

**BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
SPECIAL MEETING
Henderson City Hall
240 Water Street, Henderson
Friday, April 6, 2001**

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick
Mr. Doug Seastrand

Others Present:

Jane Nichols, Chancellor
Tom Ray, General Counsel
Sherwin Iverson, Interim Vice Chancellor
Dan Miles, Vice Chancellor
Pat Miltenberger, UNR
Nancy Flagg, Deputy to the Chancellor
Suzanne Ernst, Chief Administrative Officer
Richard Moore, President, NSCH
Orlando Sandoval, Vice President, NSCH
Mike Meyer, Interim President, CCSN
Van Weddle, SCS
Mike Harter, University of Nevada School of Medicine
John Filler, Faculty Senate Chair, UNLV
Mary Spoon, Faculty Senate Chair, UNR
Steve Carper, UNLV
Natalie Patton, Las Vegas Review Journal
David Drew, Dean, Claremont Graduate School of Education
Skip Meno, Dean, School of Education, CSU-San Diego
Carolyn Sabo, Dean, College of Health Sciences, UNLV
Casey Green, Technology Consultant

Chair Thalia Dondero called the meeting to order at 9:35 am with all members present with the exception of Regents Howard, Kirkpatrick, Seastrand, and Wiesner.

Chair Dondero stated this was the only place in America that was building a new college, new university buildings, new elementary and high schools at an amazing speed. She thanked the members of the task forces for their commitment and hard work.

1. Information Only Overview - Dr. Richard Moore, President of Nevada State College, made a presentation on procedures and processes followed by the NSCH Task Forces established by Board Chair Thalia Dondero.

Dr. Moore stated he was blessed in the development of the college with an idea from the Board Chair. Her idea was to have members of the Board of Regents to chair task forces that would be comprised of Regents and community members.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

The work was organized into 3 categories: academic & student services, chaired by Regent Derby; finance and personnel, chaired by Regent Alden; and architecture, chaired by Regent Rosenberg. He stated the chairs of the task forces would present their reports. Dr. Moore noted this would not be a college designed for Henderson, but designed for the state. It was stated that each of the task forces launched their work using the Regents' mission statement. Dr. Moore told the Regents that this was not the plan from a founding president, but was the plan from the task forces.

Regent Wiesner entered the meeting.

It was observed that educational programs would be created as needed, and as support of the community and employers was demonstrated. Dr. Moore thought that the task forces were a brilliant idea which brought forth strong recommendations based on the mission statement.

2. Academic And Student Services Task Force Presentation - Co-Chairs Regent Jill Derby, Bonnie Bryan and Sandy Miller introduced consultants and committee members who provided information on the work of the Task Force. The Co-Chairs also presented a general overview. At the end of the reports, they provided the Task Force's recommendations to the Board of Regents. Areas reviewed included:

- General Education Requirements
- Recommended Degrees
- Recommendations for the Preparation of Teachers
- Recommendations for the Preparation of Health Professionals
- Characteristics of the Initial Faculty
 - Faculty Training Center
- Technology/Computer Usage Recommendations
- Student Services Recommendations
 - Financial Aid and Student Success Strategies
 - Student Honors Program
- Accreditation

Regent Derby began by saying this was an exciting project. Regent Derby acknowledged Dr. Moore for his support of, and relinquishing control over, the process. She introduced her co chairs, former first ladies Bonnie Bryan and Sandy Miller. Mrs. Bryan stated this was an exciting experience for her. She thanked Regents Dondero and Derby for the opportunity to participate. Mrs. Miller stated she thought a state college would strengthen the system and noted her appreciation of the leadership of the Regents and Dr. Moore.

Dr. Moore introduced Dr. David Drew. Dr. Drew stated he found the site visits to the colleges to be exciting. He noted that the Committee members asked tough questions. Three areas of importance were identified through the visits that should be incorporated throughout the curriculum. These were writing, technology and diversity awareness. Each of the areas would be assessed before a student could graduate. Curriculum features were identified and reviewed for the Board. Regent Alden stated he did not see the development of a core curriculum and asked if it was interwoven into the 4-year baccalaureate program. Dr. Drew responded it was the intention and recommendation of the task force to have a core curriculum and in the initial years it would be modeled after UNR. Dr. Moore stated the faculty would be asked to bring forth the requirements after they were hired. Chancellor Nichols stated there was a need for a general outline of the college, and there was no attempt to bypass established processes. She noted that it would be impossible to get specific without having faculty in place.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Derby stated that literature shows the current educational system in the United States was not working well. There were also reports that graduates do not have expertise in writing, critical thinking and other skill areas. Regent Hill asked if the new system would work better. Dr. Drew responded there were many professors who know their subject well, but do not teach it very well. He stated that faculty who can write usually teach better.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

Regent Gallagher stated the thrust of the new college was the ability to teach in a new and better way. She also noted that this was the opportunity to do something new, different and vital.

