

BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
Building D, Room D-152
Community College of Southern Nevada
6375 West Charleston Blvd., Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, January 24-25, 2002

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

Members Absent:

Mr. Tom Wiesner {Excused}

Others present:

Chancellor Jane Nichols
Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Dan Miles
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Richard Curry
General Counsel Tom Ray
President Ron Remington, CCSN
President Stephen Wells, DRI
Interim President Carl Diekhans, GBC
President Richard Moore, NSCH
Interim President Rita Huneycutt, TMCC
President Carol Harter, UNLV
President John Lilley, UNR
Vice President Stan Aman, WNCC
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were faculty senate chairs Mr. Ruell Fiant, CCSN; Mr. William Albright, DRI; Mr. John Patrick Rice, GBC; Dr. Eun-Woo Chang, TMCC; Dr. Arthur Broten, UCCSN; Dr. Stephen Carper, UNLV; Dr. Paul Neill, UNR; and Mr. Richard Kloes, WNCC. Student government leaders present included Mr. Calvin Hooks, CCSN; Ms. Deborah Faust, GBC; Mr. Paul Moradkhan, UNLV; Ms. Rana Koran, UNLV-GSA; Mr. Matthew Wolden, UNR; Mr. Carlos Ledon, UNR-GSA; and Ms. Leslie Carlen, WNCC.

Chair Thalia Dondero called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on January 24, 2002 with all members present except Regents Seastrand and Wiesner. The Board meeting recessed and reconvened as Members of the Corporation for the CCSN Foundation report.

1. Information Only-Foundation Report, CCSN - The Board reviewed the auditor's report and management letter, as well as CCSN's response.

The Board meeting reconvened at 1:05 p.m. with all members present except Regents Seastrand and Wiesner.

2. Introductions - President Remington introduced Dr. Robert A. Anderson, Jr. and his wife, Alice. Dr. Anderson is the new Vice President for Student Services at CCSN.

3. Chair's Report - Chair Dondero reported that the Board would be busy in the coming months preparing its 2003 budget request, developing a master plan for higher education in Nevada, and, hopefully launching the state's first state college. She sent conciliatory wishes for Regent Seastrand and his family regarding the death of his mother, Mrs. Rosel Seastrand. She also encouraged those present to send good wishes to Regent Tom Wiesner, adding that, in spite of his battle with leukemia, he still calls her to share ideas for improving higher education. She announced the appointment of the following external chairs for upcoming presidential evaluations:

- Dr. Edward Reedy, Vice President and Director of the Georgia Tech Institute of Research, will serve as external chair on President Stephen Wells' evaluation committee.
- Dr. Steven VanAusdle, President of Walla Walla Community College in Washington State, will serve as external chair of President Carol Lucey's evaluation committee.

She related that each Board member would be notified with the schedule for individual interviews with the evaluation committees. The committees will also be interviewing administrators, faculty, students, foundation members, as well as business and community leaders. The closed personnel sessions will be held at the August 2002 meeting. She then named the individual members of the evaluation committees:

- President Wells' Evaluation Committee - Dr. Edward Reedy, Regents Gallagher and Sisolak, Mrs. Sandy Miller, and Mr. Bruce James.
- President Lucey's Evaluation Committee - Dr. Steven VanAusdle, Regents Derby and Dondero, Mr. Roger Sedway, and Mr. Rick Lattin.

Chair Dondero thanked President Ron Remington and his staff for hosting the meeting.

4. Chancellor's Report - Chancellor Nichols reported that UNLV was graciously loaning Dr. John Filler to serve as a Faculty Associate in System Administration for work on special projects related to ongoing teacher education and P-16 projects. She announced a similar collaboration with the Nevada Hospital Association to assign Ms. Doreen Begley to serve as Co-Chair of the Nursing Task Force that is developing a plan to double the capacity of UCCSN nursing programs. Chancellor Nichols reported that Ms. Begley currently serves as Nurse Executive with the Nevada Hospital Association and is very knowledgeable about the issues the System and state will need to address in order to accomplish gains in nursing programs. The other Co-Chair will be Dr. Julie Johnson, head of the Orvis School of Nursing at the University of Nevada, Reno. Chancellor Nichols expressed her confidence that they would help UCCSN meet the requirements set forth in AB 378. She expressed her appreciation to Dr. Mike Harter, who stepped down from his position of Health Education Coordinator for the System to assume fulltime Vice Dean duties with the School of Medicine.

Chancellor Nichols then reported the following national developments affecting Nevada:

- At the adjournment of the last session of Congress in 2001, a \$4,000 Pell Grant was adopted. This is a \$250 increase over the current year and will permit an additional 121,000 students to be assisted in attending college. Currently, 4.3 million students nationwide receive Pell Grants.
- The Basic State Grant program in the Carl Perkins Act was increased by \$80 million (7.2%), the first significant increase in the program in more than a decade.
- The TRIO program, which is so important in encouraging disadvantaged students to aspire to college, received a 10% increase. The GEAR UP program also saw an increase in federal funding.

Chancellor Nichols reported that the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) had received word that its joint grant project with the Washoe County School District, the Nevada Humanities Committee, and the Nevada State Library and Archives has been funded. The \$900,000 3-year federal grant will be used to help middle school and high school teachers learn more about American history. The Teaching American History grant is one of only 66 awarded by the U.S. Department of Education and the only one awarded in Nevada. A total of 320 teachers will be involved in seminars taught by UNR faculty and visiting faculty over the duration of the grant. She then introduced Ms. Roberta Roth, the new Director of Application and Technology Services. Ms. Roth worked for IBM for 24 years and will now be Vice Chancellor Weddle's main assistant.

Regent Hill observed the passing of former Regent Rollan Melton, noting his tremendous contribution to education and the community.

Chancellor Nichols called for a report from CCSN President Ron Remington.

President Remington noted that that the college had grown rapidly. He related that a Northwest Association evaluation team visited last April and provided helpful hints for improvement. One of the items reviewed was student retention. He introduced Mr. Ron Kinkella to share some of the progress made in this area.

Mr. Ron Kinkella, CCSN Counseling, reported that CCSN has two major initiatives to increase student success. CCSN's top priority is to increase the rate of successful class completion through degree attainment. A federal TRIO grant provided necessary support to begin a student support services program. He introduced CCSN's new Director of Retention, Mr. Rene' Cantu'.

Mr. Cantu' provided a video presentation of student, Sean Johnson, who explained his reasons for attending CCSN. Mr. Johnson indicated that he received great help from CCSN's professors and staff, adding that he now had the knowledge to further himself at UNLV. Mr. Johnson discovered his passion for working with young people, has received his AA degree, and is now attending UNLV. He noted a drastic change between the community college and university environments, adding there was more one-on-one interaction at the community college. Mr. Cantu' observed that retention was a presidential priority and

that students were coming to CCSN in record numbers. He stated that CCSN must now continue to provide quality instruction and student support services to ensure students stay at CCSN. The Retention Office's mission is to help students achieve their dreams. Goals include retention, persistence, graduation, and transfer to points beyond. He reported that successful retention relied upon a partnership of students, faculty, TRIO student support services, counseling, the Millennium Office, student services, financial aid, and the Retention Office. The Retention Office's vision is to get students connected by offering open access to all of CCSN's services. They also engage in proactive outreach, including mailings and phone calls to students placed in developmental courses. The Retention Office utilizes a holistic, solution-oriented approach offering appointments, referrals, and information. He related that faculty mentoring and student coaching were important aspects of the program.

Retention Efforts:

- Over 800 students who tested into developmental classes were contacted via phone and mail and offered appointments.
- 25,000 resource guides have been produced and are being stapled to all bookstore receipts.
- A Master Skills Brochure Series is being produced which will provide information on note taking, study skills, time management, and writing research papers.

Mr. Cantu' reported that in Fall 2000 CCSN's retention rate was 68.11%. It improved in Fall 2001 to 70.24% (2.13% increase). He then discussed the TRIO mission, which is to increase the number of low-income and first-generation students who receive a 2-year degree and/or transfer to a 4-year college. Services include a one-stop shop concept servicing about 200 students. They offer academic advising, career exploration, supplemental grant awards, supplementary tutoring, financial assistance, transfer assistance, and college survival skills instruction. Efforts have resulted in the recruitment of 135 students (84% capacity). A TRIO transfer day was conducted with 42 participants.

Mr. Cantu' reported that counseling plays an important role in student retention. Twenty counselors currently provide services to 33,000 students (enrolled in 6+ credits). Counselors help students select courses, clarify interests and majors, formulate vocational and education plans, discuss transfer, and make referrals. They also offer new student orientation, online orientation, as well as prepare transfer contracts to UCCSN institutions.

Mr. Cantu' reported on the efforts of the Millennium Office. In Fall 2000, 1,148 students (82.8%) retained eligibility. This Fall 2001, they served almost 2,000 students and the eligibility rate increased to 89.9%. Future directions include:

- Increase student participation in orientation.
- Enhance proper developmental course enrollment and provide adequate support for developmental students.
- Increase the number of students declaring their majors.
- Increase the use of financial aid resources.
- Develop strong tracking and assessment components.
- Build a stronger sense of connectivity through community building.

Mr. Cantu' concluded that student success equaled institutional success. He then introduced Dr. Laura Latimer, the new Director of TRIO.

Dr. Latimer introduced TRIO student Clarita Kendall, who described some of the barriers she overcame to pursue her education. Ms. Kendall related that she was in a car accident and suffered a traumatic brain injury resulting in some cognitive and emotional problems. She related that she had been scattered and discouraged. She came to TRIO for help. They responded with help in pursuing financial aid, arranging her class schedule, taking classes towards a purpose, and helped her focus on her objective - to become a dentist. Dr. Latimer related that Ms. Kendall earned a 4.0 GPA.

5. Approved-Executive 2001-2002 Contract Terms - The Board approved the second appearance of a recommendation for a salary increase for General Counsel Tom Ray.

Chancellor Nichols explained that the merit increase recommended for General Counsel Ray was equal to the merit given other officers (\$4,160), which would be added to his base salary of \$121,051. Regent Alden commented that General Counsel Ray was worth his weight in gold.

Regent Alden moved approval of the salary increase for General Counsel Tom Ray. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

6. Postponed-Handbook Revision, Naming of Buildings - The Board postponed a revised amendment to the Board's policy on naming buildings (Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 21.3). (Ref. A on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols explained that additional language to be added to existing Handbook language was indicated in bold in the reference material. Section "a" included a detailed list of principles for consideration. She noted that section "b" should include the limitation for "rooms, or public spaces". She related that the proposal included a provision for one institutional

exception to the prohibition concerning elected public officials (to cover plans already underway to name buildings). She explained that section "c" included a restriction for not naming more than one building at the same institution after a single individual, with the exception of buildings named for private foundations, private donors, or at the request of private donors.

