

BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
D Building, Room D-152
Community College of Southern Nevada
6375 West Charleston Blvd., Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, March 1-2, 2001

Members Present:

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

Others Present:

Chancellor Jane Nichols
Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Dan Miles
Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Sherwin Iverson
General Counsel Tom Ray
Interim President Mike Meyer, CCSN
President Stephen Wells, DRI
President Ron Remington, GBC
Interim President Rita Huneycutt, TMCC
President Carol Lucey, WNCC
President Carol Harter, UNLV
Interim President Stephen McFarlane, UNR
President Richard Moore, NSCH
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

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

Chair Thalia Dondero called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. on March 1, 2001 with all members present.

1. Introductions – None noted.

2. Chair's Report – Chair Dondero thanked those faculty members and community leaders serving on the presidential search committees. She thanked Chancellor Jane Nichols, Dr. Joe Crowley and the campus

representatives for their efforts with the Nevada State Legislature. Chair Dondero expressed gratitude to the volunteers working on the three NSCH Task Forces, noting that their recommendations would be completed by April. She also thanked the CCSN staff for graciously hosting the meeting.

3. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Nichols provided the following update:

- The formation of a part-time faculty task force is in progress, with nominations for part-time and full-time faculty being solicited from each campus. Membership should be finalized within the next week. The task force will report to the Board no later than the October meeting.
- The police study task force held its first meeting under the leadership of Professor Ken Peak, UNR and Professor Dick McCorkle, UNLV. Regent Hill attended the meeting and provided valuable perspectives to the task force members. A report is expected for the Board's June meeting.
- Seven UCCSN researchers were awarded EPSCoR grants (5-UNR, 1-UNLV, and 1-DRI). Nevada has received the most defense-related grants during the past three years (17 DEPSCoR grants). Chancellor Nichols acknowledged the efforts of Ms. Lisa Zumpft as well as the research officers from each campus.
- In response to Governor Guinn's request for energy conservation among all state entities, each campus has been asked to develop an energy conservation plan for Dr. Nichols' review.
- An invitation was extended to the March celebration of Nevada's community colleges to be held in Carson City. A breakfast with Nevada legislators will be held Friday, March 23rd at 7:00 a.m. Dr. David Baime, Director of Government Relations at the American Association of Community Colleges, will be the keynote speaker. Other related events will be held March 22-23 on the WNCC Carson campus. Dr. Nichols expressed gratitude to the WNCC faculty and staff and to Dr. Chris Chairsell for planning the event.
- A new Assistant General Counsel has been hired in the Las Vegas System Administration office – Mr. Walter Ayers. He formerly served with the U.S. Attorney's office. Mr. Ayers will provide legal representation for UNLV.

Interim President Stephen McFarlane, UNR – President McFarlane introduced Ms. Diann Laing, Media Coordinator-UNR, who assisted with the presentation. President McFarlane reported that UNR was established in 1874 as a land grant university in Elko, Nevada, moving to Reno seven years later. The institution has been mindful of its mission for teaching, research, and outreach. Partnerships were formed primarily through the Cooperative Extension, School of Medicine, and College of Extended Studies to reach out to every part of the state.

- Teaching:
 - The CORE Writing Program - Attended by all first year students, it is committed to developing students' writing, critical thinking, and research abilities. The first year program includes English 101 and 102, which teaches students to communicate their own experiences in writing and the elements of research. Headed by Director Dr. Kathy Boardman, the program employs 13 English faculty, 23 teaching assistants, and 24 part-time instructors serving approximately 3,600 students.
 - The Excellence in Teaching Program - Developed for faculty in July 1999, under the leadership of Dr. Meggin McIntosh. The goal of the program is to help teachers reach their potential and increase student achievement utilizing five themes:
 - Promoting strategic teaching among faculty at the university.
 - Teaching to facilitate strategic learning by students at the university.
 - Documenting teaching effectiveness among faculty at the university.
 - Using technology to increase teaching and learning effectiveness.
 - Extending teaching effectiveness through electronic distance education.
- Research:
 - Critical to economic development – the annual economic impact of System research activities totals

approximately \$133 million.

- COBRE Research Program – Researchers Professor Joe Hume and Professor Burton Horowitz received a \$9.24 million grant from the National Institute of Health for their work in developing new treatments for heart disease.

- Hydrologic Sciences Program – a strong graduate program encompassing many different colleges and institutions, U.S. News and World Report has consistently rated it as one of the top ten interdisciplinary programs in the country. Some of the disciplines involved include: College of Agriculture, Mackay School of Mines, College of Engineering, and DRI. The program has a direct impact on solving water quality problems in sites across Nevada (Walker Lake, Lake Tahoe, Nevada Test Site), Greenland, and Antarctica. 95% of the 70 graduate students enrolled in the program are on funded research assistantships.

- Outreach:

- Sanford Center for Aging – In 1993, Mrs. Jean Sanford's estate made a substantial gift to make the Center possible. The mission is to develop innovative ideas, educational and research opportunities, and community partnerships that add life to years. The Center contributes to research, education, and community partners via programs such as RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteer Program) and the Sanford Salute to Seniors.

4. Rejected-System Ombudsman Study – The Board rejected a repeal of action taken at the September 7-8, 2000 Board meeting rejecting a study for a UCCSN Ombudsman position.

Regent Alden moved approval of repealing action taken at the September 7-8, 2000 Board meeting to reject a study of a UCCSN Ombudsman position. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Derby expressed frustration that, in spite of limited Board time, something that was previously voted down was brought back again for Board action. Regent Alden respectfully disagreed. Regent Sisolak asked whether there was new information since it was previously voted down. Chair Dondero replied that she did not have that information.

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

5. Information Only-N-STEP: A Cooperative Science Program – Dr. Sherwin Iverson reported that N-STEP is a program in which teams of Nevada high school students and teachers engage in a science research project under the directions of UCCSN scientists (DRI, CCSN, UNLV, and UNR). It is a competitive program with individual teams preparing a formal research paper, a scientific poster and an oral presentation of their work. He introduced program director Dr. Paul Buck.

Dr. Buck reported that a coalition had been formed between the National Science Foundation (NSF), UCCSN, Clark County School District and the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) to enhance secondary science teachers' understanding of science using UCCSN faculty. The goal was to realize higher achievement and interest among K-12 science students and increased enrollment in science fields at the UCCSN campuses.

N-STEP was developed for the following reasons:

- NDE issued new state standards for K-12 science education.

- Secondary science teachers generally do not have a major in any field of science.

State and federal guidelines call for more 'hands-on' and real-world research experience. Secondary science teachers statewide are asking for more university-based science classes. Nevada school districts provide only \$197/teacher/year for professional development (about 1/3 the national average).

N-STEP is a System-wide partnership consisting of:

DRI - Dr. Paul Buck, Director, Dr. Claudia Miner, Dr. Melanie Wetzel, and Dr. Gayle Dana.

UNLV – Dr. Aimee Govett and Dr. Peter Starkweather.

UNR – Dr. Dave Crowther and Dr. John Cannon.

CCSN – Dr. David Charlet.

N-STEP participants (99-00) included: 45 teachers, 60 students, 25 Nevada schools, 1 California school, and 1 Utah school. Planned projects for 2001 include:

Botany in Jarbidge Mountains, NV

Archaeology of Anasazi Mountain, Trumbull, AZ

Atmospheric science at Steamboat Springs, CO

Dr. Buck related that the 3-year NSF program funding would end in 2001 and introduced members of the 1st place team, which studied 'Controlling One's Temper: An Investigation into the Technical Properties of Ancient Pottery in the Virgin River Area of Southern Utah.' The student membership expressed their gratitude for the program and shared insightful revelations gained from the program. The team, from Douglas County High School in Minden, Nevada, was comprised of teachers Mr. Hal Starratt and Ms. Karen Heine and students Cicely Williams, Bonnie Lee, and Andy Johnson.

Regent Rosenberg reported the presentations had been wonderful. He asked whether there were plans to continue the grant. Dr. Buck replied that he would like to extend the program, adding that more programs of this nature were needed. He was unsure of continued NSF funding for the project. Regent Derby agreed that the program had been very beneficial for the students and complimented the team for bringing credit to their community.

6. Approved-CCSN Interim President – The Board approved the appointment of a new Interim President at CCSN effective March 1, 2001. Chair Dondero proposed the appointment of Mr. David Hoggard, Jr. with a contract of \$124,000/year and car allowance (salary and car allowance pro-rated to his time of service). Mr. Hoggard would not be a candidate for the permanent position and would serve until the permanent position was filled.

Regent Wiesner nominated Mr. Mike Meyer for the position of Interim President of CCSN. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Howard asked whether Board members were not accepting the Chair's recommendation. Regent Wiesner replied that while he respected the Chair's recommendation, he had nominated Mr. Mike Meyer for the position. Regent Sisolak respectfully agreed.

Regent Derby stated that she firmly believed in the established process for selecting interim appointments, adding that she supported Chair Dondero's recommendation and was not supportive of the motion, but she related she would support the Board's ultimate selection.

Regent Kirkpatrick reviewed criteria identified for the future CCSN president (i.e. doctoral degree, 7 or more years of experience directly applicable to the position with preference given to higher education, etc.). He felt the same guidelines should be applied to the interim appointment, adding that someone with knowledge of campus operations

was essential for the interim position. He expressed his respect for Mr. Meyer, but believed that Mr. Hoggard brought more skills and experience to the position. He noted that Mr. Hoggard has a master's degree in Education and had taken many advanced courses beyond that degree.

Regent Rosenberg felt that appointing Mr. Meyer could send the wrong message to the students and faculty since the System advocates that access to education provides access to important things in life and requires students to go through that process. He felt that exceptions should be based on a specific and demonstrated need. While he did not want to impugn Mr. Meyer's reputation, he could not support the motion.