Dr. Skip Meno was introduced for the presentation on the preparation of teachers. Dr. Meno presented the recommendations of the task force:

- Content mastery
- College-wide competencies
- Degrees and majors
- Blending of content and pedagogy
- Standards for development
 - Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions
 - Assessment systems and unit evaluation
 - Field experiences and clinical practice
 - Diversity
 - Faculty qualifications, performance and development
 - Unit governance and resources
- Internships
- Parent involvement
- Time-certain objectives
- Induction
- Continuing professional development

Dr. Meno thought the task force had capitalized on the opportunity of the new college and the recommendations would develop a quality teaching workforce. Regent Sisolak asked if this was a new way of licensing teachers. The answer was that this was a new way of preparing teachers.

Regent Hill left the meeting.

Dr. Meno stated that each institution presents the methodology of meeting established credentialing standards. Regent Sisolak asked if this methodology was presently accepted by the licensing commission. Dr. Meno stated no one else has the same methodology as what was proposed. Chancellor Nichols stated there was a representative for the System on the Commission on Professional Standards. The Commission has historically licensed teachers on the basis of courses, however, there is movement toward new national standards which will license teachers on the basis of competencies and content.

Regent Hill entered the meeting.

Chancellor Nichols stated that the teaching program cannot run without certification from the state. The faculty will have the state requirements and will have to ensure they are met within this model. The model was noted to not be moving away from content, but moving away from specifically named courses. This program would have to go through the approval process before accepting students. Regent Derby stated several members of the task force were from the K-12 community and were involved in the process and the proposal. Regent Alden asked if the degrees were going to be more specific with an emphasis. Dr. Meno replied students would have a stand-alone bachelor's degree, in addition to teacher preparation work. Dr. Moore stated Dr. Garcia came before the committee and stated he needed math and science majors. He was asking for people with degrees who could be licensed. Regent Howard asked if anything was in place for PPST preparation. Dr. Meno replied that this had not been part of the discussion, but the faculty would look at licensing requirements and have things in place to assist.

Dr. Michael Harter was introduced to present the requirements for the preparation of health professionals. Dr. Harter outlined what the task force looked at to determine what programs to present to the Board of Regents. It was determined that Nevadans were not as healthy as the general population in the United States. Deaths from firearms and heart disease are among the highest in the county and Nevada is 46 out of 50 in the number of reported AIDS cases. Nevada ranked last in the number of registered nurses per 100,000 population and last in the number of nursing home beds. Dr. Harter stated that three baccalaureate programs and one concentration were presented for approval. Regent Gallagher asked how the number of nurses would be doubled when there are not enough people in the pipeline to complete this. Dr. Harter stated Assembly Bill 378 recommends doubling the capacity of the six programs in UCCSN, and makes provisions for helping to recruit additional qualified students into the nursing profession. Dr. Harter stated that for students with a technical background, NSCH would provide a liberal arts program. Regent Alden asked if there was a forecast for the number of traditional nursing students that would become available, with Dr. Harter stating that had not been estimated. Regent Alden asked if the institutions were going into K-12 and recruiting younger students for the nursing program. Dr. Sabo stated that they were participating in several programs to increase capacity in the pipeline of nursing. She also stated that the capacity to increase the programs must begin at the K-12 level. Regent Sisolak asked if the capacity at UNLV and CCSN was being exceeded with Dr. Sabo replying that there were available openings in the programs and the numbers could be increased, but there was the potential to double the capacity in the next few years. Regent Sisolak asked where the students were coming from. Dr. Harter responded the issue was recruiting students into the nursing profession. Dr. Nichols asked that Board members return to the basics of planning for the System and strategic directions associated with the RAND report. She stated the emphasis had to be in increasing the college going rate in Southern Nevada.