Regent Sisolak asked about a definition for "significant or substantial donations". Chancellor Nichols replied that it was intentionally not defined because of the difficulty for determining a specific dollar figure that would stand the test of time in the Handbook and at the institutions. Regent Sisolak took exception to not being able to name a building after someone actively employed with the UCCSN. Regent Alden agreed, adding that any person donating a significant amount of money should be allowed to have a building named after them. Regent Rosenberg asked whether a private donation would permit a building to be named after an employee. Chancellor Nichols replied that it would not, adding that the exception would need to be specified.

Regent Kirkpatrick noted that the Board had set aside policy in the past and asked whether they could suspend such policy in the future. General Counsel Ray replied that the Board had the authority to suspend its policy if it desired.

Regent Howard asked why exceptions were even allowed. Chancellor Nichols replied that the exception was allowed to accommodate those dedications currently in the works, adding that the presidents expressed concern about being able to name buildings after elected officials.

Regent Hill asked whether suspension of Board policy would require a simple or super majority. General Counsel Ray replied that, since it was not part of the Bylaws or Code, it would only require a simple majority, adding that changes to the Bylaws required a two-thirds majority.

Regent Alden suggested the addition of "rooms, part of the building, or public spaces" to section "b" and to allow discretionary language that would allow the Board to suspend the policy to accommodate significant donors. General Counsel Ray stated that he would prefer adding discretionary language to the policy rather than suspending policy.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook revision regarding the naming of buildings as amended. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether a two-thirds majority would be required to suspend the policy if the Board adopted this policy that day. General Counsel Ray replied that it would not. Bylaws require a two-thirds majority, but policies do not.

Chancellor Nichols noted the difficulty of publicly bringing forward a person's name without knowing whether the Board would suspend the rule. She agreed the language should be added to the policy. Regent Alden stated that he and Regent Sisolak would also prefer that solution.

Regent Hill stated that he was not aware of a pressing need to pass this item that day, adding that he would like to see the language prior to voting on it. Regent Rosenberg agreed.

Regent Hill moved approval of tabling the issue. Regent Alden seconded.

General Counsel Ray expressed a preference for postponing action to the next meeting.

Regent Hill withdrew his motion to table and moved approval of postponing action to the next meeting. Regent Alden removed his second to table and seconded the motion to postpone to the next meeting.

President Lilley asked whether section "a" distinguished between private and public funds. Regent Alden replied that it was intended to refer to private donations and/or non-governmental funding. Regent Hill observed that funds coming from the state or federal government would not be considered a donation. He expressed a preference for not including private vs. public language.

President Harter asked how the restriction in section "c" for not naming a building after one person would work with the exception provided in section "b". She said that UNLV was in a situation where more than one facility could be named for the same person, adding that she would like not to be barred from doing so. Regent Sisolak thought that the exception provided was an exception to the entire policy. Chancellor Nichols replied that, if the Board agreed, the new language would become effective January 2003. Regent Sisolak objected to that, adding that he did not want 4-5 exceptions between now and January 2003. Chancellor Nichols clarified that one exception to the entire new policy would be allowed between now and January 2003.

President Wells asked whether a private donor could request naming a facility after a sitting elected official. Regent Hill replied that he would like to see the Chancellor return with alternative language to address the concerns expressed. Regent Sisolak understood that section "c" allowed naming a facility in accordance with a private donor's request. He contrasted that with naming a facility for a legislator who ensured that funds were allocated for a specific purpose. Chancellor Nichols observed that staff would need to reword the policy to reflect those concerns.

President Moore felt that the Board should accept gifts and allow multiple buildings to be named after the same person. President Harter noted that her concern was with section "b" because she had plans in progress that would be prohibited by section "c".

Motion to postpone carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

7. Approved-Handbook Revision, Armed Forces Personnel and Residency - The Board approved changes to Handbook language (Title IV, Chapter 15, Section 4.5) to ensure that Nevada residents who are members of the armed forces will not lose their residency status upon leaving the military and returning to Nevada. (Ref. B on file in the Board office)

Vice Chancellor Curry explained that an issue was raised by a Nevada resident concerning residency classification for Armed Forces personnel with regard to tuition. Current Board policy does not contain a statement addressing military personnel who maintain Nevada as their state of residence while on active duty outside of state. He reported that staff researched other states' policies concerning residency regulations specific to Armed Forces personnel. Various states make concessions for individuals who were residents of their state prior to leaving for military service so they can maintain their residency status after leaving active duty. Dr. Curry stated that the proposed revision to the residency policy would allow for the same type of consideration. Additionally, the revision would be consistent with the Millennium Scholarship policy concerning residency requirements for student eligibility. Dr. Curry reported that the policy had been unanimously recommended by the Student Affairs Council.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Handbook revision regarding armed forces personnel and residency. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

8. Approved-Handbook Revision, UCCSN Code Amendment, Confidential Records - The Board approved the second reading of a proposed amendment to the UCCSN Code (Title II, Chapter 5, Section 5.6) to add a provision making personnel and payroll records of professional staff confidential, and specifying who has access to the records and what information is deemed to be public. (Title IV, Chapter 2, Section 4) may now be deleted. (Ref. C on file in the Board office)

General Counsel Ray reported that this was a second required reading for a proposed amendment to the Code. He explained that the purpose of the change was to move the requirement from the Bylaws and place it in the Code to better secure faculty privacy rights.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the Handbook revision and Code amendment regarding confidential records. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Howard asked what was included in Title IV, Chapter 2, Section 4. General Counsel Ray replied that the section referred to the Chancellor and executive officers of the Board, which would now be redundant with the new language. Regent Howard asked how it related to disciplinary records. General Counsel Ray replied that they would also be confidential.

Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

9. Denied-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, Telephonic Hookup - The Board denied the second reading of a proposed amendment to the Board of Regents' Bylaws (Title I, Article V, Section 13) to address the issue of Regents participating in a regular Board meeting by telephonic hookup. (Ref. D on file in the Board office)

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the Handbook and Bylaws revision regarding telephonic hookup. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Hill asked about the necessity for using "special committee" in the policy language. General Counsel explained that it was existing language currently in the Code. He stated that standing committee membership was set forth in the Bylaws. He noted that the Board or Chair could establish special committees. The Handbook language established quorums for special committees.

Regent Sisolak asked who defined "unavoidable travel out of state" and why only a maximum of two agenda items could be considered telephonically. He took exception to the Board Chair determining telephonic participation when the Chair also votes and might be more likely to allow telephonic participation of those supporting an issue rather than those opposed to an issue.

Regent Derby stated that it was intended to discourage telephonic hookup, which the Board had previously experienced as being difficult. She expressed a desire for the policy to be as broad and flexible as possible. She felt that a number of reasons could justify telephonic participation. She felt that it should be understood that Regents are expected to and need to be at the meetings, adding that flexibility was also important. She supported the Board Chair making the determination of whether or not to allow telephonic participation.

Regent Alden stated that he could not endorse the policy.

Regent Rosenberg stated that Regents were elected officials and should attend the meetings. He agreed that telephonic participation was difficult to achieve and added time to the meeting length. He stated that he was not comfortable with the proposed language and requested suggestions for alternative language. He felt strongly that Regents should attend Board and committee meetings.

Regent Alden felt that permanent sites should be developed in Las Vegas and Reno to accommodate Board meetings and teleconferencing.

Regent Kirkpatrick felt that Regents who wanted to convey a specific idea should make the effort to attend the meeting in person. He was concerned that allowing telephonic participation on a regular basis could affect meeting attendance.

Regent Seastrand entered the meeting.

Regent Kirkpatrick agreed that circumstances could arise that would justify telephonic participation, but recommended meeting attendance in person.

Regent Derby stated that she would likely not support the proposed language. She observed that everyone was aware of the responsibilities of their office. She felt there were circumstances not specified in current language that could arise and would require telephonic participation. She felt it would be better left to each Regent to decide whether to participate in person or by telephone, recognizing the importance of meeting attendance. She felt it would be a difficult decision for a Board Chair to make.

Regent Sisolak echoed Regent Derby's thoughts. He believed that everyone tries to come to the meetings, but sometimes circumstances arise that would require an individual to miss a meeting. He stated that he could not support the policy.

Regent Rosenberg agreed, adding that Regent Seastrand was a classic example of a Regent making the effort to attend a meeting in spite of personal obligations. He suggested postponing action until better language could be developed. Other Board members did not agree.

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

10. Approved-Handbook Revision, Summer Session Salary Flexibility, Community Colleges - The Board approved Handbook language adjustments (Title IV, Chapter 3, Section 26, Subsection 3) relative to policies on summer salary flexibility for small classes taught by faculty who are not on a "B" contract during the academic year. (Ref. E on file in the Board office)

Associate Vice Chancellor Sherwin Iverson explained that some of the changes were editorial in nature for clarification purposes. He noted that one change was substantive and the result of an issue brought to System Administration's attention by one of the community colleges. The state of Nevada does not fund instruction in the summer. Decisions to hold a class are based upon enrollment and the income generated. Existing policy allows the president (or president's designee) to establish a mutually agreeable salary at a rate less than normally provided for B-Contract faculty, rather than canceling a class due to low enrollment, if all parties agree. He related that it was not clear whether that option also applied to adjunct/temporary employees. The General Counsel's office determined that a different salary rate for adjunct employees could not be negotiated. The institution was forced to cancel approximately 14% of their summer classes, which affected many students. The proposed change would allow the policy to be applied to both sets of faculty.

Regent Hill asked about the formula. Dr. Iverson replied that the formula was also under review, as it was subject to different interpretations across the campuses. Chancellor Nichols acknowledged there were problems with the formula and that it needed to be changed. She related that System Administration required Board approval of the recommended policy in order to prepare for summer school. Regent Hill stated that he did not object to passing the policy, adding that he would object to contracts signed in the interim using different percentages. Dr. Iverson expressed a preference for not changing the formula until the proper corrective action had been determined. Chancellor Nichols stated that System Administration would like to bring forward a separate recommendation for the formula at the next meeting. Regent Hill asked whether the institutions would notify potential contract signers that the formula was currently under review. Chancellor Nichols replied that she did not believe that summer contracts would be signed between this meeting and the March meeting.

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision regarding summer session salary flexibility for the community colleges, with the caveat that any contracts signed in the interim would be subject to future Board action regarding the formula. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked which formula interpretation would be used on any interim contracts. Chancellor Nichols replied that each community college campus had a different interpretation of the formula. It was only recently discovered that different interpretations existed. She stated that they would arrive at a common understanding and clarify the Handbook language for the next meeting. She said that no summer contracts would be issued between now and the March meeting.

Regent Sisolak requested clarification on what the Board was acting upon. Chancellor Nichols replied that the Board was not addressing the formula with this action. The motion pertained to existing Handbook language that would allow faculty to teach for a reduced amount if they chose to do so. Regent Sisolak requested comment from the community college presidents. President Remington explained that, occasionally, the community colleges wanted to carry a class for which there were insufficient student enrollments to fund the formula for faculty. He stated that they would like to be able to teach the course for less pay with fewer students. President Diekhans stated that he thought there was an error in the formula because it calculated to paying 30% of the salary for a 1-credit class. He thought that it pertained to teaching 8 credits, adding that he would attempt to locate a description of the formula. Vice President Aman explained that the community colleges were asking for the ability to negotiate with part-time faculty in the same manner as with full-time faculty.