Regent Howard indicated her respect for the Chair and Chancellor's recommendation. She stated that she has known Mr. Hoggard for many years, adding that he was very well respected in the higher education arena. She noted that his mother was the first black educator in Clark County. She felt that he would be the best person for the position. She noted that the Nevada Faculty Alliance had expressed strong opposition to Mr. Meyer. She stated that she did not personally know Mr. Meyer, but had heard that he possesses great fundraising skills. She felt that supporting the Chair's suggestion would be a positive move in the diversification of higher education administration. She urged Board members to support Mr. Hoggard's appointment.

Regent Seastrand felt that a doctoral degree was not necessary for an interim appointment. He indicated that he did not know Mr. Hoggard, but was impressed with Mr. Meyer and his ability to lead. He supported Mr. Meyer's appointment.

CCSN Faculty Senate Chair Dr. Fred Jackson stated that the process for determining interim appointments was important. The faculty appreciates the Chair and Chancellor providing faculty input to the process. He stated that CCSN faculty felt strongly that credentials and experience were critical issues. In the spirit of shared governance, they were prepared to work with the Board's selection. He asked that the Board consider the individual possessing the credentials and experience and support the established process, which he hoped would be continued.

Upon a roll call vote, the nomination of Mr. Mike Meyer carried. Regents Alden, Gallagher, Hill, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted yes. Regents Derby, Dondero, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Rosenberg voted no.

Regent Alden moved approval of making the appointment unanimous. Motion died for lack of second.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the contract terms as presented. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

The meeting recessed at 2:25 p.m. and reconvened at 2:35 p.m. with all members present.

Regent Alden moved for unanimous approval of the appointment of Mr. Mike Meyer as Interim President of CCSN. Regent Sisolak seconded.

General Counsel Ray related that Board process and parliamentary procedure did not recognize unanimous support. He noted that it had been Board custom to do so. Under parliamentary procedure a Board could act informally if there was unanimous consent. He recommended that if there was not unanimous consent, the motion not be made. Regent Alden respectfully disagreed. Regent Kirkpatrick observed that there was not unanimous consent. Regent Gallagher felt the Board should follow General Counsel's recommendation. Motion died due to lack of consent.

7. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Report - Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met March 1, 2001 and requested that System staff provide a report on past

and current practices for the calculation of graduate FTE at a future meeting. Dr. Sherwin Iverson reported that the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Councils would hold a joint meeting in April to review current transfer policy and to make recommendations for improvement. The Student Affairs Council will provide an update of the Council's activities to the Committee on a regular basis. A report on time to doctoral degrees will be presented at the June meeting. Results of a study on advisement will be presented at the August meeting. Regent Derby requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

2001 Board of Regents' Awards – The Committee reviewed recommendations of the selection committees for the following Regents' awards: (Ref. A on file in the Board office)

A. Nevada Regents' Researcher Award

Dr. Judith Chow, DRI

B. Nevada Regents' Creative Activity Award

Dr. David Hickey, UNLV

C. Nevada Regents' Teaching Award – Community College Faculty

Ms. Marilee Swirczek, WNCC

D. Nevada Regents' Teaching Award – University and DRI Faculty

Dr. Marta Meana, UNLV

E. Nevada Regents' Academic Advisor Awards

UNLV–Undergraduate – Ms. Heather Howard

UNLV-Graduate – Dr. Charles Regin

UNR-Undergraduate – Dr. Christine Cheney

UNR-Graduate – Dr. Mary Maples

CCSN – Ms. Carmen Martin

GBC – Teacher Education Committee

Ms. Julie Byrnes

Dr. Eric Henderson

Mr. Mike McFarlane

Ms. Lynne Ownes

Mrs. Nancy Remington

Mr. John Patrick Rice

Dr. Leonardo Sanchez-Saenz

TMCC – Ms. Cheryl Woehr

WNCC – Mr. Paul Nelson

New Program Proposals – The Committee reviewed the following new program proposals: (Ref. ARSA Report 03/2001 on file in the Board office)

BA, Integrative and Professional Studies, GBC

Ph.D., Learning and Technology Studies, UNLV

Ph.D., Educational Leadership, Emphasis on Higher Education Administration and Post-Secondary Education, UNLV

Ph.D., Teacher Education, UNLV

MS, Biochemistry, UNLV

Innovation in Existing Programs, UNLV – The Committee reviewed the following innovations to existing programs: (Ref. ARSA Report 03/2001 on file in the Board office)

Executive MBA
Dual Degree: MBA/MS, Hotel Administration
Professional MA, Criminal Justice

Regent Derby moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak indicated that he had grave concerns about the executive MBA at UNLV with a \$30,000 cost. Regent Derby noted that the Committee approved it with a 4-1 vote. President Harter related that the cost was all-inclusive for the 1½-year program and included all textbooks, travel to an international experience, faculty salaries, all registration and admissions costs. She noted that it was a self-supporting program and received no state subsidy. The cost was compared with 12 other institutions. Arizona State's fee is \$44,000 and the University of Utah's fee is \$25,000. She noted that the average fee for the program was \$30,309, and felt that UNLV's course was competitively priced. Dr. Harter related that most students in the program would be employed in middle management in their fields and their companies would pay some or this entire fee. Regent Alden stated that he reviewed every program in depth. He noted that they were not new program proposals, but had been planned for quite some time. He acknowledged that the RAND study recommended ceasing introduction of new programs. He encouraged full Board support of all of the programs recommended by the Committee.

Motion carried.

7.1 Approved-Bill Draft Request: External Contract Policy for Employees - The Committee reviewed a proposed change to NRS 281.221 (3), NRS 281.230 (3), and NRS 281.505 (3) and recommended approval. The change clarifies the Regents' authority in defining the conditions under which a staff member may enter into a contractual agreement. (Ref. ARSA Report 03/2001 on file in the Board office)

Regent Derby moved approval of the bill draft request. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

8. Approved-Audit Committee Report - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Audit Committee met March 1, 2001 and received follow-up responses for twelve internal audit reports presented to the Committee at the June, August, September, and October 2000 meetings. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit, reported that the institution bank reconciliations were up-to-date. Mr. Tom Judy, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration-UNR, reported on the status of the University of Nevada School of Medicine Practice Plan. A consolidated profit/loss statement for the six periods from July 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000 was distributed to the Committee. Net income for the period was reported at \$150,000. Mr. Judy indicated the external debt of the Practice Plan remains at approximately \$1.1 million. UNR is working with the bank to improve the interest on the Letter of Credit. Regent Alden requested that interest expense be separately reported on future reports. Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

Internal Audit Reports – The Committee reviewed the following Internal Audit reports: (Ref. B on file in the Board office)

Grants & Contracts Office, UNR
Student Financial Services, UNLV
Information & Marketing Services Department, WNCC

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

9. Approved-Campus Environment Committee Report - Chair Tom Kirkpatrick reported the Campus Environment Committee met March 1, 2001 and requested System staff to provide additional diversity data regarding ethnicity and age at the next meeting. The Committee requested a preamble be added to the UCCSN Diversity Goals which states: "the Regents are dedicated to equitably serving all citizens of Nevada and to the creation of an educational environment that promotes mutual respect and civility." President Harter suggested a change to item #3 of the UCCSN Diversity Goals: "Each institution will have courses that embody the experiences of traditionally underrepresented groups and women in an effort to enhance and deepen understanding of these groups, their history and culture." The Campus Climate Survey was distributed to be reviewed by diversity committee representatives and discussed at a future meeting. Regent Kirkpatrick requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

Final Report, 1999-2000 Diversity Goals – The Committee reviewed the final report concerning diversity goals established for 1999-2000.

Proposed 2001-2006 System Diversity Goals – The Committee reviewed System goals established in collaboration with campus representatives. (Ref. CEC-3 on file in the Board office)

Climate Survey – The Committee reviewed recommendations regarding a System-wide faculty climate survey scheduled for Fall 2001.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Kirkpatrick acknowledged and recognized the work of the campus representatives.

10. Approved-Finance & Planning Committee Report - Chair Dorothy Gallagher reported the Finance & Planning Committee met March 1, 2001 to review responses to questions raised at the last Committee meeting, the 2nd Quarter Fiscal 00-01 All Funds Report and the 2nd Quarter Fiscal 00-01 Fiscal Exceptions Report. Additionally, the Committee considered a revised Host Account Policy and approval of a Bill Draft Request to re-establish authorization for revenue bonds at UNLV and UNR. The Self-Supporting Summer School Budgets for 2001 were presented at the January meeting. The Committee requested additional information on the planned use of 'Transfers to Other Accounts' reflected in those budgets. The Committee received reports from UNR, UNLV, CCSN and TMCC on their transfers and reviewed the 2nd Quarter Fiscal Exceptions Report. Exceptions are noted when a self-supporting budget experiences a deficit or negative cash balance. Fiscal exceptions were noted for the UNR Fire Protection Training Academy with a deficit of \$2.6 million and the TMCC Food Service Management account with a potential deficit of \$265,601 in fiscal 2001. The TMCC deficit is expected to be cleared with additional account revenues and contingency reserves. No other exceptions were reported. The Exception Report also included information on the state appropriated budgets. Currently, UNR projects a net revenue surplus this year due to additional student fees and indirect cost recovery funds. All other institutions project revenue shortfalls primarily due to student enrollments being lower than anticipated and, in some cases, investment income being lower than budgeted. Expenditure budgets will be adjusted to compensate for the lower revenues. The Committee also reviewed and recommended approval of a revised Host Account Policy on Host Account expenditures. The revised policy and Chancellor's Memorandum are intended to clarify Board policy regarding the appropriate use of Host funds. The Committee also recommends approval of a Bill Draft Request (BDR) to re-establish revenue bond authority for UNLV and UNR. Revenue bonds for specific campus projects may be issued by UCCSN up to the limits established by the Legislature. In the last two years both UNLV and UNR have issued revenue bonds for projects and used much of the approved authority level. Under current limits UNLV has \$18 million and UNR has \$8.5 million in authority. If plans or

opportunities in the next two years require bonding in excess of current limits the authority level must be revised. The proposed BDR would set UNLV authority at \$57 million and UNR's at \$42 million. The Board of Regents would retain control of the issuance of bonds and approval of individual projects. Regent Gallagher requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

Host Account Policy – The Committee reviewed current Handbook policies (Title 4, Chapter 10, Section 16) on host accounts. (Ref. C on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden moved approval of the Host Account Policy. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Sisolak had a question on the table purchase policy. Regent Gallagher replied that it was not part of the motion and would be revised and reconsidered by the Committee and released as a Chancellor's Memorandum.