Dr. Moore remarked there were three professional fields; law enforcement, fire science and health sciences, that CCSN would like to see programs created at NSCH for students to receive baccalaureate degrees in public administration. He stated the issue was how to prepare individuals for middle management positions. Regent Sisolak stated that public administration was not part of the initial discussions and he thought only two programs would be offered, health and education. Dr. Nichols replied that the emphasis was on the importance of teaching and nursing, but there was a mandate to link to the community college and provide the upper division coursework for the completion of a bachelor's degree from the community college.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

Dr. Iverson highlighted certain selections on the hiring of faculty. He noted that the importance of the institutional mission was a prime element of hiring and selecting faculty. It was the feeling of the group that the college should create a distinctive niche in the UCCSN. The reasons for this was that it would be a more efficient use of state resources, it would reduce competition between the institutions, and provide a clearer path for national recognition. Dr. Iverson stated that it was recommended for an initial hire of a provost to serve as the focal point for the development of academic programs. It was recommended to have faculty from the other institutions help in the selection of the new faculty for NSCH.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Mr. Casey Green stated that technology was a commitment that must be made to the institution, students and faculty. He believed that faculty members from across the country would be drawn to the institution for this opportunity. The technology would be inclusive and would enhance the learning experiences.

Dr. Miltenberger spoke on accreditation and stated this was an exciting process. She noted that UNR, as the sponsoring institution, would lend their accreditation to NSCH for the first year. UNR's role as the accrediting sponsor would be to work with NSCH and assist in the process so that students would receive a quality education and an opportunity to obtain their goals. Dr. Miltenberger stated that UNR would contract with NSCH to provide initial registration and financial aid processing. She also noted that she was working with the definition of library requirements and access to electronic collections. Finally, the UNR faculty, as well as System faculty, would assist in selecting and hiring the NSCH faculty. Regent Alden asked how important it was that UNR established the core curriculum. Dr. Miltenberger replied that it redefined the university to students.

Regent Hill left the meeting.

Regent Howard stated she was concerned that there would be dual curriculum at CCSN and NSCH. Dr. Moore stated that the program degrees were proposals that were brought forward by the community college.

Regent Hill entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked if the degrees would be phased in or begun at the same time. The first degrees offered would be the BA in art and science and the rest would follow. The starting of programs would depend upon the faculty hired. Regent Sisolak asked about financial aid services for NSCH. Dr. Miltenberger replied that financial aid and registration offices would be located at NSCH, but UNR would do the processing of the data. When Regent Sisolak asked what the students would be using for library facilities, Dr. Miltenberger replied that UNR would make their electronic collections available. She noted that work would be done with UNLV and CCSN and the City of Henderson to talk about where a physical place for the library could be located. Dr. Miltenberger stated that there had been many discussions on how the collection in the library would grow. It was thought that the collection would build from the faculty and the courses and curriculum.

The meeting recessed at 11:53 am and reconvened at 12:12 pm.

The student service recommendations were reviewed by Dr. Miltenberger. The assumption was that there would be different types of students going to NSCH and the attempt was to put together a plan for a thoughtful and integrated support system. The emphasis would be on a multicultural student body that would reflect Southern Nevada. There would be an academic and transfer center for adult or transfer students that would provide support. In the initial year the primary focus would be on academic advising, articulation, support for transfer students, and the inaugural class.

Regent Derby reminded the Board that this was a general plan and that the specifics would come later. She stated that this was a highly competitive environment and this was a time to make some changes and do things differently to meet the needs of those who want a higher education. Part of the excitement was recognizing the need for changes and looking at how those could be incorporated.

Regent Derby moved approval of the Academic and Student Services Task Force recommendations. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Alden offered a friendly amendment that a strong emphasis be on the development of a core curriculum. The amendment was accepted by Regents Derby and Rosenberg.

Regent Rosenberg stated this was a new way of doing something and it would affect how the universities and community colleges teach. Regent Howard asked why a vote needed to be taken on the approval of the plan without hearing about funding. Regent Derby stated the plan was put together with the assumption that funding would be available.

Motion carried. Regent Sisolak voted no.

3. Architecture Task Force Presentation - Co-Chairs Regent Howard Rosenberg and Rick Kellogg presented an overview and results of the juried state and national competition. The Task Force's recommended Campus Master Plan and Architectural Features were presented for Board approval. Members of the Task Force, and Architectural Competition Consultant Dr. Gamez, were available for comments and discussion.