Regent Derby asked what would be negotiated. Dr. Aman explained that the community colleges could negotiate with full-time faculty to pay a lesser fee for summer courses with smaller enrollments. They would also like to negotiate with part-time faculty. Dr. Aman noted that it would only be with common agreement with the teachers.

Regent Seastrand asked for part-time faculty comments. Dr. Neil explained that, if there were not enough students to "make" the class, this would provide the opportunity to offer the class for less pay upon agreement with the faculty affected.

Motion carried. Regent Wiesner was absent.

11. Approved-Handbook Revision, Personal Use of System Property - The Board approved an amendment to the Board of Regents' Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 1, new Section 22) to address personal use of System property or resources. (Ref. F on file in the Board office)

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision regarding personal use of System property. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Alden asked whether General Counsel had reviewed the proposal. General Counsel Ray replied that he had. He stated that the language was taken from the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), which applied to all state employees and would now be applicable to System employees.

Regent Kirkpatrick requested a definition of "nominal". General Counsel Ray agreed that broad terminology was used, adding that it would be determined by the employee's supervisor. He noted that a grievance or appeal process was available to address disagreements.

Regent Howard asked whether action taken without supervisory approval would be a violation of any of the NRS. General Counsel Ray replied that the state statute recognizes that it is permissible for an employee to make a personal phone call. When the action becomes excessive, the supervisor would notify the employee.

Regent Seastrand asked whether the presidents supported the measure. Chancellor Nichols replied that the presidents were supportive of the policy, adding that it helped clarify existing law. She related that the item originated from the legal staff's concern for replicating NRS language into System policy.

Motion carried. Regent Wiesner was absent.

The Board recessed at 2:35 p.m. and reconvened at 2:50 p.m. with all members present except Regent Wiesner.

12. Approved-Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society, UNR - The Board approved a number of agreements and amendments to existing agreements regarding the Board of Regents' participation, through UNR, as a member of the Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society, a non-profit corporation. These amendments will remove the Board of Regents as a member of the Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society and will eliminate any rights and obligations related thereto. The agreements will allow limited access for the purposes of holding conferences and continued monitoring of Lake Tahoe by UNR and DRI. Approval of the following documents was recommended: (Ref. O on file in the Board office)

- Agreement to Amend Joint Use Agreement.
- Amended and Restated Joint Use Agreement.
- Quit Claim Deed.
- Water Rights Quit Claim Deed.
- Assignment of Personal Property.
- Assignment of Reserved Estate.
- Assignment of Interest in Dreyfus Agreement.
- Memorandum of Understanding.

President Lilley introduced Mr. Scott Higginson, representing the Del Webb Corporation. Mr. Higginson explained the original purpose for forming the preservation society. He said that the recommended changes would protect the interests and needs of UNR and the System, as well as remove certain obligations that were initially imposed.

Regent Alden moved approval of removing the Board from membership in the Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Seastrand recalled a land exchange and asked what the System received in exchange for the land. Mr. Higginson replied that the land exchange occurred between the Del Webb Corporation and the federal government. The federal government did not want ownership interest in the buildings and required the Del Webb Corporation to form a private 501(c)3 that held ownership of the buildings. The Thunderbird Lodge Society has responsibility for maintenance and upkeep of the buildings. He explained that the University only received the ability to use the facilities. Regent Seastrand asked about opportunities for research at the site. Mr. Higginson replied that research was being conducted by DRI and UNR. Regent Seastrand asked what the System would lose with the transaction. President Lilley replied they would lose nothing except for the obligations, which had not been carried out very well. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether System institutions would be able to use the facility after relinquishing responsibility for the obligations. President Lilley replied that they would for certain purposes.

Regent Hill recalled that, when the matter was first presented, the university claimed things that never materialized. He observed that the Board placed a lot of faith in what the institutions reported. He hoped that sort of hyperbole would not occur again in the future. President Lilley replied that what caused the change was that UNR now had operating experience with the project, adding that they did not know these things at the time of the original agreement.

President Wells observed that the agreement had allowed UCCSN to bring together U.C. Davis, DRI, and UNR to form an agreement for use of shared facilities. He felt it had tremendously positive aspects. Regent Hill stated there might have been some miscalculations, adding that he did not believe dissolution was the original intent.

Regent Sisolak asked whether Presidents Lilley and Wells, and Mr. Higginson all agreed that this was beneficial to the System. They all replied that it was.

Motion carried. Regent Wiesner was absent.

13. Approved-Millennium Bound Outreach Center Report - Staff presented a final report of the Millennium Bound Outreach Center Task Force and requested Board consideration of recommendations from the November 8, 2001 Task Force meeting. (Ref. G on file in the Board office)

- Approval of the concept of the Millennium Bound Outreach Center as a pilot program.
- Authority to begin seeking grants.
- Approval to include the Center on the enhancement list for the next biennium budget.
- Authority to begin seeking partnerships.

Chancellor Nichols reported that she would represent Associate Vice Chancellor Chris Chairsell, who was unable to be present. Dr. Nichols reminded the Board that after the April 2001 meeting Chair Dondero established a community-based task force to explore and report on:

- The feasibility of the project.
- The program scope.
- Potential funding sources.

Chancellor Nichols named and thanked all of the participants from the task force. She reported that the task force agreed that the outreach center would constitute a pilot program designed to achieve the following:

- Help in strengthening the K-16 relationship.
- Facilitate the extension of existing institutional recruitment efforts and activities in the neighborhoods of North Las Vegas and the surrounding areas.
- Increase dissemination of factual information about college requirements, college preparation, and potential resources to underrepresented groups.
- Enhance the support and advocacy for underrepresented groups through participation in cultural and community events.
- Assist parents, high school students, and counselors by serving as a central neighborhood location to explore opportunities and strategies for success in higher education.

Chancellor Nichols reported that campus representatives worked hard to coordinate such a center with their existing activities. The final plan includes a strong link of oversight by UCCSN campuses. The task force reviewed national models and other places in the country where such centers had been implemented, many funded by federal grants. Dr. Nichols stated that the recommendation for a Millennium Bound Outreach Center would emulate the Educational Opportunities Center in the following manner:

- Services provided at the centers would include:
 - Information on post-secondary schools.
 - Career counseling and assessment.
 - Admission information and applications.
 - Financial information and referrals.
 - Personal counseling.
 - Interest assessment.
 - College transfer assistance.
 - Study skills analysis.
 - GED tutoring referrals.
 - Community referrals.
- The center would target the following populations:
 - First generation college students.
 - Veterans.
 - Individuals with disabilities.
 - Underrepresented and economically disadvantaged groups.
- The project scope and mission:

Through a consortium of all UCCSN institutions, the Millennium Bound Outreach Center will provide a support network to assist underrepresented and economically disadvantaged groups realize the benefits of higher education.

This will increase the number of persons among those populations who access and benefit from post-secondary education and thus respond to the UCCSN Diversity Goals and the Master Plan for Higher Education in Nevada to enhance the participation and success of its students.

- Recommended Goals:
 - Increase the high school graduation rate among the targeted populations, specifically underrepresented and economically disadvantaged groups.
 - Increase post-secondary participation, retention, and graduation rates among the targeted populations.
 - Improve the quality of high school preparation to support a higher rate of Millennium Scholarship eligibility among targeted populations.
 - Counsel participants on financial aid options and to assist in the admissions/application process.
 - Provide information on the opportunities and services at all UCCSN institutions.
 - Provide exposure to UCCSN academic programs and cultural events through on-campus tours, activities, and programs.
 - Develop community partnerships among the institutions and other educational institutions to advocate the benefits of higher education.
 - Periodically review and assess the success of students involved with the center.

Chancellor Nichols noted that the Deputy Director for Outreach would report to the Director, Vice Chancellor Dick Curry, as well as the UCCSN institutions. A lean staff, including student workers, was proposed with the understanding that UCCSN institutions' outreach efforts would also be involved with the center. Dr. Nichols then reviewed the project scope and proposed budget option plans. Through discussions it was determined that 1,310-sq. ft. would adequately accommodate institutional outreach activities at the Center. An average of \$1.25/sq. ft. was used to determine leased space costs for commercial space and \$2.00 for executive space. Three proposals were presented in the material:

- Commercial property @ \$1.25/sq. ft.
- Executive property @ \$2.00/sq. ft.
- Partnership program - no lease expense, center located in another agency (i.e. Economic Opportunity Board).

Chancellor Nichols related that, if the Board approved the concept, other actions would include allowing the center to seek grants, Board commitment for continued funding if funded by the legislature, and developing partnerships with community organizations and shared facilities. She said that task force members strongly advocated the need for such a facility.

Mr. Mark Bird, Economic Opportunity Board, related that his agency would be willing to partner in the outreach effort by assisting with grant-writing activity.

Regent Alden stated that the full Board should thank Regent Linda Howard for taking the initiative on this issue, adding that it was the right thing to do. He expressed concern for receiving the necessary funding to support the center. He felt that the philosophical approach was correct, in spite of staffing problems. He did not agree with creating the project out of the Chancellor's office, adding that he felt that it was a statewide issue. He observed that often the only exit from poor neighborhoods and environments was provided by outreach effort. He urged Board support for making the center part of the entire System and present on all of the campuses. He believed it was important, but was unsure about the proposed structure.

Regent Derby agreed that the project was worthy of Board support, adding that the process had synergy with the community. She acknowledged that System funds could not support the project. She felt it important to realize that the concept itself was very important. The institutions all have their own outreach efforts, which she felt should continue. She believed there is a real need for a center to be located in the neighborhoods of ethnic minorities. She related that many people are inhibited to come to the campus initially. She acknowledged that grants and other methods of support would be necessary and encouraged Board support.

Regent Seastrand requested clarification regarding grant-funding requirements that guarantee a future budget. Chancellor Nichols replied that she knew of no granting agency that would provide money for a project that would end at the termination of the grant. She stated that grant funding would require a Board commitment to continue with the project. She explained that the Board could seek state funding for the center and had committed to the concept. She said that a grant application would need to be affiliated with an institution. Regent Seastrand asked whether a commitment for pursuing a request for budget enhancement could be done at this time. Chancellor Nichols replied that the Board could only commit to including the center in their discussion of the enhancement items for the budget. Regent Seastrand asked whether a record for success had been demonstrated with other centers, with the Chancellor replying that an increased participation in college rates had been realized. Regent Seastrand encouraged Board support to take the necessary steps to get the word out and provide the necessary outreach.

Regent Kirkpatrick stated that underrepresented groups had fallen through the cracks and had little opportunity for redemption. He noted that most institutions had outreach centers and were striving to provide similar services as those proposed. He expressed concern for duplication of effort, identifying the best location for such a center, and the cost. He was also concerned about the System's priority for supporting the center.