Motion carried.

Bill Draft Request – The Committee proposed a bill draft request to re-establish revenue bond authority for UNLV and UNR.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Bill Draft Request and acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Sisolak asked about the table purchase limits for state colleges. Chancellor Nichols replied that the Committee requested the Chancellor's Memorandum be revised to reflect concerns addressed in the meeting and resubmit it at the next meeting. She indicated that she would develop an amount for the state colleges.

11. Approved-Health Care Education Committee Report - Chair Doug Seastrand reported the Health Care Education Committee met February 14, 2001. Dr. Robert Miller, Dean of the University of Nevada School of Medicine (SOM), presented an Academic Medical Center proposal that, if approved by the Board, would be submitted to the City of Las Vegas. The proposal will provide the City with information necessary for UCCSN potentially to receive land in downtown Las Vegas for the construction of the Academic Medical Center. Mayor Oscar Goodman attended the meeting to answer questions posed by Committee members. He requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

Academic Medical Center – The Committee recommended that the Board of Regents submit a proposal to the City of Las Vegas that authorizes UNR and UNLV to negotiate an exchange of land in the Las Vegas Technology Center for land in the 100 South Grand project with the terms and conditions of the exchange subject to Board approval. Further the committee recommended Board authorization for UNR and UNLV to begin negotiation with the City of Las Vegas to explore the possibility of building an Academic Medical Center on land in the City's 100 South Grand project. At this time the Board would make no commitment to fund an Academic Medical Center.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Alden asked about obligation to a future financial commitment. General Counsel Ray replied that the proposal must be clear that it was limited to an exchange of land. He related that he had reviewed the proposal that was submitted to the Committee. If the City accepts the proposal it would need to be presented to the full Board for approval of the terms and conditions.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether the Committee was requesting the ability to draft a proposal for a land exchange and that the Board was simply giving them the authority to explore possibilities. General Counsel Ray replied that the proposal was already drafted. He recommended the Board authorize a proposal be submitted to the City of Las Vegas to exchange land. It would be subject to Board approval of the terms and conditions imposed by the City. Regent Rosenberg stated that he was not clear on what the Board was approving. General Counsel Ray related that the intent was to develop an Academic Medical Center (AMC), which the Board could not commit to building in the proposal. Regent Rosenberg asked whether money was involved in the exchange of property, what the Board would receive and what the Board would give up. He asked whether there was a time limit on the property and who would build the building. He indicated that he could not support such vague language. Regent Seastrand clarified that the Committee was asking for the ability to submit a proposal to the City of Las Vegas indicating that the Board would like to build an AMC downtown. He noted that the Board would exchange Board-owned property for the City-held property. If the City accepted the proposal, the terms would be negotiated. Regent Rosenberg stated that he had not yet agreed that it was a good idea to build an AMC. Chancellor Nichols stated that her understanding was that before the Board could agree to build an AMC there would need to be a feasibility study, a long-term plan and facts on which to base such a decision. She explained that the Committee recommendation was to approve the proposal of a land swap with the suggestion that an AMC be placed on that land if funding and Board approval transpired in the future. She stated that the Board could not approve the AMC in the proposal. Regent Seastrand added that the motion included a statement that the Board was not approving the AMC that day. He related that the Board was considering the exchange of property set aside for medical purposes for the City land in question.

Regent Alden stated that while he supported the proposal he would not support the exchange of land. General Counsel Ray replied that the proposal before the Board related to an exchange of land with the City of Las Vegas. Regent Alden was not in support of such a proposal.

Regent Hill asked for clarification regarding what the Board was acting upon. General Counsel Ray related that if the Board approved the recommendation, the Committee would submit a proposal to the City suggesting a land exchange. The City's response and/or terms and conditions would be returned to the full Board for approval. Regent Hill asked whether the Board was authorizing negotiations, with the understanding that those negotiations would be subject to another vote of the Board. General Counsel Ray agreed. Regent Hill acknowledged the benefits of an AMC, but was unsure how it could be realistically accomplished. He felt it was a wonderful concept but failed to recognize a funding source.

Regent Wiesner asked whether the property exchange would yield development of a medical center. General Counsel Ray replied that if the City accepted the System's proposal they would likely provide a date by which it must be completed or the land would revert back to the City. Regent Kirkpatrick stated that the Board could only vote to submit a proposal to the City that presented no long-term System commitments. Regent Gallagher noted that the Tenaya land was given for medical development. She felt it unlikely that land would be developed for such a purpose. She noted that the Board would exchange the Tenaya land for City-held property where they may or may not develop an AMC. She felt the Board would be no worse for the exchange, adding that it would depend on whether funding was available. She did not perceive any detrimental effect with the land exchange.

Regent Sisolak stated that he was supportive of the concept, but was confused by the discussion. General Counsel Ray related that if the Board approved the Committee recommendation they would be implicitly endorsing the concept of building an AMC. He noted that since the Board did not have the funding they could not make a binding commitment to build one in the future. President Harter related that UNR and UNLV each received land from the City at the Tenaya site. It was agreed to develop a medical- or biomedical-related activity on some combination of that land. She related that it never transpired and the feeling was that it was more feasible in the downtown area. Dr. McFarlane itemized the advantages of the land exchange: 1) It would provide more land for development of a more

intensive center and 2) The location was more conducive to patient flow. Dean Miller clarified that 10 acres was donated to the SOM in 1995 for medical development. The land would revert back to the City if not developed within 3 years. He noted there had already been two extensions. He stated that similar caveats would apply to the downtown property. Ms. Lesa Coper, Office of Business Development for the City of Las Vegas, stated that all of the proposals would be reviewed and ranked in order of best use of the property. The city council would then determine which projects to pursue. Negotiations would begin after that point. Upon city council action and approval, those negotiations would become final and binding. She noted that Board discussion regarding the exchange of land would not be final at this point.

Regent Derby observed that the System would be acquiring more valuable land, even if they were unable to develop it in the manner desired. Chair Dondero agreed. Regent Sisolak asked for clarification on the Tenaya site. Dean Miller stated that it had been deeded to the System with the caveat that it reverts back to the City if no construction had begun. The deadline now is the end of February 2002. General Counsel Ray stated that he had not seen the recorded document from that transaction. He reported that it was possible to deed property with certain restrictions.

Regent Howard asked whether the deadline was that day. Dean Miller replied that it was because the City released a Request for Proposal for the land that was due March 3rd. He noted they were requesting Board consideration the land be used for such purposes. Regent Howard asked whether other entities were vying for that land. Dean Miller replied that there were. Regent Sisolak asked whether the motion before the Board represented what the Committee decided to move forward with. Regents Dondero and Gallagher replied that it was. Ms. Ernst related that the agenda language reflected the exact motion language from the tape of the Committee meeting. Regent Seastrand explained that his motion was intended to clarify the recommendation.

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

12. Approved-Investment Committee Report - Chair Mark Alden reported the Investment Committee met January 30, 2001. Mr. Lindsay Van Voorhis of Cambridge Associates provided an update of market index performance for 2001. It was a tough year for equity markets with the S&P 500 down 9.1%, international stocks down -14.2%, and U.S. stocks down -10.3%. Mr. Van Voorhis reviewed asset allocation and performance for the UCCSN's pooled endowment and pooled operating funds for the quarter and year ended December 31, 2000. Endowment investments returned -1.1% for the quarter and 3.7% for the calendar year 2000. For the year, the System outperformed its index by 7.2%. The System's managers' defensive characteristics helped them to post strong results relative to their benchmarks over this period. The System's allocation to REITs, absolute return and private equity also helped to boost performance. The total return for the pooled operating funds was 0.7% for the 4th quarter and 6.3% for calendar year 2000. The Committee discussed current asset allocation and spending policies of the operating funds. At the end of December the operating funds were running a deficit of \$3.17 million. After a lengthy discussion, the Committee left the current target allocations and spending policy unchanged and agreed to review the spending policy at its April meeting. The System's endowment fund in 2000 outperformed an index fund benchmark by 7.2%, resulting in an additional \$18.2 million in capital. Navellier agreed to a requested reduction in their fees (from 45 to 40 basis points), which was well below industry averages. A letter will also be sent to Cadence Capital requesting a similar reduction in their fees. The Committee took no action.

Regent Alden moved acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

13. Approved-UNR Presidential Search Committee Report - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the UNR

Presidential Search Committee met February 21, 2001. Consultant Shirley Chater presented the resumes of the eleven semi-finalists. Dr. Chater reviewed the process that culminated in the selection of the semi-finalists and answered questions from the committees. The committees agreed that all of the candidates should remain in the pool and reference checks be made. Committee members volunteered to contact the references provided by the candidates and discussed what questions would be asked. The findings will be brought to the March 5th Committee meeting. Regent Hill noted that one of the candidates had already accepted a position at another institution. The committees agreed they had a very good pool of candidates. The number of candidates will be reduced to the finalists for the position at the next meeting.

