to the Legislative Counsel Bureau and the Governor's Budget Office.

Regent Hill entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

- Addition to Capital Improvement Program 2001-2003 – The committee reviewed and recommended approval to add a project to Priority #1 (Furnishings & Equipment/Buildout) of the 2001-2003 Capital Improvement request. The Learning Resource Center at the School of Medicine was funded by the 1999 Legislature without funds for furnishings and equipment. This request for \$2,195,000 would complete the project. The project was initially requested on one-time equipment funds, but more appropriately belongs with similar projects in the capital request.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Regent Phillips left the meeting.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regent Phillips was absent.

26. Approved CCSN Presidential Search Committee Recommendations - Chair Doug Seastrand reported the CCSN Presidential Search committees met August 25, 2000 to consider repeal of prior approval of selection of six (6) finalists for the position of President of CCSN. Chair Seastrand noted the importance of the committee's work in advising the Board (the deciding body) in selecting the next president. Although the Board had accepted the list of six finalists, expansion of the list was still of interest. The Regents' Committee approved the repeal of prior action, and nominations were requested for additional finalist candidates. Dr. Robert Silverman, Interim President of CCSN, was nominated and added to the list of finalists. Tours and informal meetings were organized for September 26-28 and interviews were scheduled for September 28-29. At the conclusion of the interviews, the Institutional Advisory Committee and the Regents' Committee would determine up to three finalists to return for a second interview the week of October 2-6. The October visit would include additional opportunities for public meetings and formal receptions. The committees will meet October 6 to prepare a recommendation for the Board's October 19-20 meeting. He requested Board action to approve the following committee recommendations:

- Repeal of previous action, which approved six (6) finalists for the President of CCSN.
- Expand the list of finalists to seven (7) and add Dr. Robert Silverman as a finalist.
- Organize tours and informal meetings on CCSN campuses for September 26-28 and interviews for September 28-29.
- Invite up to three (3) finalists for a second interview October 2-6, preceded by forums and formal receptions.
- Develop a schedule of finalist activities and interview questions by staff, subject to approval by the committee chair.
- Prepare a recommendation for CCSN President on October 6 for the October 19-20 meeting.

Regent Phillips entered the meeting.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Phillips seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick felt that the motion required a 2/3 majority to pass. General Counsel Ray agreed with the analysis. He noted that the pattern had been that a special committee (appointed for special purposes) existed until its work was complete (bringing a final recommendation to the Board for approval). As long as the committee was doing its work, the Board could not consider matters dedicated to the committee. He noted that Robert's Rules of Order and Board Bylaws allowed committee reconsideration to afford the Board a considered committee analysis. He felt the Board should distinguish between acceptance of report and approving action. He noted that recommendations from the committee should be adopted and the report should be accepted. He noted that this action taken by the committee did not necessarily require Board approval.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval to table action on the item. Regent Alden seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion to table failed. Regents Alden, Kirkpatrick, and Rosenberg voted yes. Regents Derby, Dondero, Gallagher, Hill, Phillips, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted no.

Upon a roll call vote the motion to approve the committee recommendations and accept the report carried. Regents Alden, Derby, Dondero, Gallagher, Hill, Phillips, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted yes. Regents Kirkpatrick and Rosenberg voted no.

Regent Seastrand noted that one candidate had withdrawn (Dr. Stephen Head), so there were six (6) finalists.

27. Public Comment – Mr. Chris Powell, representing the students of UNLV, stated that UNLV student government no longer wished to continue their relationship with KUNV. He stated that the majority of the students wanted to concentrate their efforts on other issues including: increasing student involvement, establishing traditions at UNLV, and establishing better lines of communication. He felt it important to understand that the student government never promised to support the current radio station. Students interested in the development of KUNV radio station were encouraged to form an organization and obtain recognition by CSUN to enable use of resources under the student organization umbrella. Student government acknowledged the possibility of sponsorship of student internships to work with the radio station and/or sponsorship of a student hour. Student government has no interest in the format of the radio station and believed it to be an issue to be addressed by Academic Affairs. CSUN apologized for any confusion.

Mr. Bill Newhall commented on President Richardson's resignation. He clarified that his silence was not indicative of faculty ambivalence, adding that the faculty was supportive of the stable environment that he created and deeply appreciated his leadership. He stated that Dr. Richardson would be sincerely missed.

Regent Wiesner asked whether there was interest in moving the next meeting from November 30-December 1 to December 7-8, adding that the UNLV Rebels would be playing in Hawaii. Regents Alden and Dondero had no problem with the change. Regent Sisolak requested feedback from students and faculty. Regent Rosenberg stated that his students would be studying for exams. President Harter stated that Board meetings were scheduled in advance on their calendars. President Wells noted a conflict with the DRI Foundation meeting. Mrs. Mary Spoon stated that UNR commencement was scheduled the following day, with events scheduled for that week. Ms. Ernst suggested a having a full business day on November 30th to accommodate travelers on December 1st. Chair Dondero stated that they would look at the situation, but the meeting was still scheduled for November 30-December 1, 2000.

28. New Business – None.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Suzanne Ernst

Chief Administrative Officer to the Board