Regent Rosenberg reported that UNR utilized an Office for Recruitment, Advisement, and Retention, which was highly effective. He observed that students needed to come to campus for recruitment efforts. He agreed that location was an important factor. He expressed concern for starting a project with soft money, adding that he did not want to lose the program that warranted Board attention.

Mr. Ledon suggested that the center might be more appropriately located at the junior high or high schools. Regent Howard said that the high schools had not addressed this ongoing issue. She related that community residents had expressed a need for more avenues to access. She said that the high schools and universities were not doing enough outreach to the neighborhoods. Mr. Ledon felt that the center should be located at high school locations rather than at one single location. Regent Howard stated that the plan was to work with grades 8-12. She did not feel that \$200,000 was much money when compared with some of the System's budgets. She stated that retention and recruitment numbers for minority students was pitiful. She noted that UNLV has a \$12 million budget for recruitment and asked why the money was not used to serve the minority neighborhoods. President Harter noted that some of the money was used for that purpose.

Mr. Larry Mason, Dean, Student Development and Community Outreach, CCSN-Henderson, Clark County School Board and Outreach Task Force member, reminded the Board that it was a pilot project, adding that it could expand if it did indeed work. He recommended using the public schools to expose minority students to campus literature regarding higher education. He noted that higher education was very intimidating in many cultures. He felt the Board must open the doors, communicate, and provide access. He observed that Clark County has over 242,000 students with 25% Latino and 14% African American representation, adding that the minority was now the majority. He cautioned that unless people had access to higher education they would not pursue it. He urged the Board not to let the idea go, adding that it would be a small investment on greater returns.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked about the increasing Hispanic population and the proper location for an outreach center. Mr. Mason replied that it should be available in 4 regional areas, citing as examples Clark County, Elko County, and Washoe County, and starting with one location. Regent Rosenberg suggested locating it someplace accessible to public transportation. Regent Howard related that the task force had identified a downtown, North Las Vegas location, close to low-income families of various races.

Regent Gallagher agreed with the concept, but expressed concern that the governor had informed the Board that new programs would not be entertained in this budget. She expressed concern for misleading people if the Board committed to putting the center in the budget in order to apply for grants and was unsuccessful in attaining state funding. She was worried about starting the project without an identified source of funds. She suggested that the center could be started in a non-standalone manner for the first biennium.

Regent Sisolak expressed his support for the concept. He asked what would happen if a grant were issued and the center was not state funded. Chancellor Nichols replied that non-profit organizations typically keep writing grants to remain open. She noted the importance of recognizing the possibility that it could close without state funding. She told the Board they could decide not to open it with grants and opt to take it to the state, adding that she had no indication that no new programs would be entertained, rather that they had assured UCCSN it would be a difficult year. She said that she knew of no other way of funding the center without new state funding. Regent Sisolak expressed concern for using grants to open the facility, adding that \$200,000 was still a lot of money to ask the state for in spite of it being a worthwhile project. He was under the

impression that UNLV had made great inroads in increasing the diversity of their student population over the past 10 years. President Harter stated that UNLV made significant investments in recruitment and retention efforts of underrepresented groups (i.e. advising, counseling), adding that it had a positive effect on students. She related that minority representation was significantly higher than 10 years ago (19% minority enrollment to 28%). She observed that some of the increase was reflective of growth in the community, adding that it could also be attributed to their outreach efforts. Regent Sisolak related that President Moore also made reference to increased enrollments with loans of equipment at CCSN. Regent Howard stated that she doubted that information, agreeing there had been some improvement, but not "great inroads". She said that she was not trying to undermine Dr. Harter's efforts, but felt there was still much to be accomplished, adding that UNR could use some improvement. President Lilley replied that UNR had improved a great deal. Regent Howard felt that more could be accomplished with the provision of additional avenues. She reported that Nevada ranked very low in recruitment and retention of minority students. President Harter agreed that it was a problem that UNLV was addressing.

Regent Sisolak asked about locating the center on a bus line. Regent Rosenberg clarified that he had suggested locating the center in an area with access to public transportation. Regent Howard stated that Regent Sisolak did not understand what a bus line was.

Regent Alden stated that Clark County had many underserved neighborhoods, adding that it was clear that many things needed to occur in order for the center to survive. He observed the need to diversify the economy and increase efforts in recruiting and retaining nurses and teachers, as well as the need to do more for the communities. He observed the need for substantial support for other efforts in order for the outreach center to survive. He felt that this was a good starting point.

Chair Dondero asked Mr. Mason about use of public school facilities for outreach programs as part of a partnership. Mr. Mason replied that it had been one of the original concepts, adding that the school district was willing to help as much as possible.

President Harter noted that minority recruitment and retention was typically a significant issue at urban universities and that significant dollars were dedicated to addressing recruitment and retention. She reported that the new freshman class at UNLV was comprised of 33% minority students.

Regent Derby felt there was little risk involved for the Board to agree to go ahead with this, adding that the institutions were already doing a piece of it. She acknowledged the need for neighborhood representation and did not believe that the \$200,000 request was excessive. She related that it would allow flexibility for the Board to review other items on the enhancement list as well and provided the idea a chance to move forward.

Regent Howard stated that nothing now held the institutions accountable for their recruitment and retention efforts, adding that the center would. She thanked Chair Dondero for establishing the task force and Chancellor Nichols for her support. She also commended the efforts of the task force members, adding that she hoped the Board would approve the concept.

Dr. Juanita Fain, Vice President, Administration-UNLV, stated that she was initially somewhat defensive because the institutions believe they have made extraordinary efforts to reach underrepresented communities. She related that she now views the center as an additional avenue for outreach. She clarified that the outreach center would be located in a community, adding that students would be referred to the various campuses so they would become comfortable there. She noted that the effort would have an impact on existing personnel. Regent Howard asked about the impact. Dr. Fain replied that they would need to schedule time for existing staff to be at the center.

President Harter stated that she hoped Regent Howard did not misunderstand her to be unsupportive of the center. She felt it was a perfectly legitimate enhancement item. She stated that UNLV believes they have made some real progress with minority recruitment and retention.

Dr. Rebecca Mills, Vice President, Student Life-UNLV, stated that she too came to the task force with a defensive attitude because UNLV believed they had made extra efforts to reach underrepresented groups. She agreed that students would benefit from this additional avenue.

Regent Sisolak observed that UNLV and CCSN had made admirable progress with increasing minority enrollment and should be commended for their efforts. Regent Alden agreed. President Lilley noted that the past two freshmen classes at UNR included 25% minority representation.

Regent Hill observed that opposing outreach could be negatively perceived. He felt it was embarrassing to ask the legislature to create a new bureaucracy in a time of financial belt-tightening and economic downturn. He suggested a review of the effectiveness and efficiencies of existing programs and advised against creating a new program at additional cost.

Regent Seastrand noted that the Board agreed that outreach is important and had expressed concerns about funding and the best form of outreach. He asked President Moore about his outreach efforts in the community while he was president of CCSN. President Moore stated that he was pleased that, as the college doubled in size, the ethnic representation tripled. Regent Seastrand asked to what that was attributed. President Moore replied that it was due to extensive work in the

community and partnerships formed for scholarships. He stated that he compared the county population to the minority representation at the college. He said that CCSN worked with the NAACP, and hired recruiters and ministers. He noted that CCSN failed to match county statistics with the Hispanic community. He observed that a lot of work helped increase Hispanic enrollments from 8% to 19%. He said that he strongly supported outreach programs. He acknowledged the need for role models off campus to encourage students to go to college and to sponsor scholarships. He said that students need someone to help them succeed and advocated a community intervention system to help keep students in school when college is not a family priority. He recommended rearranging the use of existing funds to support such measures.

Regent Seastrand agreed that the concept appeared to be sound, adding that funding remained a question for him. He was not opposed to seeking a budget enhancement. He asked whether the motion could include "or other permanent funding sources". He felt the Board should not limit the funding source.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the recommendations and acceptance of the report with the addition to look at other forms of permanent funding. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Rosenberg stated that he did not believe the legislature would ignore such a worthy cause, adding that it was a small request. He related that one presidential candidate from Texas raised the GED success rate in his community by a minimum of 60% by moving from the campus to the churches in the neighborhood.

Regent Gallagher asked whether a source of "other funding" could be identified prior to starting the grant-writing process. Chancellor Nichols replied that if the Board approved the concept it would enable the System to start a pilot program. She related that, if it proves to be successful, it would attract grants and the institutions would not let the idea die. She stated that, if it were not successful, they would not continue. She stated that she would like the Board to approve the concept to begin with a pilot program. Regent Gallagher said that she had no problem approving the concept.

Regent Alden stated that underrepresented students were not only people of color but could also include low-income people from many ethnic backgrounds. He indicated that he did support the concept.

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

The meeting recessed at 4:25 p.m. and reconvened at 4:35 p.m. with all members present except Regents Sisolak and Wiesner.

14. Approved-UCCSN Master Plan Goals - Chancellor Jane Nichols provided an update on public feedback to the draft UCCSN master plan and presented proposed revisions to the goal statements for the Board's consideration. (Ref. H on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols related that the impact of September 11th created economic uncertainties that had slowed down the planning process. She asked the Board to review and approve the proposed six new goals. She stated that public and campus input helped revise the goals and targets. The new goals put more emphasis on economic development, diversity and P-16. Overall, most goals and targets resonate with the constituencies and remain the same - meeting the needs of Nevadans. Principles to be included:

- Nevada has limited state revenue to support higher education.
- Growth in state population and need for more educated workforce create potential crisis in demand.
- Resources must be used cost-effectively and efficiently.
- Higher education institutions in Nevada must work together collaboratively to achieve the highest level of effectiveness and efficiency.

Chancellor Nichols reviewed the following goals:

1. A prosperous economy for Nevada:
 - We believe that all Nevada students should have access to the courses, degrees, training, or credentials needed for entering the workforce of the 21st Century and for adapting to changes in the workforce over time.
 - The future economic success of Nevada depends on an educated, trained workforce and an entrepreneurial environment supported by first-rate higher education.
 - Through partnerships with business, higher education will be an essential element in developing a dynamic, knowledge-based economy for Nevada.
 - Targets:
 - Develop and increase educational programs focused on critical shortages in identified fields.'
 - Increase the proportion and number of graduates in high-skill fields who come from Nevada's higher education institutions.
 - Increase research and development funds from federal government and other sources.