Regent Hill moved acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded

Regent Kirkpatrick asked about the dates and locations for candidate interviews. Ms. Ernst stated that the dates had not been finalized yet, adding that all the finalists would come to southern Nevada to meet the southern Nevada Regents. Regent Hill related that approximately five candidates would be interviewed and then the committees would narrow the list to approximately three candidates who would visit northern and southern Nevada.

Regent Alden related that he had reviewed all eleven candidates. He expressed appreciation to Dr. Chater and commended the process for selecting them.

Motion carried. Regent Sisolak was absent.

14. Approved-CCSN Search Process – The Board approved the Chancellor's recommendation for the ad hoc CCSN Presidential Search Committee to proceed on March 9th to continue the current search (with four finalists) or hire a search firm if needed to complete the CCSN search, at a budgeted amount not to exceed \$45,000. Chancellor Nichols related that this would put the System in the strongest possible position to resume the search. She noted that it allowed for either possibility and did not dictate that one or the other be followed. She stated that it was possible the Supreme Court decision could dictate action that the Committee must take. She reported there was still \$20,000 unspent in the original search. The additional amount was recommended in case of need. She wanted to provide the Committee the ability to move quickly and have a president selected by mid-summer. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the \$45,000 included the unspent \$20,000. Chancellor Nichols replied that it did.

Regent Sisolak reentered the meeting.

Regent Alden asked about the number of finalists. Chancellor Nichols replied there were five. Regent Alden asked which candidate had removed their name from consideration. Chancellor Nichols replied that Dr. Vivelo accepted another position in New Mexico. Regent Alden recommended that a CCSN president be selected as quickly as possible and felt the search should be completed in open session.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the materials could be made public if a search firm were hired. He stated that there was a suspicion or perception that using a search firm allowed things to be hidden. Chancellor Nichols replied that the search firm would own the applications until a list of finalists was released to the Committee. She stated that the search firm could be instructed to share more names with the Committee, but once the names were provided to the Committee they became public information. She felt it was clear from comments shared by Dr. Chater that going public early in the pool was a problem for executives at that level. She believed the primary reason for considering a search firm at this time was the time factor. She felt the Committee would be able to complete the search more quickly if they had to start over. Regent Derby noted that a primary reason for hiring a search firm was the ability to identify qualified candidates who were actively recruited into the pool. She felt it enhanced the quality of the pool.

Regent Hill felt the Committee should make its own decision.

Regent Hill moved approval of a budgeted amount not to exceed \$45,000, should the Committee determine to hire a search firm to complete the search. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked about a search firm recommending the same group of candidates. Regent Kirkpatrick replied that ACCT might suggest a candidate previously submitted, but also searched for new candidates. He felt it would provide new candidates. Regent Derby related that her experience had been that the consultant facilitated the construction of a profile/description and then found the best people fitting the description determined by the Committee to move the institution forward. The consultants know these people and would know whether or not they fit the profile submitted. Regent Gallagher acknowledged that it likely was the same pool of candidates as there were limited individuals qualifying for the position. She noted that many may possess the qualifications but were not the proper fit. The consultant assists with determining the proper fit. Regent Rosenberg stated that many candidates were involved in other searches as well. He felt that no attempt was being made at secrecy, but that it was for the candidates' protection. Regent Alden recommended the four remaining candidates be interviewed and move along so that CCSN would have a president soon. He indicated that he would be voting no on the motion.

Regent Sisolak stated that he understood the academic viewpoint, but was troubled with confidential personnel reports and confidential draft reports leading to a perception that the System was hiding something. Regent Gallagher stated that opening personnel matters would lead to more problems.

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

15. Approved-Suspension of Regents' Recognition Program – The Board approved suspending the Regents' Recognition Program. In the interest of complying with the Governor's call for internal cost-savings among the various segments of state government, Chancellor Nichols recommended suspending the Regents' Recognition Program beginning 2001. The program may be reevaluated in future years for possible reestablishment. The recognition program is not mandated by Board policy and the suspension required no Handbook change. Dr. Nichols noted the need to standardize the selection process and the number of individuals recognized at each institution. She related that the presidents and faculty senate were in agreement that this type of recognition could best be accomplished on the individual campuses. She reported that the cost of that evening's reception was approximately \$12,500 with 209 staff hours at the System level.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the suspension of the Regents' Recognition Program. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Derby asked whether there would be other ways to honor those individuals. Chancellor Nichols replied that the campuses felt it would be more meaningful to honor them individually on their own campus. Regent Seastrand noted that with the elimination of the program previous awards were now more valuable. Mr. Ledon asked about the 2000 northern ceremony. Chancellor Nichols replied that it would be held in the north this year as well, but that it would be the last year.

Motion carried.

16. Approved-Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda:

(1)Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the meeting held January 18-19, 2001.

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

Computer Desks Room 134C (Charleston Campus)\$10,900
International Space Station Model (Cheyenne Campus)22,000
TOTAL:\$32,900

(3)Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, WNCC – The Board approved the use of \$5,000 in Capital Improvement Fee funds for water mitigation at Western Nevada Community College. (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office)

(4)Approved-Roundabout Easement Amendment, DRI – The Board approved amending a grant of public access easement between the Board of Regents/UCCSN, on behalf of DRI, and MACPartners LLC and J.R. Investments LLC (MAC/J.R.), previously approved at the October 1999 Board meeting. The amended easement allows for design revisions requested by the Regional Transportation Commission to improve traffic flow and benefits DRI and TMCC. (Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office)

(5)Approved-Allocation of Grants-in-Aid, 2001-2002 – The Board approved the allocation of Grants-in-Aid for 2001-2002. NRS 396.540 provides for tuition waivers for 'students from other states and foreign countries, not to exceed a number equal to three percent of the total matriculated enrollment of students for the past preceding fall semester.' Board policy provides for grants-in-aid for the same number of students for the payment of in-state registration fees. It should be noted that the allocations are amounts that institutions could award. In all cases funding is not sufficient to support the statutory and Board maximums.

Based upon enrollment figures for Fall 2000, the officers have requested the following allocation of Grants-in-Aid for Fall 2001-2002:

IN-STATEOUT-OF-STATE
CCSN 979979
GBC 9898
TMCC 326326
WNCC 170170
UNLV 620620
UNR 394394

(6)Approved-Tenure – The Board approved of tenure for the individuals listed below as recommended by the institution presidents, effective July 1, 2001.

CCSN – (Ref. C-6a on file in the Board office)

Dr. Froozan Pourboghraht Afiat
Ms. Barbara Graham
Mr. Charles E. Obi
Dr. Victor Hugo Alvarez
Dr. Linda Graham
Dr. Ekwueme Obie Ogbonna
Mr. Dennis Angel
Mr. Michael Granata
Mr. Alok Pandey

Ms. Katherine L. Baker
Ms. Roberta (Robin) Grenz
Mr. Steve Pannell
Mr. Lee Barnes
Mr. Robert Gutschick
Mr. Robert S. Partch
Dr. J. David Batchelor
Dr. Dana L. Haldeman
Mr. Norman Mark Rauls
Ms. Sherri A. Burgess
Ms. Elizabeth Ann Hanley
Mr. Richard A. Reitz
Dr. Frances M. Campbell
Mr. Adrian Havas
Dr. Maria C. Roa
Dr. Sylvia Cara-Monica
Mr. Jerry R. Hodges
Dr. Sherry L. Rosenthal
Dr. Ronald J. Casey
Mr. Carlton R. Insley III
Ms. Vivienne J. Sario
Ms. Patricia Castro
Ms. Sally J. Johnston
Dr. Samuel Sarri
Dr. David Charlet
Ms. Terri A. Jones
Mr. David Schultz
Dr. Elizabeth Cluff
Dr. Richard Knies
Dr. Marianne L. Sebok-Shillingburg
Mr. Gary Cohen
Mr. Christopher G. Kuchuris
Dr. Warren C. Shillingburg
Ms. Susana Contreras de Finch
Ms. Marcela La Bounty
Mr. Cameron Smith
Ms. Gabriele C.J. Costa
Ms. Patricia (Trish) LaFlamme
Mr. David R. Smith
Ms. Doreen S. Craig
Dr. Kevin Marie Laxalt
Ms. Gretchen Smolka
Mr. Ray Demman
Mr. Thomas P. Lisa, Jr.
Ms. Sandra Strickland
Ms. Myrna Elyse Diamond
Mr. Michael Love
Ms. Patricia Vazquez

Dr. Christian I. Egemba
Dr. Robert Manis
Dr. Jess F. Veasey
Ms. Tina D. Eliopoulos
Mr. Joseph F. McDonald
Mr. Stan VerNooy
Ms. Rhonda Faul
Dr. Joan B. McGee
Ms. Michelle Ann Ware
Ms. Lynn Forkos
Dr. Marcus A. Mihail
Mr. Ronald W. Yates
Dr. Cynthia L. Glickman
Ms. Jill Mora
Mr. Michael E. Young

GBC – (Ref. C-6b on file in the Board office)

Mr. Jon H. Licht
Ms. Lynne R. Owens
Ms. Lynn M. Mahlberg
Ms. Nancy Remington

TMCC – (Ref. C-6c on file in the Board office)

Mr. Daniel Adams
Mr. William A. Gallegos
Dr. Jamie D. Campbell
Ms. Sharon Lowe
Mr. Carlo Ferguson-McIntyre
Ms. Ruth McKnight
Mr. John J. Fitzsimmons
Dr. John B. Reid

WNCC – (Ref. C-6d on file in the Board office)

Mr. Tim Guthrie
Mr. Leonard F. MacKey

UNLV – (Ref. C6e on file in the Board office) *Denotes recommendation for both promotion and tenure.