Regent Rosenberg stated there was a need for a building, or a series of buildings, at NSCH and they would need to look a certain way. It was important to the task force that this be given importance. It was decided to conduct an architectural competition and a detailed packet was made available for any who were interested. 34 architects indicated interest but there were 18 submissions. A jury was put together, and the members were reviewed for the Board. Regent Rosenberg stated it was important to recognize that none of the submissions were identified by name or firm. Nothing was opened until the jury had made their determination and the finalists were announced in a public meeting. The jury selected three finalists. BMI donated \$100,000 for the prize money and it was the decision of the jury to name the number of finalists and the money would be divided equally. The award was contingent upon finalists meeting the criteria of the state board and the committee. When checking the references on each of the three finalists, it was determined that one did not meet the criteria and was disqualified. It was also determined by the jury that the top award would be \$33,333.33 for each qualified finalist. The designs were made for the original site, and the finalists were asked to go to the new site and inform the committee if the designs would be appropriate. It was decided there would be a one board submission by the architects to show the concept on the new site, which would be presented at a meeting on May 8. Regent Rosenberg reviewed the designs, he stated these were concepts, the plan was the most important. No action was taken by the task force to recommend a design, and no action will be taken until after the May 8 meeting.

Regent Alden stated he agreed in concept, however, he was concerned that this be followed closely by General Counsel. Regent Sisolak understood that the competition was started with site A and everyone submitted for that site with winners selected for site A. When moving to site B, he asked regarding those not allowed to submit plans for site B. Regent Rosenberg stated the design specifications were sent out and the task force was bound by the document. Regent Sisolak stated that no comparison could be made between the 2 sites and he was unsure if we were getting the best design for the new site. He asked if there was the option to start over with the new site. General Counsel Ray stated that he was not familiar with the actual terms of the contest, however, it was a published contest, and there was a need to comply with the terms of the contest. He stated it would have been

difficult to change the terms, and the contest was now over. Chancellor Nichols stated the selection of the architect for the buildings would be done by the Public Works Board, and the contest was an attempt to bring out new and innovative ideas. She noted that if the Board made a recommendation of a firm, it would be advisory only. Ms. Ernst stated that designs were submitted based on the quality of the jury and the jury had specific and technical reasons for the selection of the finalists. Regent Alden asked Mr. Ray to research the potentiality of redoing the contest because of the site change. Dr. Moore commented that the jury picked the best campus design based on cost and a desert setting. Regent Rosenberg thanked Jose Gamez at UNLV and thanked UNLV for allowing him to participate. He also thanked Orlando Sandoval for his assistance.

4. Finance And Personnel Task Force Presentation - Co-Chairs Regent Mark Alden, Guy Hobbs and Perry Rogers provided an overview on the work of the Task Force. Presentations and recommendations were made on the following subjects:

- Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Planning Budget and 2002-2003 Operating Budget Recommendations
- Capital Budget Plans and Recommendations
- Recommended Faculty/Administrative Staff Hiring Plans and Procedures
- Recommended Salary Schedule Proposal

Regent Alden reviewed the planning budget. He recommended that the Board adopt and fund in priority order the following:

- Initial administrative team
- Initial faculty planning team
- Class schedules & recruitment information
- Financial aid and registration
- Librarian
- Operations & maintenance
- Full planning administrative team
- Full planning faculty

If money was available, they would ask that the full computing and library personnel and recruiting and brochures items be funded. The operating budget was reviewed; Regent Alden recommended that a minimum of 84.59%, \$7.2 million, of the original budget be funded. Dr. Moore stated for the first year of operation with 1000 students, the costs would be approximately \$7.2 million, with \$6 million coming from state funds. The remaining funds would be raised from student fees. Regent Derby stated there was a need for library resources and wondered how this was incorporated. It was responded that there was no money to buy books prior to the opening of the school. Regent Rosenberg stated that the programs would have a cost attached. Regent Sisolak asked if there was an FTE associated with the budget; it was noted to be specified on the individual line items in the budget.

The capital budget was reviewed. Regent Alden stated that the salary schedules would be competitive and would be between the university and community college salary schedules.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Finance and Personnel Task Force recommendations. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

5. Public Comment - none noted.

6. New Business -

It was asked if there was a time certain for the May 10 meeting. Ms. Ernst responded that the UNLV Alumni Association would like to have a breakfast for the Regents and the meeting would begin after the breakfast. It was asked if the breakfast could begin at 9:30.

Dr. Moore stated he was able to give the Regents a tour of the new site for the Nevada State College.

Regent Sisolak stated he had received a copy of a draft letter from Vicky Taylor. Ms. Ernst stated that Shawna Hughes asked it be distributed as a response to an article in the paper for the Regents' information.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board of Regents