- Target significant research resources to specific economic objectives.
 - Increase and focus on workforce development in sectors with the highest potential for growth.
2. Quality Education:
- We believe that high expectations and quality learning experiences help students develop to their fullest potential.
 - We believe that accountability demands that we be measured by our success, not our efforts, in each of our endeavors.
 - Higher education will provide consistently excellent learning experiences for its students through instruction, research, and service.
 - Targets:
 - Differentiate the instructional and research missions of institutions to eliminate unnecessary redundancy.
 - Develop effective measures of student learning outcomes.
 - Establish assessment and accountability measures.
 - Increase the number of rich learning experiences available to students through research collaboration with faculty and community service learning.
3. Opportunity for All:
- We believe that all students should be given the opportunity to be successful and to complete a degree or credential if that is their goal.
 - Higher education will increase the overall participation and success of Nevadans enrolling in higher education at all levels of education and in all ethnic groups.
 - Targets:
 - Raise the percent of Nevada's high school graduates who continue their education.
 - Increase the percent of students who complete bachelor's degrees in six years.
 - Increase the percent of students who complete associate degrees in three years.
 - Bring participation in higher education by underrepresented groups into parity with the white population.
4. New Goal - Accessible Education:
- We believe that lifelong learning is a noble endeavor and that providing these opportunities are necessary for a citizenry that must continuously adapt to changing societal and economic conditions.
 - We believe that higher education should provide flexible and innovative delivery systems designed to meet the educational needs of Nevadans.
 - Higher education will provide programs and services that address the unique educational needs of a highly diverse and non-traditional population.
 - Targets:
 - Increase programs and courses designed to meet the needs of working adults.
 - Increase programs and courses designed to meet the needs of underrepresented groups.
 - Increase need-based financial aid for Nevada students.
5. New Goal - P-16 Education:
- We believe that success in higher education is a joint endeavor that begins at pre-kindergarten and continues to grade 16 and beyond, with seamless transitions and articulation throughout all levels of education.
 - Higher education will increase its partnerships with the public education system to provide the cooperative delivery of education from pre-kindergarten through college degrees.
 - Targets:
 - Increase P-16 programs that provide seamless transitions and result in student success in college.
 - Through P-16 efforts, decrease the percent of recent Nevada high school graduates taking remedial/developmental courses.
6. Building Quality of Life:
- We believe that higher education enriches the quality of life for Nevadans through benefits from research, the arts, the humanities, civic engagement, faculty service, and educated alumni.
 - Higher education will be instrumental in advancing society and enriching the lives of Nevada's citizens.
 - Targets:
 - Position institutions as intellectual, cultural, and artistic centers and as the "marketplace for ideas".
 - Prepare students as citizens involved in advancing civic, social, and cultural goals.
 - Improve "educational benefits" grade on National Report Card from a C minus to at least a B grade.

Chancellor Nichols reported that several steps were necessary in order to reach those goals:

- Establish measurable targets for each goal.
- Accountability for the system and each institution within these targets.
- Internal review process for targets and development of strategies, both System-wide and by institution

Chancellor Nichols indicated that key ingredients of the plan included:

- Internal efficiencies and increased effectiveness with existing resources.
- Students provide increased support.

- State of Nevada provides increased support.
- Growth in federal funding for research and other programs.
- Technology transfer and business support.

Chancellor Nichols reviewed changes to the estimate of high school graduates, 2009-2010:

- In 2000-01, Nevada high school graduates were 6.3% less than WICHE projections (911 students).
- UCCSN enrollment growth for fall 2001 was 2.4% (2,139 students).
- In light of this new information, UCCSN looked at new projections by trend data and by examining enrollments by grade level in each Nevada county.
- With this new data, the new projection for 2009-10 is 18,300 (-4,372 or 19% less than the original WICHE projections).
- We recommend using 18,300 as our estimate and assuming a variance of 3% above and below (low-17,750/middle-18,300/high-18,850).

Impact of new estimate:

- Rather than a 60% increase in high school graduates, we are now facing a 48.6% increase in high school graduates by 2009-10.
- This will decrease the total number of students anticipated to enroll in UCCSN in future years.
- This will decrease the anticipated cost of our Master Plan.

Chancellor Nichols reported that UCCSN enrollment projections were based on numbers of high school graduates, headcount per 1,000 Nevada population, and college-going rate. Thus, the final cost would be less than the original plan estimate. Next steps will include:

- Approve final UCCSN plan by April.
- Develop and approve structure and methodology to support plan no later than January 2003.
 - Criteria for mission differentiation and program evaluation.
 - Strategies to reach goals and targets for each campus.
 - Accountability plan.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked what future goal for increases would be since the number of projected high school graduates was expected to decrease by 2009-10. Chancellor Nichols replied that the initial goal was to reach the WICHE median. The community and campuses did not like setting a long-term goal for "average". She agreed that a percentage needed to be set, adding that it was not included in the material presented. She reported that the national median was 65% and the WICHE median was 56%.

Regent Derby noted that the System had been working toward a master plan for a long time and commended the Chancellor and her staff for their efforts. She liked the use of goals and targets, adding that it would be most helpful to the Board in the future.

Regent Alden observed that some things were beyond Board control (i.e. control over state funding). He felt there was a structural defect with funding education, particularly K-12, adding that little had been done to change that. He felt the Board should concentrate on ongoing efforts to diversify the economy. President Harter stated that the plan's goals were now in a different order, adding that the Chancellor had responded to community input regarding economic development and the new plan reflected that.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the revisions to the UCCSN Master Plan goal statements. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Rosenberg complimented Chancellor Nichols and Vice Chancellor Curry for building the accountability factors into the plan.

Regent Gallagher asked whether UCCSN could begin with mission differentiation first. Chancellor Nichols replied that they could, adding that staff had intended to bring that issue to the March meeting. She related that certain details would not be ready in March, but could be forthcoming prior to January 2003.

President Lilley was pleased with the re-draft and the improvements made. He observed the importance of providing young people with an international experience. Chancellor Nichols agreed to review the plan for possible inclusion of that item as a target.

Regent Seastrand was glad to see the progress that had been made. He asked whether the Master Plan would include planning of campus growth or growing communities that required service. Chancellor Nichols replied that it would be included as part of the Master Plan in the mission differentiation section. The Board will set criteria for when (what size) a community should be considered for a branch campus or new institution, the process by which a branch campus might become an institution, when a High Tech Center is considered for a community college, etc. She related that Vice Chancellor Curry was

reviewing models from other states. Dr. Curry stated there were also other aspects of mission differentiation to be considered. Regent Seastrand agreed that the Board had very little control over state funding and asked whether other avenues for enhancing funding should be explored. Chancellor Nichols agreed that was a very good idea. She said they could make certain assumptions and had submitted a request to the governor's task force and would have an opportunity to present the System's case for the future of higher education in Nevada. She noted the urgent need to make that case. She related that, historically, higher education had been under-funded for many years. She agreed the System must review several potential sources of alternative funding. Regent Seastrand suggested pursuing resources for all education.

Regent Howard commended the Chancellor for her efforts, adding that she hoped the Board would be provided the opportunity to review more in the future. She felt that Regents should be better advocates for education and become better fundraisers. Chancellor Nichols agreed that was a critical role for Regents to fill. She said that the UCCSN's greatest criticism was waste of money, adding that Board members could become spokespersons to the community and legislature that the Board was closely monitoring the situation to ensure the money was spent well.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked about accommodations made to address community criticism from Reno participants regarding the lack of graduates in their disciplines. Chancellor Nichols replied that she had tried to ensure that programs were in line with workforce and research needs, as well as forming partnerships with business. She related that input from the business community confirmed that UCCSN should listen to them and be able to produce graduates that can meet their requirements. She noted that their goals were the same. She stated that the plan would be distributed to roundtable participants.

Regent Gallagher asked whether a Facilities Master Plan would follow. Chancellor Nichols replied that, with the addition of Mr. John Amend to System staff, he was starting that process with the campuses.

Motion carried. Regents Sisolak and Wiesner were absent.

The meeting recessed at 5:35 p.m. and reconvened at 8:10 a.m. on Friday, January 25, 2002 with all members present except Regents Howard, Seastrand, and Wiesner. Chair Dondero reported that items #17 (Support Policies and Programs for Increased University Admissions Standards) and #24 (Fire Science Academy, UNR) had been removed from the agenda.

15. Approved-Interlocal Agreement, City of Las Vegas, Soccer Fields, CCSN - The Board approved termination of the interlocal agreement with the City of Las Vegas by which the parties intended to jointly build, and use, soccer fields at the Community College of Southern Nevada West Charleston Campus. The agreement was terminated due to substantially increased costs to CCSN, and also to make the property available for other uses. (Ref. J on file in the Board office)

President Remington reported that the Board had previously approved an interlocal agreement between CCSN and the City of Las Vegas to locate soccer fields on college property. The projected cost of the soccer fields was \$700,000. The City of Las Vegas advanced the college \$200,000 towards that cost. After careful investigation of the cost and maintenance of the fields, it was discovered that the cost of the fields would be close to \$1.9 million. He reported that he met with Councilman Mike McDonald and they believed it would be better to return the money to the City so the fields could be developed elsewhere. Dr. Remington reported that maintenance costs could run \$400,000-500,000 per year, adding that the college could not afford it.

Regent Hill moved approval of terminating the interlocal agreement between CCSN and the City of Las Vegas regarding joint development and use of proposed soccer fields. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether Mr. McDonald agreed with the decision. President Remington replied that Councilman McDonald could locate another site for the soccer field and understood the college was in no position to accommodate the soccer fields.

Regent Kirkpatrick expressed his support for President Remington's decision. He noted that this was another example where the Board took action without benefit of factual data.

Regent Dondero stated that the property could be put to better use in the future. She announced that Mr. Dan Musgrove from City of Las Vegas was present to answer any questions.

Motion carried. Regents Howard, Seastrand, and Wiesner were absent.

16. Information Only-Credit Card Solicitation - Staff reviewed current institutional practices regarding the distribution of student and alumni information to external vendors and recommended a System-wide policy for Board consideration. (Ref. I on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols asked the Board to review this matter over two meetings prior to taking final action due to the complexity of the issue, adding that Board action could impact other areas. She stated that policy would be developed from discussion held that day. She related that she would explain the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the issues that had arisen over credit cards.

General Counsel Tom Ray reported that two separate issues needed to be considered prior to making a decision:

- Is the practice allowed by law?
- Is this a relationship you wish to continue, or do you want to limit it in some fashion?

He stated that the privacy of faculty and staff records was controlled by state law and the Regents' Code. Under these provisions, all personal records of employees are confidential with the exception of roster information (name, job title, business address, business telephone number, and salary). Those items are public by law and anyone can access that information. Anything else is confidential and cannot be released to the public or credit card companies.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

General Counsel Ray related that FERPA provides that educational records are confidential. He explained that any document or material prepared or maintained by an institution are confidential educational records and only school officials may access those records. School officials must have a legitimate, educational purpose for accessing those records as it relates to the student. Educational records cannot be released to anyone else without the express written consent of the student. One exception to this rule is directory information. The law allows certain rights to all students:

- Right to see their records.
- Right to seek an amendment to their records if they believe there is an error.
- Right to be informed by the institution what the institution considers "personally identifiable information", commonly referred to as directory information.
- Right to refuse disclosure of directory information.
- Must be informed annually of these rights and what the institution considers directory information. Students must be provided a reasonable, specified time to inform the institution not to disclose these records.

General Counsel Ray reported that FERPA did not specify what was considered directory information. Each institution has the discretion to define directory information. If challenged, the Department of Education would take a position. Typical examples of directory information include name, address, telephone number, major, height, weight, place of birth, date of birth, and periods of attendance, which can be disclosed under FERPA. He related that it was important for institutions to have directory information (i.e. athletic programs post height and weight of student athletes and graduation announcements contain student names).