*Dr. Alike Barnstone
*Dr. Barbara A. Luke
Ms. Susan Biery
*Dr. Steven G. McCafferty
Mr. Joe Nathan Bynum, Jr.
Dr. Susan Rush Michael
*Dr. Gurpreet S. Dhillon
Dr. Peter Michel
*Dr. Zhonghai Ding
*Ms. Victoria A. Nozero
Mr. Brackley S. Frayer

Dr. Linda F. Quinn
*Dr. Nancy P. Gallavan
*Dr. Gail Sammons
*Dr. Cynthia Giorgis
*Dr. Stowe Shoemaker
*Dr. Kathryn M. Hausbeck
Dr. Gale M. Sinatra
*Dr. William H. Johnson
*Ms. Penelope A. Whitten

UNR – (Ref. C-6f on file in the Board office) *Denotes recommendation for both promotion and tenure.

*Dr. Inmaculada B. Aban
*Dr. Hugh L. Shapiro
*Dr. Michael A. Crognale
*Ms. Millie L. Syring
*Dr. David T. Crowther
*Dr. Ronald S. Tibben-Lembke
Dr. Hussein S. Hussein
Dr. Scott W. Tyler
Dr. Dale W. Johnson
Dr. Christopher S. von Bartheld
*Dr. Horst Lange
*Dr. Eric L. Wang
*Dr. Swatee Naik
*Dr. Lynda R. Wiest
*Dr. Mark W. Nichols
Mr. Robert E. Wilson
*Dr. Robert G. Qualls
*Dr. James Winn
*Dr. Alice Running
*Dr. Jeanne H. Yamamura
*Dr. David W. Zeh

(7)Approved-Handbook, Student Fees for Financial Aid – The Board approved revisions to the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 18, Sections 16.2, 16.3, and 16.4, to incorporate Board action increasing the percent of funds available for need-based financial aid. (Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office)

(8)Approved-Handbook, Nevada Student Alliance Constitution – The Board approved revisions to the Handbook, Title 5, Chapter 21, Section 300.0, regarding meeting dates to provide more flexibility for the students to meet. (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office)

(9)Information Only-Handbook, Summer Term Salary Schedules – This is the first reading for a Handbook revision, Title 4, Chapter 3, to update the summer term salary schedules for 2001 at UNLV and UNR. Board action will be requested at the April meeting. (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office)

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

Regent Rosenberg noted that he was abstaining from the vote so as not to be perceived in conflict of interest.

Regent Sisolak requested an explanation for #5 (Allocation of Grants-in-Aid, 2001-2002). Dr. Nichols replied that it was an annual accounting of the number of grants-in-aid that could be awarded (maximum). She noted that less would actually be granted because grants-in-aid were never fully funded, adding that the figures change yearly as headcount changes.

Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained.

17. Tabled-Handbook, Proposed Mission Statement, Intercollegiate Athletics, UCCSN – The Board tabled adoption of the proposed UCCSN mission statement (second revision) regarding Intercollegiate Athletics. (Ref. E on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden explained his recommendations for the System mission statement. He felt that a Board statement was necessary. Regent Sisolak asked why the statement solely specified 'universities'. Regent Alden replied that the language could be modified, adding that he was specifically considering Division I competitions. Regent Sisolak asked about CCSN's baseball team. Regent Alden replied that he had not intended to leave any institution out of consideration. He felt a preamble was needed for Section 17. Regent Seastrand asked about feedback from the university presidents and Athletics representatives. President Harter replied that it was fine with UNLV, which already has a mission statement and a series of goals that reflect institutional goals. She noted that UNLV's statement was praised in the NCAA certification review. Regent Kirkpatrick suggested allowing Regent Alden to amend Section 17. Regent Alden indicated that he would work with General Counsel Ray.

Regent Hill moved approval of tabling action to a future meeting. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regent Wiesner voted no.

Regent Gallagher asked how alike the two universities' mission statements were. Presidents Harter and McFarlane felt they were fairly close. Chair Dondero related that the matter had been tabled and there would be no further discussion.

18. Approved-Handbook, Student Financial Aid Policy – The Board approved: 1) Suspension for the 2001-03 biennium of current Board policy (Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 1.3) requiring one-half of the student fee increase be set aside for financial aid and 2) New language for this policy for subsequent biennia. (Ref. F on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols recommended removing 'dedicated to the state budget' and a reference to another section in the Handbook. Currently funds are set aside and dedicated to specific enterprises (i.e. student government) before the money is sent to the state general fund. It was discovered that it does not come back from the state in new budget allocations. That puts the campuses in the difficult position to find the funds elsewhere. The proposed change would assure that funds are used for the purpose intended by the Board.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the new student financial aid policy. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Hill asked how the proposed change was an improvement. Dr. Nichols replied that part of future fee increases would be held at the System to be used for financial aid.

Motion carried.

19. Approved-Handbook, Grants-in-Aid, Professional Staff & Dependents – The Board approved a Handbook revision, Chapter 18, Section 5, Subsection 5. The amendment more specifically defines the term "financially

dependent child" in order to bring UCCSN policy in line with IRS criteria for dependent status. Chancellor Nichols noted that current policy was not in compliance with IRS requirements. The definition must be brought in compliance with IRS requirements or the benefit will be taxed, which would decrease the benefit.

5. For the purposes of this chapter, "financially dependent child" shall mean a natural, adopted or step-son or step-daughter of a professional staff member, who receives at least fifty percent (50%) of his or her financial support from the professional staff member and/or the professional staff member's spouse, who has not attained the age of 24, and is not married. The professional staff member must complete and sign a dependency declaration each time a grand-in-aid is issued.

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

20. Information Only-Handbook, Regents' Bylaw Amendment - This was the first reading of a proposed Handbook revision, Title 1, Article IV, Section 2, Election of Officers. The amendment would clarify and/or limit the number of successive terms a Board Chairperson could serve. Board action will be requested at the April meeting. (Ref. G on file in the Board office)

Regent Kirkpatrick stated that the amendment was designed to clarify ambiguous language. Regent Alden asked whether General Counsel Ray reviewed the amendment for clarity. General Counsel Ray believed that it did. He suggested that he would present two versions for Board discussion at the next meeting (partial terms). Regent Kirkpatrick clarified that they would vote at the April meeting and General Counsel Ray agreed. Regent Hill stated that he would provide General Counsel with suggested language changes. Regent Sisolak asked whether the 2-year lapse was new. Regent Kirkpatrick related that he obtained that from a seminar he attended the previous year advising rotating Board leadership. Regent Sisolak clarified that it would involve a change from a 1-year lapse to a 2-year lapse. Regent Kirkpatrick agreed. Regent Derby stated that she was not supportive of term limits anywhere. She thought that providing flexibility when choosing the best leader without term limits was a healthy choice.

21. Information Only-Handbook, Student/Special Fees - This was the first reading of proposed student fee changes for the institutions. Board action will be requested at the April meeting. (Ref. H on file in the Board office)

Mrs. Sandi Cardinal provided a synopsis of new and proposed special fees and changes in fees. Regent Seastrand asked whether the technology fee should be revisited since the new formulas now funded technology. Chancellor Nichols reported that the new formula included funding for technology for desktop equipment, new hires, and a 3-year equipment replacement. She stated that since it was not sufficient to cover the needs for student labs, the budget request included a \$6.5 million request for equipment that was not in the Governor's recommended budget. She felt it appropriate to reassess System needs after seeing what the state funded. Regent Seastrand agreed it would be appropriate to do so. He was hopeful that the student technology fee would sunset and possibly lower student fees. Chancellor Nichols acknowledged that the students stepped forward last time, because there was insufficient funding from the state.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that good things had been accomplished with the technology fee in the last year. She acknowledged that students do not relish increased fees, but felt that it would be a shame if the money were not available for the coming year because it was definitely needed. Ms. Radloff agreed, adding that the graduate student association had acquired more computers for student use. She felt that clear, positive results had been seen.

Regent Gallagher noted that the institutions had been behind for so long. Even if the state provided more money, they would still need to keep pace with technological innovations.

Regent Sisolak asked about energy surcharge fees for UNR. Chancellor Nichols replied that the state was currently collecting information regarding the impact of increased energy costs. Vice Chancellor Miles related that the state surveyed all state agencies including higher education. A summary report was delivered yesterday and he was uncertain what the state planned to do with that information. He related that System Administration was surveying the institutions independently and would share that information with Carson City.

Regent Howard stated that students had expressed concern about the technology fees during the student forums that she held at various institutions. She requested feedback. Mrs. Cardinal reported there is a \$4/credit technology fee that is paid by the students. Additional laboratory fees are assessed in warranted classes (i.e. TMCC will charge a fee for a student kit in addition to the technology fee assessed per credit). She noted that the Board approves any special fees over \$50. Regent Howard asked what constituted lab fees. Mrs. Cardinal replied that it could be for music classes, science and computer classes, welding, or whenever supplies were required to complete the course. She also noted corrections to the reference material that would be accurately reflected in the April packet.

Regent Sisolak asked about the UNLV parking fee increase. Dr. Rebecca Mills replied that a letter was sent to the Regents because they knew there would be calls. Because the parking fee is not mandatory, the Board does not approve it. Regent Seastrand noted that the primary student complaint was parking. He could not remember when a presentation had been provided regarding the use of parking fees. President Harter stated that there had not been an increase in 6 years. The parking fees were used to build the parking garage.

Ms. Jakubowski stated that her constituents actively use the Health Center as their primary health care provider and were concerned about the survival and expansion of services offered by the Health Center. She indicated that UNR graduate students support the \$66 increase and requested the Regents help maintain the Health Center with System financial support.

Chair Dondero noted that the Reapportionment discussion would take place on Friday earlier than originally scheduled due to the progress sustained on Thursday.

The meeting recessed at 4:30 p.m. and reconvened at 8:35 a.m. on Friday, March 2nd with all members present except Regent Seastrand. Chair Dondero noted an article authored by President Stephen Wells regarding forming a Nevada research alliance to stimulate technology-base economic growth. Regent Hill observed that President Wells received the Farouk El-Baz award for desert studies. Regent Sisolak introduced several UNLV students in attendance at the meeting.

22. Information Only-Legislative Report – Assistant to the Chancellor for Legislative Relations Dr. Joe Crowley reported on current bill draft requests (BDR's) and other legislative initiatives relevant to UCCSN. Vice Chancellor Dan Miles provided a brief update on the Governor's recommended budget. (Ref. D on file in the Board office)

Dr. Crowley discussed the System's lobbying effort with the Legislature. He met with each institution to determine their priority projects, adding that legislative relations representatives (6) meet bi-weekly to exchange information. Minutes from those meetings will be sent to Board members, the Chancellor's Cabinet, and institution presidents. Faculty senate and student body representatives will also be provided with periodic updates. A meeting was planned with the institutions' public information officers for the coming week. Meetings with the Assembly Ways & Means and Senate Finance representatives have gone well. Dr. Crowley was trying to arrange legislative visits for the campus legislative relations representatives and presidents. Most institution presidents and legislative relations personnel have taken advantage of those meetings. He indicated that he spends a fair amount of time tracking BDR's via the Legislature's bill tracking system. He is following approximately 40 bills and is establishing a system

that will notify them of changes to the BDR's being followed. Dr. Crowley reported on specific bills of UCCSN interest:

- AB25 would afford other institutions (i.e. Sierra Nevada College) participation in the Millennium Scholarship program. It will likely result in changes to the Millennium Scholarship program.
- SB54 proposes specialized plates on behalf of animal rights (PETA). The System has been in conflict with that organization in the past and were going to oppose the measure. Appropriate amendments have been made regarding local distribution of the fees, so the UCCSN will not oppose it.
- SCR10 encourages UCCSN and other organizations to participate in economic development and diversification.
- SBR40 proposes scholarships for disadvantaged, underrepresented students in the School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry. It would appropriate \$50,000/year for 4 years.
- SB195 relates to right-of-way on state highways and is sponsored by the telecommunications industry. UCCSN's concern is what it would do to the Internet 2 connection and the Nevada Network serving the public school system with distance education. He reported a contentious environment during the hearing. The System remained neutral since its interests were not at stake during that portion of the hearing.
- AB216 proposes appropriation of \$100,000/year to the state Commission on Economic Development to support biotechnology and work with the UCCSN in the interest of advancing assorted biotechnology programs and initiatives.
- AB193 would appropriate funds to the Office of Diversity Initiatives at UNLV to help the economically disadvantaged achieve a 4 year degree.
- SB95 would authorize state employees to obtain state retirement credit for unused sick leave.
- Another bill would provide matching contributions to deferred compensation programs for classified workers, which would have a significant fiscal impact (\$600/month/classified employee).
- AB47 (from the last session) – a report is expected on implementation of a teacher recruitment/professional development plan. Dr. Chris Chairsell will testify as well as other campus representatives who worked on development of the plan.
- AB118 proposes \$600,000 to assist low-income, single-parent students at UNR and UNLV.
- AB146 proposes a center for statistics in the UNLV Department of Criminal Justice.
- AB39 proposes high tech centers in Yerington and Fernley. A BDR also exists for one in Douglas County.
- AB5 proposes a Winnemucca facility for Great Basin College (GBC).
- SB97 proposes building a residence hall on the GBC campus in Elko.
- AB143 would establish a community college in Pahrump.
- AB220 discusses school violence; UCCSN is mentioned as having influence with Metro P.D., County Sheriff, and/or Reno P.D.
- AB253 – Uniform Athletic Agent Act provides for registration, regulation and certain prohibitions and penalties for agents of student athletes.

Dr. Crowley related that BDR's not yet released as bills included one that would make the CCSN Cheyenne campus a separate institution.

Chair Dondero requested a list of bills be provided to the Regents weekly. Dr. Crowley related that he intended to provide that information as the BDR's became bills.

Chancellor Nichols indicated that the System felt it inappropriate for the Legislature to make such a decision for the CCSN campus. Regent Sisolak stated that it would be helpful to know the sponsor's names.

Regent Howard asked about AB39 (high tech centers in Yerington and Fernley). Chancellor Nichols reported that it was her understanding that it was still in BDR form. Regent Howard related that she understood the bill to make the Cheyenne campus a separate institution was being revised. Dr. Crowley replied that BDR's in the process of revision would eventually be released as an actual bill. Regent Howard asked how the System position was determined and indicated her support of the Chancellor's position on the Cheyenne campus. Dr. Crowley replied that they follow the will of the Board and, when none was indicated, he spoke with the Chancellor to determine the position. Dr. Nichols stated that bills come up very quickly and a decision was needed on whether to and/or who should testify. She reviews the Regents' positions, priorities and budget priorities. She felt the Cheyenne campus issue was easy to determine because it was a Board decision to make. On more complex issues with less clarity, she consults with her staff, campus presidents and representatives directly involved (i.e. the telecommunications bill). She related that she makes the final decision on which position to take. She noted that they also consider the political ramifications of taking a position in some instances. When a bill is not likely to pass and it is not necessary to establish a System position, one is not taken. She stated that if there were a lack of certainty of the Board's will, there would be time to contact Board members. She noted that it was unlikely there would be time to wait for a Board meeting. Regent Howard stated that she was informed about the Cheyenne campus bill from a college president. She wondered how the Regents would be informed. Chair Dondero explained that she had requested weekly reports for the Regents. Regent Howard stated that it was important to receive that information since there could be occasion for her to make a personal appearance before the Legislature. Dr. Crowley replied that they would do their best to provide information on all of the bills. He noted that tracking them through the legislative process was fairly complicated. He promised to try to keep track of everything and keep the Board informed.

Regent Wiesner asked about the Chancellor's process for determining the will of the Board. Chancellor Nichols replied that she reviewed previous Board actions and the budget, adding that most issues were budget-driven and budget-related. Her priority is to achieve the budget request approved by the Board. In instances where Board will is not specific (i.e. SBR40 - scholarships for disadvantaged, under represented students in the School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry), the Board has been clear in its desire for proactive recruiting of disadvantaged students. She stated that she relies on prior Board actions and discussions to make those decisions.

Regent Sisolak asked when the Board discussed the Cheyenne situation. He indicated that he would like to hear Assemblyman Arberry's reasoning for separating the campus. Dr. Nichols stated that the System would like to keep a good relationship with him as well. She stated that she would not testify on the merits (or lack of) of a separate institution. Instead she would observe that the concerns need to be heard and decided by the Board of Regents and that it was not a legislative decision. She felt that the System had been clear about where Board's authority and legislative authority join forces (or not). She did not think that she had a sense of the Board's will regarding whether or not to create a new community college at the Cheyenne site. Dr. Crowley indicated that the situation would need to be handled carefully, adding that they would not offend Assemblyman Arberry. He related that often bills were introduced to create a process of bargaining or negotiation and were not actually intended to be passed.

Regent Alden felt it important that the sports agent bill be similar to ones in Tennessee and Texas. He felt it unfair for rogues to harm an institution with no System recourse. He asked that the bill protect System interests. Dr. Crowley replied that it was model legislation, adding that a gross misdemeanor was a fairly stiff penalty. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the new bill would affect the existing sports booster policy. Dr. Crowley replied that it would not.

Regent Alden expressed concern about the law school accreditation. Dr. Crowley replied that there was a BDR that had not yet been released as a bill. It was discussed with President Harter in the hearings that have taken place. Regent Alden asked about the joint initiative between UNR and UNLV regarding the pharmacy school. Dr. Crowley replied that there was very little in the executive budget in the form of one-shot dollars and enhancements. He related that the issue was not dead and that the money committees were very aware that the request was still there.

Regent Alden stated that he was very concerned about part-time faculty salaries, especially with the growth at UNLV. Chancellor Nichols replied that part-time faculty had been very active in Carson City in communicating their needs. She has notified the Legislature about the study task force that will provide recommendations that will likely impact the budget request for the next biennium. She reported that for this biennium the System was seeking a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA). She related that the campuses had indicated their intent to raise part-time salaries at least by the COLA level. She reported there was no other addition to address part-time salaries. Dr. Nichols stated that the will of the Board needed to be determined for the next biennium.

Dr. Crowley reported on other BDR's:

- Advisory review boards for campus police departments.
- Interim study of Cooperative Extension, UNR.
- Appropriation of funds for the College of Agriculture, UNR.
- Bonding revisions affecting UCCSN.
- Millennium Scholarship question – there is very strong interest in changing the payback requirement for students not continuing with the program. There is also a change being discussed regarding the adult education eligibility component.
- Establishment of a special Millennium Scholarship eligibility category for nursing and teaching students.
- Treasurer's Office trying to secure a large portion of tobacco settlement and investing the funds for future disbursement.
- Intellectual property practices.
- Rural health, classified employees and state health insurance issues.

Regent Wiesner asked about legislation regarding law enforcement agencies. Dr. Crowley replied that it originated from an interim study committee dealing with violence at the K-12 level. The language suggests that UCCSN campus security departments have a superior authority in the form of a local constabulary.

The meeting recessed at 9:30 a.m. and reconvened at 9:35 a.m. with all members present. Regent Seastrand participated via telephone.

23. Tabled-Reapportionment – The Board tabled action regarding the number of Regents' districts for recommendation to the Nevada Legislature. Dr. Keith Schwer, consultant, presented findings related to reapportionment of Regents' districts.

Dr. Schwer reported that he and his colleagues met with each of the Regents and had compiled a selection of maps for Board sizes 9-13. He related that maps were available on two websites: UNLV (cber.unlv.edu/all.pdf) and the Regents website (www.nevada.edu). The maps are tentative, as they are still awaiting the final census figures. Once the final data is received they will meet again with the Board to assist with developing their legislative recommendations.