General Counsel Ray reported that institutions could engage in a relationship with credit card companies provided it was done in a manner that conformed to FERPA. The information must be identified as "directory information" by the institution in order to be released. Students are typically notified in the institution's catalog. If the notification is not in the catalog, the information cannot be disclosed. Students have to be provided reasonable opportunity to inform the institution not to release the information. He related that the same legal requirements also applied to former students and alumni. Once the student leaves the institution, the institution does not have to continue annual notification of FERPA rights.

Regent Gallagher noted that confidential records were available to Regents and asked why the Regents would need access to such records. General Counsel Ray replied that circumstances could exist when developing policy or the institution's curricula. He related that it was important to ensure that it was for a legitimate reason. He explained that he could access student records when working on a disciplinary matter, but not for idle curiosity.

Regent Alden asked about the method of disclosure (i.e. notification in bold print, ability to reject at the time of registration). General Counsel Ray replied that he could not speak to the individual practices of the institutions, adding that notification was typically placed in the catalog. Regent Alden asked whether it was possible for students to register at an institution and not be aware of the policy. General Counsel Ray replied that it could happen if the student did not read the catalog. He related that those were the minimum requirements of FERPA, adding that the Board could require additional notice requirements.

Regent Sisolak thanked student Denise Wilcox. His interest in the matter was initiated by her letter of complaint regarding credit card solicitation. He asked whether the Board could see a sample catalog to see the disclosure. Catalogs and schedules were provided. A discussion ensued regarding which page number the notification appeared on in different institution catalogs. He asked what type of information would not be defined or categorized as directory information. General Counsel Ray replied that grades, classes taken, and disciplinary matters would not. Regent Sisolak asked whether consistent policy existed between institutions. General Counsel Ray replied it did not.

Chancellor Nichols stated there was no current System policy regarding FERPA or directory information. She suggested a review of potential policies for Board consideration. The first group of policies related to FERPA and common definitions of student directory information. The second group of policies specifically related to credit card companies.

- Choose to do nothing; all institutions must be in compliance with FERPA.
- Define what is considered acceptable directory information.

- o Could limit what is considered directory information.
- Define how the student opts in or out. FERPA only requires the student has the opportunity to opt out.
 - o Some suggest the policy should be more restrictive (i.e. the student opts in). Many problems exist with a "blanket" opt in policy. If the student did not opt out, their name could not be listed on the graduation announcement.

Chancellor Nichols reported that, under the provisions of FERPA, institutions may disclose, without consent, directory information to individuals upon request. Under no circumstances shall directory information for currently enrolled students be provided in aggregate form by UCCSN institutions to external parties. She stated that military recruiters often ask for such a list. She said that it would eliminate the need for policy banning the sale of lists. Another policy choice could be the process used to opt out (notification requirements). She indicated that the Board could determine a specific location or method of student notification. She related that many students currently register online. Another potential policy concerned non-disclosure requests, where a uniform process would be determined for the amount of time students had to notify the institution to not disclose their information (up to 6 weeks). The request for non-disclosure would apply during the entire period of the student's attendance at an institution. Current practice allows a student to permanently opt out. A final policy option addressed prohibition of the sale or rental of student directory information for a fee, which would apply to students and alumni.

Chancellor Nichols then discussed potential policy related to credit cards:

- UCCSN institutions are prohibited from participating in credit card solicitations of currently enrolled students by mail or telephone through the use of student directory information.
 - o UNLV currently protects students' privacy by handling credit card solicitation internally. Student names and addresses are not disclosed to the credit card company.
- Credit card marketers and their representatives must comply with institutional policies on rental and use of campus facilities.
 - o Bans use of incentives to get students to apply for credit cards.

Chancellor Nichols stated that Board action on this issue would affect many other areas (i.e. health and insurance programs).

Regent Alden felt the issue was the credit card companies. He observed there were two pools of students (current and alumni), adding that he did not want to micromanage the Alumni Association but was concerned about current students. He felt the notification provided was not clear for students and that students should be aware they could reject or accept the notification.

Regent Rosenberg observed that the Board's decision related directly to what was considered directory information. He was bothered by providing student addresses, noting that telephone numbers were easily changed. He felt the Board should first clarify directory information.

Mr. Fred Albrecht, Vice President, Community Relations and Executive Director, UNLV Alumni Association, related that university merchandise was marketed in an effort to demonstrate student and institution pride (i.e. license plate program). He noted that it also provided an avenue to generate money for scholarships. He explained that UNLV did not sell lists to the credit card companies. The UNLV Alumni Association, comprised of former students, respects student rights. He felt that students should have the right to determine if their information was released. Money generated from these programs is dedicated to scholarship funds and programs to enhance the student experience. He acknowledged that credit cards could create problems, adding that UNLV holds seminars to educate students about establishing credit and using the card properly. He reported that 40% of students have and/or use credit cards, adding that they had the right to ignore the application. He related that UNLV was trying to provide an opportunity to show school pride. As a student graduates and earns more money, the institution makes money from the credit card balances. Those funds are used to support student programs and scholarships. He stated that UNLV would abide by the Board's decision, adding that UNLV was not in violation of any federal or state regulations.

Regent Alden asked whether students approached the Alumni Association voluntarily and whether they paid an annual fee. Mr. Albrecht replied that every UNLV graduate was a member of the Alumni Association. Active members pay a fee and receive more information than inactive (non-paying) members. Regent Alden asked about students. Mr. Albrecht replied that the Alumni Association sent a letter asking them if they wanted to be an active member of the Association. He stated that anyone taking credits at the institution could request to become a member. Regent Alden stated that the Alumni Association was separate, adding that he did not want to dictate their operations.

Regent Sisolak asked about the percentage of revenue realized from currently enrolled students vs. alumni. Mr. Albrecht replied that students comprised approximately 25-30% of the revenue because their credit limit was so low. He noted that it provided students an opportunity to have a credit card, adding that they would likely keep it. Regent Sisolak asked about other uses of student directory information. Mr. Albrecht replied that a program of supplemental insurance was offered to graduating seniors. Regent Sisolak asked how much the university realized from that effort. Mr. Albrecht replied very little

was received (\$1,000/year). Regent Sisolak asked whether these programs could be potentially expanded to include magazine sales and long distance service. Mr. Albrecht replied that it could be, adding that UNLV did not want to overuse the solicitation process. The Alumni Association has declined many offers and only two programs were currently being used. Regent Sisolak asked about UNLV's participation in associations. Mr. Albrecht replied there were two organizations being used: Council for Advancement and Support of Education and the Council of Alumni Association Executives, comprised of 80 schools (Pac 10, Big 10, ivy league and southeast conference). He reported that organizations that sell lists must report unrelated business income and pay taxes on that income. A credit card program like UNLV's is not taxed. Money is generated from 1/2 of 1% of the interest income. To protect the rights of students and alumni, the program is handled internally. Regent Sisolak asked whether other members of these associations used their disclosure capabilities for other services (i.e. long distance service). Mr. Albrecht replied that they did. Regent Sisolak asked about the nature of those programs. Mr. Albrecht replied that other examples included the license plate program, insurance, auto insurance, mortgage insurance, and long distance calling programs. He stated that UNLV did not employ those other programs. He reported there were approximately 6-8 programs offered nationally. He related that credit card programs were the largest revenue generator. He stated that some institutions even endow chairs with the revenue generated.

Regent Hill observed that editorials were critical of list selling. Mr. Albrecht replied that the UNLV Alumni Association did not sell any lists. Regent Hill asked whether UNLV evaluated the credit card terms. Mr. Albrecht replied that they did, adding that the rates were generally lower (9.9-12.9% for alumni and 15.9% for students). He observed that some credit card rates (not endorsed by universities) were as high as 22%. He indicated that UNLV tried to get the best interest rates they could offer to students and alumni. Regent Hill thought it was good that the money was generated for students, scholarships, and the university. He asked students to keep track of the number of credit card solicitations received and bring them to the next meeting.

Regent Alden asked whether the Board could set policy that the alumni associations would have to abide by. General Counsel Ray replied that the Board could do so by determining allowable directory information and how it could be released. He explained that any restrictions placed on the information could restrict an alumni association.

Regent Rosenberg asked how the students would receive the disclosure notification since many students did not read the catalog or schedule. He felt the policy should address whether the Board wanted to assist dissemination of student information. He applauded UNLV's use of the money, but was uncomfortable with releasing any information, particularly for credit cards. He reported that UNR's student orientation included a segment on credit cards and students still got into credit difficulties. He was opposed to sharing student or alumni information with credit card companies. Mr. Albrecht noted that the average age of UNLV's students was 28 years. He felt the institutions could not discriminate against students based upon their age. Regent Rosenberg stated that he had encountered many students in financial trouble and did not want to help the process.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked why he had received a communication from UNLV's Alumni Association. Mr. Albrecht replied that faculty was also considered part of the Alumni Association.

Regent Sisolak noted that UNLV's list included certain names they could track to ensure the list was not used by the mailing house for non-authorized programs. Mr. Albrecht stated that UNLV used fictitious names with the university's address to check what other solicitations were sent. Regent Sisolak did not want to discriminate which programs the list could be used for. He felt that the Board should decide whether they wanted to use the information for anything or nothing and whether the information could be disseminated for profit. He felt it would be pointless to restrict the information for credit cards because other programs would be employed to raise the revenue.

Chair Dondero requested clarification on the information sent by Mr. Albrecht's office. Mr. Albrecht replied that he reviewed and signed the letter sent to faculty, staff, students and alumni. Chair Dondero agreed that insurance offered to students was helpful. She asked whether most students were adults. Mr. Albrecht replied that he considered all of UNLV's students as adults.

Regent Rosenberg stated that the Board needed to determine what was appropriate directory information.

16. Information Only-Credit Card Solicitation - (Cont'd.)

Regent Derby felt it was important to pursue other forms of revenue when funding for higher education was being squeezed. She thanked the Chancellor for providing multiple alternatives for Board consideration. Mr. Albrecht stated that limiting the use of directory information could have a negative impact on student scholarships, adding that telephone numbers were often shared with scholarship organizations.

Regent Howard stated that the issue was about student privacy protection and not about credit cards. She asked to hear more about student privacy from Mr. Gary Peck, ACLU.

Mr. Gary Peck, ACLU, introduced Mr. Allen Lichtenstein, ACLU General Counsel. Mr. Lichtenstein related that the ACLU's concern was informed consent, adding that they had no problem with the dissemination of information if the student agreed. The ACLU felt that it was currently difficult for students to ascertain the informed consent. He suggested the Board adopt a

policy providing students maximum control. He felt a student might reasonably not object to having their name on a graduation list, but would object to commercial solicitation. He agreed that students were adults and must take responsibility. He felt that informed consent should not be limited to students and alumni, but also applied to faculty and donors. He stated that policies must be in effect to prevent lists from being over-circulated. He offered to assist in the development of policy that would focus on the fundamental issue of informed consent.