Chancellor Nichols explained the motion on the agenda. She felt that after meeting with the consultants and relying on their information it appeared reasonable for the Regents to decide upon a number they wish to concentrate upon. Deciding on a number would make the consultants' work easier for presenting potential boundary lines at the April meeting.

Regent Derby acknowledged that it would be a tough call for the Board, adding that she was aware of discussion about decreasing to a smaller number. The Association of Governance Boards (AGB), which studies governance structures, suggests that most public Boards are too small and recommends a makeup of 9-15 members. She

proposed moving to a larger number. She admitted that moving to a smaller Board or remaining the same size would likely result in the elimination of her seat, adding that she was attempting to be objective. She suggested adding one district and cited the Board's committee structure. Sufficient membership is required in order for the committee structure to function effectively without straining individuals with increased participation. She noted there were currently 11-12 functioning committees, multiple task forces, and three search committees. She felt that the eleven existing members were strained to manage this workload and questioned the Board's ability to manage with a smaller membership. She noted a movement towards a larger and more complex System with the Rand Report's recommendation for more state colleges. She felt the committee structure (comprised of 5 Regents) works well and that the Board tended to accept committee recommendations with complete trust. She felt that decreasing the Board size at a time when the System was expanding would detract from the committee structure. She related that many Board members had full-time jobs in addition to their Regent duties. She suggested that if the Board size grew by one or two members, the committee structure could also be expanded with committees devoted specifically to the community colleges and/or the universities' research sector. She felt that decreasing the Board size would likely warrant a different governance structure (i.e. local Boards for each institution acting on an advisory basis) with the smaller Board concentrating on broader functions (i.e. budget, program approval, new campuses, System strategic plans). She related that she was familiar with states that employ this method. She felt it would be even more challenging for a smaller Board to be effective advocates for each institution. She recognized that there had been some resistance from the presidents for adding another Regent. She felt that the Board's committee structure was its major advantage and proposed consideration of increasing the Board size to 12 or 13 members. She noted that it would also provide opportunity for greater diversity in Board membership.

Regent Derby moved approval of 12 districts. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Alden agreed that advisory boards for each institution was an innovative approach. He felt that the Board should be comprised of appointed paid members and proposed decreasing the Board size to nine members.

Regent Derby asked whether the additional position could be appointed. Chair Dondero stated that the campus foundation boards were advisory to the full Board. She questioned adding another layer. Regent Derby acknowledged that many institutions employ foundation boards as fundraisers and advisory boards as advocates of their institutions and to advise the state board of appropriate actions for the individual institutions. Chair Dondero asked about the cost involved with advisory boards. Regent Derby replied that she did not know the cost and was not proposing the creation of advisory boards. She felt that if the Board size decreased another structure would be necessary. Regent Howard asked about the districts makeup if the Board increased to twelve districts. She asked where the additional district would be located. Dr. Schwer referred her to their packet with the tab 'new 12th'. He reported that it would be in Clark County and bordered by Decatur, Moccasin and Lake Mead streets.

Regent Gallagher expressed concern for expanding her district to Clark County (Mesquite and Overton). She noted that those were rapidly growing parts of Clark County. She observed that a Clark County resident could file for her district and felt it would be unfair representation for rural Nevada. She supported a proposal that would not combine rural Nevada with Clark County. She stated that adding or decreasing Regents would not affect the workload of existing Regents due to the level of intensity of the issues and constituency representation. She agreed that something was necessary to help distribute the work more evenly. She felt decreasing to nine districts would be unacceptable and noted that remaining with eleven districts would result in 42% of her district lying in Clark County. She stated that increasing to twelve districts and combining rural Nevada's district with Clark County would result in a lack of fair representation.

Regent Wiesner felt that the number of Board members should be separate from whether they should be paid or elected. He felt that appointed Regents would be no less political and was not in favor of an appointed Board. He

avored a more efficient, smaller number and supported a membership of nine districts. He felt that Regents had a responsibility to the statewide System regardless of what district they represented.

General Counsel Ray stated that the Regents are constitutionally created officers. The constitution would need to be amended in order to change the makeup of the Board. He believed that neither the Board nor the Legislature could decide that an additional member could be appointed with equal power and authority.

Regent Hill felt that the Board should determine a preferred governmental structure. He felt that decreasing the size of an elected Board would require moving to a professional paid structure. He thought the committee structure employed by the Board was effective. He agreed that decreasing the Board size would make the job even tougher. He felt it was important to have a variety of people with different ideas.

Regent Hill offered a friendly amendment to increase the number of districts to twelve or thirteen and decide upon the final number after receipt of the final census figures. Regents Derby and Rosenberg accepted the amendment.

Regent Sisolak noted that decreasing to nine districts also placed his seat at risk. He asked what would happen to people in the middle of their terms. General Counsel Ray replied that the legislation to be passed would need to determine that. He questioned whether the legislature had the authority to shorten a term of office. He related that he had not performed any independent research on that issue. He noted that the Legislative Counsel Bureau felt that the Legislature had the authority to make such a decision and could terminate a Regent's term. Ms. Ernst restated the motion. Regent Derby expressed a desire for more clarity on the issue of existing terms as it could influence the vote. Chair Dondero noted that when she was a county commissioner they were allowed to complete their term and the new number went into effect after their term expired. Regent Wiesner observed that he had to run again for election in the middle of his term. Chair Dondero felt that it had been a mistake.

Chancellor Nichols suggested that it was the discretion of the Legislature to make that decision, adding that the Board could still express their preference when forwarding the number of districts in the bill draft request. Regent Gallagher observed that the Legislature had always conceded to the Regents' recommendation in the past. She felt a unanimous Board decision was imperative in order to avoid legislative intervention.

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

Regent Seastrand noted that since the motion to increase the Board size had failed, the only options were to remain the same size or decrease to nine or ten districts. He expressed concern for bringing the rural counties into Las Vegas and recommended decreasing to ten districts.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of decreasing the Board size to ten districts. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion failed. Regents Gallagher, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted yes. Regents Alden, Derby, Dondero, Hill, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Rosenberg voted no.

Regent Howard moved approval of remaining with eleven districts. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Gallagher noted that remaining with eleven districts would result in 42% of the rural district lying in Clark County which she felt was unfair representation. Regent Sisolak asked whether there would be any discussion. He felt that some comments might be helpful in making a decision. Chair Dondero felt that remaining with eleven districts would likely be accepted by the Legislature. Regent Gallagher disagreed. Regent Howard felt that since consensus could not be reached on increasing or decreasing the Board size it was logical to remain the same size.

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

Regent Alden moved approval of decreasing the Board size to nine districts. Regent Wiesner seconded.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern about discussion held the previous day regarding limiting the term that a Board chair could serve. He agreed that many Regents did not have a great deal of time to dedicate to the Board and applauded those members who devoted 3-4 days per week. He questioned the logic of limiting the terms for Chair and/or Vice Chair for someone who did have the time to serve in leadership in addition to decreasing the Board size. Regent Rosenberg agreed that it would be very difficult with only nine members. Regent Sisolak clarified that by limiting the terms of people who could devote the necessary time it could also limit the number of individuals who could serve in leadership roles due to their individual time constraints. Regent Wiesner stated that those electing to run for office needed to be aware of the time commitment.

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

Regent Hill moved approval of increasing the Board size to thirteen districts. Regent Gallagher seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion failed. Regents Derby, Dondero, Gallagher, Hill, and Rosenberg voted yes. Regents Alden, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted no.

Regent Hill moved approval of tabling the item to the next meeting. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Derby, Dondero, Gallagher, Hill, Howard, Rosenberg, and Seastrand voted yes. Regents Alden, Kirkpatrick, Sisolak, and Wiesner voted no.

The meeting recessed at 10:25 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m. with all members present except Regent Seastrand.

Vice Chancellor Miles reported that Reference D represented selected pages from a packet presented to the Legislature's first budget hearing and provided comparisons of the UCCSN request with the Governor's budget recommendations. He noted that the Governor had recommended slightly more than was requested due to including his Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) recommendations in the budgets. The Governor has recommended the addition of a 9th step to the classified pay scale and has also provided funding for a 4% COLA in each biennium for classified employees. Additionally, he added funds for a 2% COLA in each biennium for professional employees. Mr. Miles noted that the Governor's recommendation was about 17.9% higher than the current biennial budget for higher education. Mr. Miles reviewed the revenue mix to support the projected expenditures. He indicated that the Governor increased Estate Tax expenditures by \$8.3 million/year, primarily to address equity funding. He also changed the funding source for some Estate Tax expenditures. Mr. Miles stated that UCCSN's special priorities (totaling \$15.5 million) were basically not funded, although \$250,000 in one-shot funding for the Harry Reid Research Center was included in the Governor's proposal. The UCCSN had also requested \$26.4 million in one-shot dollars. The Governor's budget recommended priority #2 (SCS equipment \$2,604,063) and \$ 1,000,000 for priority #9 (NSCH startup costs). Governor Guinn also recommended \$54.77 million in Estate Tax funding compared with the UCCSN request for \$40.12 million. The increase was due to the Governor's decision to fund equity funding with the Estate Tax rather than general operating, a \$30,000 adjustment to the Manufacturing Assistance Program, and \$500,000/year in Operating & Maintenance support for DRI.

Regent Gallagher asked whether this would be the last time that equity funding was funded by the Estate Tax. Mr.