Regent Sisolak asked whether FERPA applied to alumni regardless of their age. Mr. Lichtenstein replied that student records transferred to the Alumni Association were protected by FERPA. Chancellor Nichols stated that the student record was protected by FERPA. If the Alumni Association received information that was not part of the student record (i.e. a new address) it would not be protected. Regent Sisolak asked whether the ACLU was opposed to companies having a booth on campus and providing incentives for signing up for a program. Mr. Lichtenstein replied he would not as long as they were disclosing all relevant information and had informed consent. Regent Sisolak asked whether checking a box on a registration form to prevent commercial solicitation would comprise informed consent. Mr. Lichtenstein replied that a better method would be for the student to identify which purposes they wanted their information released (i.e. graduation list). He urged the use of a method that ensured the students identified the areas they wanted their information disclosed (opt in). Mr. Peck stated that the institution should send the message that if they were involved with an individual's privacy rights the burden was on the institution to get the individual's permission to do so. He felt that universities and colleges should be a model for society and show people how to do things properly. He felt the System had been very sensitive to these issues, adding that he was happy to work with them in a collegial manner. Regent Sisolak asked about drawing a distinction between student lists and alumni lists. Mr. Lichtenstein replied that information received from alumni voluntarily was a separate issue than the directory information, but the same principle of informed consent would apply.

Chair Dondero stated that she was unwilling to interfere with the privacy rights of adult aged students. Mr. Lichtenstein stated that the disclosure notification currently offered did not allow the students to make their own decision.

Regent Rosenberg stated that it all revolved around the directory information and what was released. Mr. Peck stated that people's privacy had been already been inadvertently violated. He urged the Board to ask the campuses to halt practices until a System-wide policy was developed and adopted because the System was now exposed to legal liability. He related that currently alumni could file suit for privacy violations. He wanted to ensure that no one's rights were violated between now and policy adoption. Mr. Lichtenstein stated that one consideration was that some information could be appropriate in some circumstances and not in others. He stated that students could always waive privacy rights in certain circumstances. He felt it was important for the student to decide what information was disclosed and to whom.

Chancellor Nichols stated that System institutions would be brought into FERPA compliance immediately, adding that it would not require Board action.

Regent Alden felt there was a difference between university students and members of an alumni association. He appreciated the distinction made for how the information was received. He felt that some student directory information was necessary for ongoing business (i.e. graduation lists) and a distinction should be made between lists for commercial solicitation and directory information required for normal operation of the institution. Mr. Lichtenstein stated that the mechanism should be one of informed consent. Students have the right to say their information will not be disclosed for any purpose other than educational. He felt it was easy to ask the student what information they wanted disclosed and in what context.

Chancellor Nichols expressed her appreciation to the ACLU for keeping the System on their toes, adding that she was happy to work with them in framing potential policy.

Ms. Rana Koran, UNLV GSA student body president, agreed that students do not read the catalog. She observed that students attend universities and community colleges to learn to think and research. Students know that their first reference item is the university catalog. She felt the university would use her information properly. She felt that a discretionary power over what the information was used for would be confusing to students. She said they might not be aware of the opportunities that would be denied if they chose to deny information to be released. She stated that she receives 3-5 credit card solicitations per week. She actively sought a credit card because she could not afford to pay for everything with cash. She felt it was a good learning experience with an appropriately low limit.

Mr. Matthew Wolden, UNR student body president, felt that informed consent was very important. He was very disturbed the university would use his name to generate profits.

Mr. Paul Moradkhan, UNLV student body president spoke to the orientation process, which included procedures for opting out. He reported that he received more solicitations from other avenues than from the university. He noted that money generated helped support student programs and was tightly regulated. He felt that UNLV students were aware of their rights and were kept informed, adding that he had not received any complaints from students.

Regent Sisolak observed that each institution required a different number of days for opting in and/or out.

Mr. Carlos Ledon, UNR GSA student body president, felt it would be difficult to keep a list of options for what students did and did not want released. He felt that students needed a liberal policy to opt out and not be required to opt in on the first day. He said that he received credit card solicitations daily. He felt that UNLV's policy was a good one, adding that he did not know UNR's policy. He too had not received any student complaints. The only complaint received was when booths were on campus, which was a different issue. He agreed that determining directory information was key, and was unsure about including the student's address. He suggested that as technology progressed specific audiences could be targeted for pertinent information. He felt the students could trust the university administrators to do the right thing with the information provided. He noted that any concerns would be addressed and was impressed with the options provided by the Chancellor.

UNLV student Lewis Whitten stated that, currently, students were required to write a letter to be removed from the list, which he felt discouraged students from removing their names. He suggested that students should have to write a letter in order for their information to be made available, or not provide the information at all.

Regent Hill suggested the use of a simple sentence for students to check "yes" or "no". He felt it was important to notify the students how the money was spent. He recommended that institutions get into compliance with FERPA requirements. He expressed a simple, concise, and practical solution.

Regent Derby felt it had been a helpful discussion, adding that she liked UNLV's policy. She recognized the need for making the option to opt out to be made easy and clear. She appreciated efforts extended during orientation. She did not support the automatic "opt in" because she felt that students might miss out on important information.

Chancellor Nichols thanked the Board for the discussion, adding that staff was now in a better position to bring clear policy options to the March meeting.

Wells Fargo Foundation Donation - Chair Dondero introduced Ms. Laura Schulte, Chairman, President and CEO of Wells Fargo Bank Nevada, N.A., and Mr. Jay Kommayer, Executive Vice President, Commercial Banking. Ms. Schulte announced that, in celebrating 150 years of service and a long-standing commitment to education, Wells Fargo was reaffirming that commitment with a \$3 million contribution to Nevada's higher education effort. The pledge was a promise to dedicate a minimum of \$3 million to the UCCSN over the next 5 years. She related that each institution would be funded separately based on their specific needs. A minimum of \$5,000 annually will be dedicated to each of the UCCSN's four community colleges and the scholarship program will increase to \$100,000/year. Chair Dondero expressed the Board's sincere appreciation for the generous donation, adding that the Wells Fargo foundation had always been a valued community partner.

The meeting recessed at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened at 10:35 a.m. with all members present except Regents Seastrand and Wiesner.

17. Approved-Interlocal Agreements, NSCH/City of Henderson - The Board approved President Moore's request for proposed amendments to the interlocal agreements with the City of Henderson regarding the lease of the Dawson Avenue building. (Ref. L on file in the Board office)

President Moore reported the terms of the agreement had changed from 10 to 5 years, adding that the cost would remain the same at \$1.00/year. He said the purchase price of \$2.2 million for 28,000-sq. ft. had not changed. The City of Henderson was moving 80 employees to another building so NSCH would have full use of the facility. He said that the rooms would easily convert into classrooms and the college would not need to build additional parking lots. He reported the remodeling could be accomplished for \$225,000. The building is still owned by the City of Las Vegas, but the college would now pay utilities for the entire building. He reported that the first new building would be constructed on City land with future developments to be made on BLM land. Dr. Moore indicated that the revised agreement would provide sufficient space for 5 classrooms, a library and offices.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the proposed amendments to the interlocal agreements with the City of Henderson for NSCH. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

General Counsel stated that the additional reference material referred to insurance requirements affected by the amendment.

Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

18. Information Only-Status Report, NSCH - President Richard Moore provided a status report on Nevada State College including facilities, personnel, and plans for the start of classes on September 3, 2002.

President Moore reported that, when the Board insisted upon private funding to open the college, the Landwell Corporation agreed to pay his salary while he searched for donors. He noted that Mr. Bill Martin donated \$50,000 and \$650,000 in pledges had been secured. The City of Henderson committed \$250,000 for remodeling. The college Foundation has raised \$1.1 million total including Dr. Moore's salary. Already 5 months behind schedule, the college Foundation recommended assembling the brightest people to help develop the necessary plans. Deadlines facing the college include:

- The nursing program plan must be reviewed and approved by the State licensing board by the end of February.
- The teacher education program must also be reviewed and approved by the end of February.

Dr. Moore reported that he placed an advertisement in The Chronicle of Higher Education. Applications were reviewed in December. Four applicants for the Director of Nursing position were received, but none were qualified. The UNR Nursing Director called associates across the nation and located a candidate from Oklahoma who had already started a nursing program. She accepted the position and has begun plans to parallel programs offered by UNR and UNLV. He mentioned valuable partnerships with Mr. Brian Cram and Mr. Carlos Garcia. He reported that the Clark County School District (CCSD) hires 1,700-1,800 teachers per year. A plan was formulated allowing instructors to teach from their academic majors. Dr. Georgeanne Rice took vacation time to help develop the teacher education program. Ms. Marcia Banderas, former Deputy Superintendent of Education, came out of retirement to assist with teacher licensure. He has also worked with UNR to develop general education requirements. All teaching students will have a degree in an academic field. He reported the college would now meet the deadlines, offering high-quality programs that could become a national model.

Dr. Moore reported that the college was conducting 15 searches for faculty positions. He acknowledged his secretary and temporary assistant. The search process is being managed with assistance from UNR's Ms. Carol Ort, Dr. Melisa Choroszy, Dr. Pat Miltenberger, the Director of Orvis School of Nursing, and the Dean of Education. He acknowledged Regent participation on the task forces formed to derive the original planning for the college. He observed that DRI loaned a past faculty senate chair who was on sabbatical. Mr. Bob Johns, the principal of Foothill High School, will take a year off his job to become the interim Director of Admissions for the college. Mr. Johns will talk to high school students about options provided at NSCH. CCSD will place NSCH teachers in their system as tutors. Mr. Johns will recruit and place students in the community service project. He reported that new administrative positions would start July 1.

Dr. Moore reported that UCCSN institutions were well represented at a recent college fair that generated 250 cards of interest. He stated the college had received 10-15 applications from students, with programs, faculty and administrators yet to be hired. He thanked UNLV for their assistance with student housing and student health insurance. Dr. Moore indicated that President Harter had been cooperative and supportive. Mr. Garcia has identified high schools in 5 regions where students can go to college in late afternoons and evenings. Dr. Moore related that the governor acknowledged that NSCH would become a reality and would go a long way to eliminating Nevada's teacher shortage. Dr. Moore concluded that opening the new college was a story of dreams, grit and great friends.

Regent Alden expressed hope that Dr. Moore would work closely with all of the area hospitals when developing the nursing program. Dr. Moore replied that he had been, adding that all 10 hospitals were cooperating. Regent Alden asked whether it was necessary for accreditation to provide a full 4-year plan even for the first year of operation. Dr. Moore replied that the college would need to show a full 4-year program for the BSN and the teacher training degrees. Regent Alden advised Dr. Moore to work closely with CCSN and UNLV to make the programs seamless. Dr. Moore replied that he would, adding that he and President Remington were meeting the following week to discuss 2+2 programs. He said that the college's second priority was to support the community colleges. Regent Alden asked whether students could attend the first two years at NSCH and transfer to UNLV (or vice versa) with seamless transition. Dr. Moore replied that it would be a seamless transition.