Miles replied that the formulas would normally address that, adding that UCCSN requested state funds for equity funding. The UCCSN feels that the state formula should be state funded and that the Estate Tax should be used for one-time funding of special needs. Mr. Miles related that the Legislature would require \$14 million in state funds in order to relieve the Estate Tax of that burden. He was unsure what would be done with future budgets. Regent Kirkpatrick asked about the Governor's allocation of \$1.86 million in Estate Tax funds for the four-year programs at GBC. Mr. Miles replied that it was originally requested under formula funding state dollars. He felt the change was due to the anticipated tight budget, adding that the danger for the System was it could lead to an expectation for permanent funding from that source. The System's position is that these expenses should be under the state formula and state funded. Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the institutions could not depend on that money in the future. President Remington agreed. President Harter stated that UNLV was in jeopardy of not receiving the equity funds when funded by the Estate Tax. Additionally, salary increments for positions funded with the Estate Tax were not accounted for.

Vice Chancellor Miles discussed the Capital Improvement Program and compared the UCCSN request with the State Public Works Board and the Governor's recommendation. The following priorities were fully funded (and some at more than requested) in the Governor's request:

- #1 Furnish/Build-Out Redfield - \$5,000,000
- #1 Furnish/Build-Out WNCC Library - \$1,575,000
- #1 Furnish/Build-Out UNR Medical Building - \$2,195,000
- #3 CCSN Health Science/Bio Tech - \$25,000,000
- #7 UNR Library - \$66,000,000

The following projects were funded at less than requested by the UCCSN:

- #1 Furnish/Build-Out DRI South - \$1,211,055
- #1 Furnish/Build-Out CCSN Science Building - \$3,502,062
- #2 UNLV Science/Engineering - \$9,832,152
- #4 TMCC Student Services Center - \$11,000,000
- #5 UNLV Wright Hall - \$18,792,181
- #8 NSCH Classroom/Student Services - \$26,000,000
- #11 UNLV Student Services - \$300,000

Vice Chancellor Miles related that several projects never made it to the Governor's recommendation. \$10 million in HECC (Higher Education Capital Construction) funds and \$5 million in SHECC (Special Higher Education Capital Construction) funds for maintenance and renovation projects on all of the campuses were also part of the Governor's proposed budget.

Vice Chancellor Miles indicated that the System had attended two hearings regarding the budget and had responded to all questions asked by the LCB (Legislative Counsel Bureau). They have also discussed enrollment projections, the part-time salary issue, as well as the difficulty of finding a 2% COLA match for professional employees. He indicated that they were facing the reduction of staff in order to match the COLA. Indirect cost recovery was discussed, with the System requesting 100% to enable campus research areas. Utility costs are yet to be discussed. By statute, the Governor must submit a balanced budget and by constitution, the Legislature must approve a balanced budget. Adjustments will be made in May once sales tax revenues are in. Currently the gaming tax is below the forecast level. Mr. Miles related there is always a lag between budget approval and the May 1st final decision. He noted that downward adjustments would affect all budgets negatively and was not optimistic for increases at this point.

24. Information Only-Report on Supreme Court Hearing - General Counsel Ray reported there had been no decision regarding the Supreme Court case concerning presidential searches. He reported that the System presented its argument February 8th. He felt that the System's arguments were well received. Regent Gallagher stated that she had witnessed General Counsel Ray's argument and felt he did a spectacular job. She noted that Justice Nancy Becker asked quite a few pointed questions. She felt the Board had been well represented.

25. Information Only-Review of Presidential Perquisites – Chancellor Jane Nichols reviewed presidential perquisites, including an examination of current Board policy as well as national data. (Ref. I on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols stated that she was planning a more extensive report in the future. She felt a thorough review was necessary with the anticipated new presidential hires. She reported that System Administration had reviewed the most recent CUPA (College and University Personnel Association) data regarding perquisites offered to chief executive officers in 1997. The results were not differentiated by level of academic institution (other than for automobile).

- 84% of the community colleges and even more universities have some type of automobile policy in place.
- Growing trend of institutions providing an automobile instead of an auto allowance.
- Current Board policy allows a car or a car allowance be provided to the Chancellor and Presidents. The practice has been to provide a \$6,000 car allowance.
- WICHE states comparison:
 - Community colleges vary widely in their pattern of perquisites.
 - Universally either a vehicle or an allowance is provided for community college presidents.
 - Housing allowance – 67.3% of the institutions provide a housing allowance or assistance with housing expenses. Dr. Nichols felt this would likely affect searches currently underway.

Dr. Nichols related that a more recent survey was now being analyzed. The results of a study completed by the William and Burser Company for the California State University System became available December 2000. This study includes all California State University System campuses. She noted that the study contained very interesting data indicative of the type of pressure UCCSN will be facing when hiring presidents. The average presidential salary in that study was \$217,817. She indicated the study would be analyzed more thoroughly and the findings would be presented at a future meeting. Other presidential perquisites include: deferred income, private memberships, and supplemental insurance. She concluded that, while the review was preliminary, it was clear that adjustments may need to be made to current Board policy.

Regent Hill felt that some adjustments were in order. He noted that some items were taxable, while others were not. He suggested focusing on those benefits that were not taxable. He expressed concern for payment of dues to private clubs.

Regent Howard asked whether perquisites applied to interim presidents. Chancellor Nichols did not believe there was data available on interim or acting presidents. She stated that a salary range and benefit package was set. She indicated that they would check whether differentiation was made for interim or acting appointments. Regent Howard asked about current practice. Chancellor Nichols replied that the perquisites were pro-rated (monthly) for the time of service. She was unsure of other states' practices.

Regent Rosenberg apologized that previous study results he presented to the Board had been in error. He indicated that he has learned a great deal from participating in the search process and apologized to Presidents Harter, Crowley and Remington.

26. Approved-Regents' Awards – The Board approved the 2001 Regents' awards.

26.1 Information Only-Closed Session - In compliance with NRS 241.030, a closed session was held for purposes of discussion of the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or physical or mental health of persons.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of moving to a closed session. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried.

The meeting moved to a closed session at 11:25 a.m. and reconvened at 11:55 a.m. with all members present except Regent Seastrand.

26.2 Approved Return to Open Session - The Board then reviewed the 2001 Regent Awards:

A. Distinguished Nevadan Awards - Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 11.1 (Biographies on file in the Board office)

Regent Sisolak nominated Dr. Elias F. Ghanem. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Hill nominated Dr. Marvin Moss. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Dondero nominated Mr. Wayne Newton. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Kirkpatrick nominated Dr. Anthony Saville. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

Regent Derby nominated Mrs. Sallie Springmeyer. Regent Howard seconded. Motion carried.

B. Honorary Doctorate Degrees – Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 11.2

Mr. William Bennett, UNLV

Mr. James R. Dickinson, UNLV (posthumously)

Mr. Don Snyder, UNLV

Ms. Emilie Wanderer, UNLV

Senator Richard Bryan, UNR

Mr. Jerome Lemelson, UNR (posthumously)

Ms. Dixie May, UNR

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Honorary Doctorate Degrees. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried.

C. Honorary Associate Degrees – Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 11.3

Ms. Hannah Brown, CCSN

Mr. Joseph Buckley, CCSN

Mr. Carlos Garcia, CCSN

Mrs. Barbara Joan Greenspun, CCSN

Mr. A. Allan Stipe, CCSN

Mr. Charles Briggs, GBC

Dr. Jim Hager, TMCC

Mr. Ron Turek, TMCC

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the Honorary Associate Degrees. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

D. Regents' Scholars – Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 12

Ms. Kelli Jones, UNLV Undergraduate

Ms. Cheryl Radeloff, UNLV Graduate

Ms. Alicia Privette, UNR Undergraduate

Ms. Jennifer Frankovich, UNR Graduate

Mr. David Campbell, CCSN

Mr. Brian S. Hutchison, GBC

Mr. Casey Gillham, TMCC

Ms. Crystal Smith, WNCC

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Regents' Scholars. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried.

27. Public Comment – Mr. Shannon Shilling-CCSN thanked Regent Howard for hosting student forums on the campuses. Regent Dondero requested copies of the forum minutes be provided to the Regents. Regent Howard stated that over sixty concerns had been noted, adding that Dr. Rebecca Mills-UNLV and Mr. Gary Helgeson-CCSN could provide that information.

Mr. Paul Moradkhan-UNLV provided an update on the KUNV radio station and student government activity. He and the executive board have been working with Dean Martha Watson on a proposal for a 'leaky cable' radio station. The station would be a student-funded and collaborative effort. He believed this was the best planned action for the station. Regent Sisolak asked if members from the alumni group had been involved with the decision. Mr. Moradkhan felt that he represented the undergraduate student body and had advised those alumni to take their concerns to the alumni board. Regent Rosenberg asked that the alumni group be informed about the proposal. He acknowledged that since the undergraduates were funding the proposal the alumni members would need to express their concerns at an open meeting. Mr. Moradkhan stated that the alumni group had been updated. Regent Dondero asked for President Harter's comments. President Harter stated that she felt it was an amicable solution. KUNV was now integrated into the academic program of the College of Urban Affairs. Courses were being designed to provide students with professional experiences. The 'leaky cable' would provide students with another radio station and a different opportunity to be involved. Regent Rosenberg stated that UNR students were doing the same thing and that it could be the solution, with the school providing the necessary education and the students having the freedom to design their own programming.

Regent Howard thanked Mr. Moradkhan, Mr. Gillham, the institutional presidents and administrators for their assistance with the student forums. She indicated that she looked forward to holding forums on the other campuses as well and encouraged other Regents to join her.

Mr. Carlos Ledon-UNR observed that, while the Regents claim to want to hear what students think, the student leadership had not been recognized for several different agenda items. He noted that the student leadership table did not have a microphone. Regent Dondero stated that the Board did want to hear from the students and apologized for not seeing their attempts at recognition. It was noted that the microphone setup had been maximized for the meeting in that room. Ms. Elisa Goyeneche-GBC agreed with Mr. Ledon's concerns.

28. New Business – None.

The meeting adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst

Chief Administrative Officer to the Board