Regent Howard asked about the college's budget. Dr. Moore replied that the Foundation raised \$650,000, \$230,000 raised by the Foundation for his salary, and \$225,000 from the City of Henderson for a total of \$1.1 million raised. Regent Howard asked about the controversy surrounding the hire of Dr. Rice for \$1000/day. Dr. Moore replied that Dr. Rice is a national scholar and that was the rate for such services. He stated that the cheapest model involved renting temporary help, while the most expensive model would be the hire of full-time professionals. He observed that if the state had provided the \$1 million initially they would have spent approximately \$850,000 on administrators. He related they would spend less than \$200,000 on consultants, which was the least expensive model he could offer. Regent Howard asked about the number of consultants being used. Dr. Moore replied there were approximately six. Three individuals are working on faculty searches, one is working on teacher and nursing licensing, one is working on teacher education, and one is working on the nursing program.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether elementary education students would be graduates in a content area. Dr. Moore replied that they would have liberal arts degrees. Middle school and high school teachers would have a degree in one of the traditional fields.

Regent Derby stated that Dr. Moore continued to inspire her, adding that she wanted to be present on opening day. She acknowledged that it was a challenging process, adding that he had persevered in the face of obstacles. She applauded his relentless optimism.

Regent Kirkpatrick stated that he wanted the college to be successful. He questioned the liberal arts degree. Dr. Moore replied that students would receive a liberal arts degree with adequate course work to become licensed as a teacher. He related that Dr. Rice would help hire the faculty. He stated that it was an experiment in crafting great teachers. Regent Kirkpatrick referred to a letter dated January 10 where Dr. Moore indicated the college would have a licensure program and a select master's degree program in education. Dr. Moore replied that Mr. Garcia had indicated his interest in securing people with master's degree trained in bilingual education, special education, math, and science. He felt the program might engage

current teachers to return to school for their master's degrees. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether UNLV currently offered those programs. President Harter replied that they did. Regent Kirkpatrick questioned the need for duplicating programs. He felt it was far more important to establish the baccalaureate programs prior to initiating any master's programs. He felt the System did not have the resources for duplicating master's programs. He expressed concern for offering courses at the 5 area high schools instead of staying in the Henderson area. He was concerned about Dr. Moore's methods, adding that he could have used UNLV faculty instead of hiring consultants.

Regent Alden acknowledged that two very important things were being addressed with the nursing and teaching programs. He thanked Dr. Moore for his efforts.

19. Information Only-Expansion and Remodeling of Buildings, UNLV - A report was given describing the process for exploring the expansion and remodeling of Moyer Student Union and McDermott Physical Education Complex on the UNLV campus.

President Harter stated that she wished to preview a very ambitious project that Dr. Rebecca Mills, her staff and the students had conceptualized.

Vice President Rebecca Mills reported that one of her first duties as vice president had been to assess and enhance existing services and programs for students. She spoke with students and staff about what UNLV needed in order to create a better student environment that led to the proposed project to renovate and expand Moyer Student Union (MSU) and McDermott Physical Education Complex (MPE). She recalled that when first hired in 1986, Regent Kirkpatrick had told her that MSU was woefully inadequate. Now UNLV has 1,500 students living on campus. Students want a high quality experience outside of the classroom. She reported that MSU was built in 1968 to handle 5,000 students. MPE was built in 1974 and provides the only space for student recreation. She related that it was highly used and well run, but still an old gym. She expressed UNLV's desire to create spaces for students to meet and recreate. The plan to address this will include a student-led process and UNLV will assess their willingness to pay for a portion of the cost. Consultants have been hired to guide the process, as she did not want to unduly influence the students. Preliminary surveys indicate that students want better facilities, were willing to pay for them, but lacked sufficient information. The process was slowed down in order to provide students with additional information. UNLV wants to study what has and has not worked at other campuses and get a sense of student interests. She reported they would pursue all possible sources of funding and keep the Board informed. UNLV will only pursue the matter if student interest and willingness to pay is indicated. She stressed that the project was in its infancy, adding that UNLV was still exploring whether they could or should remodel/expand.

President Harter reminded the Board that, historically, the state had not built student unions, recreation facilities, or parking facilities.

20. Approved-Consent Agenda - The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of items (5) (Appointment, Vice President, Student Services, CCSN) and (7) (Handbook Revision, Summer 2002 Salary Schedule, UNR) which were discussed separately.

(1) Approved-Minutes - The Board approved the minutes from the meeting held December 6-7, 2001.

(2) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR - The Board approved tenure upon hire of Esmail Zanjani, Ph.D., to the Department of Animal Biotechnology, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, University of Nevada, Reno. Dr. Zanjani has an outstanding record of scientific achievements and publications. The appointment was supported unanimously by the tenured faculty and Chair of Animal Biotechnology and the Dean of the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources. (Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office)

(3) Approved-Extended Leave for Associate Professor, UNR - The Board approved extending the unpaid leave of absence for Dr. Jack Hayes, Associate Professor of Biology at UNR, for six additional months (01/01/02 - 06/30/02). Dr. Hayes was approved for a one-year leave of absence to serve as a Program Director for the National Science Foundation. Granting this request would allow him to gain additional benefits from his directorship, thereby making him a stronger contributor to the university upon his return.

(4) Approved-Extended Leave for Vice President, TMCC - The Board approved extending salaried sick leave for Vice President Richard Brand due to his illness. (Ref.C-4 on file in the Board office)

(6) Approved-Handbook Revision, Increase in University Admission Requirements - The Board approved Handbook language (Title IV, Chapter 16) for the changes to university admission requirements approved by the Board of Regents December 6-7, 2001. (Ref.C-6 on file in the Board office)

(8) Approved-Handbook Revision, Summer 2002 Salary Schedule UNR - The Board approved amending the Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 3, Section 26) to update the Summer Term salary schedule for 2002 at UNR. (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office)

(9) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, UNLV - The Board approved the use of Capital Improvement Fee funds for the following projects at UNLV: (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office)

Campus Master Plan \$625,000
Art Studio Lease-Liberace Plaza 122,000
ADA accommodations for faculty and staff 33,500
College of Business Advising Center 235,000
Conversion of teaching labs 180,000
Campus Services Building 140,000
Academic Program Offices 200,000
Summary Program-Science & Engineering Complex 150,000
Frazier Hall renovations 100,000
Cooling Tower 100,000
TOTAL: \$1,885,500

(10) Approved-Workers Compensation - The Board approved the issuance of an RFP for, and subsequent purchase of, a Letter of Credit in an amount not to exceed \$1,200,000. The Letter of Credit is in lieu of paying a cash deposit in a substantially larger amount to our Workers Compensation carrier. The Letter of Credit will be used as collateral for the UCCSN's Workers Compensation insurance for calendar year 2002. (Ref. C-10 on file in the Board office)

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with exception of items (5) (Appointment, Vice President, Student Services, CCSN) and (7) (Handbook Revision, Summer 2002 Salary Schedule, UNR), which were discussed separately. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

(5) Approved-Appointment, Vice President, Student Services, CCSN - The Board approved the appointment of the new Vice President for Student Services at CCSN.

Regent Kirkpatrick discussed locating the appointment of a vice president on the Consent Agenda, adding that the public had very little chance for input. He wanted to ensure the public had the opportunity to see the quality of individuals hired.

President Remington stated that he was pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Robert Anderson as Vice President for Student Services at CCSN. He indicated that Dr. Anderson had an extensive background, having served as CEO for three different institutions and Executive Vice Chancellor of a large community college in Houston. Dr. Remington felt that Dr. Anderson would be an excellent fit for the college. He encouraged Board support, as Dr. Anderson was still considering other options.

Regent Kirkpatrick expressed hope that the public and media would review his resume and realize the tremendous contribution he would make to CCSN. He observed that Dr. Anderson had been a UCCSN presidential candidate on a past search. Chair Dondero stated that the Board was fortunate to have such a highly qualified candidate.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the appointment. Regent Howard seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

Dr. Anderson said that it was a humbling experience. He related that he had reviewed a copy of the Board's strategic directions, which were greatly enhanced by the Chancellor's earlier presentation. He stated that it was his experience that systems that had solid strategic planning were successful ones. He thanked the Board for their approval.

(7) Approved-Handbook Revision, Summer 2002 Salary Schedule, UNLV - The Board approved amending the Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 3, Section 26) to update the Summer Term salary schedule for 2002 at UNLV. (Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office)

President Harter noted a clerical omission of 3 sentences regarding professor emeritus. Additional reference material was provided to correct the omission. (Consent 7 on file in the Board office).

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Handbook revision. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

21. Postponed-Regents' Awards - The Board discussed and postponed action until the March meeting regarding the format for awarding the Distinguished Nevadan Awards, the Student Scholar Awards, and faculty awards for Creative Activity, Research, Teaching, and Advising in Spring 2002. (Ref. M on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols reported that the cost for both receptions totaled approximately \$15,000 not including travel, staff time, or postage. She noted a decline in attendance, particularly by the awardees themselves, adding that the actual awards were conveyed at each institution's commencement exercise. She recommended the possibility of determining a better method for extending the awards. She suggested that the Board Chair and the Regent nominator could present the Distinguished

Nevadan medal at graduation. Honorary degrees and presidents' medals would be extended by the presidents. She suggested that a small ceremony could be held in conjunction with a Regents meeting for the other Regents' awards

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Chancellor's suggestion. Regent Howard seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked about a graceful method for handling the situation of having more nominees than awards. Ms. Ernst stated that UCCSN must provide 30 days notice to each individual that they would be discussed in closed session. The letter clearly states that the individual has been nominated but yet not approved. Regent Sisolak felt that the nomination itself should be recognized.

Mr. Ledon felt that System recognition was very important, adding that he was disappointed by the elimination of recognition programs. Regent Alden observed that the honorees would be honored at the commencement ceremony, adding that the Board's primary mission was to educate students. He stated that the System needed to show a proactive effort to reduce costs, adding that the Board had been hosting two events (one in Reno and one in Las Vegas) to honor the same people. He felt that every reduction counted and expressed his support for the measure.

Regent Gallagher felt that, since the Distinguished Nevadan was the most prestigious award the Board extended, it was important to do something in the form of a reception with the Regents.

Regent Hill stated that he was torn, observing that the one of the things the System did best was pomp and circumstance. He was inclined to support the motion, but suggested postponing the matter so the Board could consider ideas for saving money on such ceremonies.

Regent Hill moved approval of postponing the item to next meeting. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Derby stated that she had noticed the reduced attendance. She suggested a compromise by doing something at graduation and urged staff to consider other options. She expressed concern for the internal Regent awards, adding that it appeared to mean a lot to the recipients and that a shortened ceremony could diminish the award. She acknowledged that the ceremonies were expensive, but was reluctant to forego the ceremony entirely. She asked whether the ceremonies could be pursued on a smaller scale. She stated that it was wonderful to connect with people at functions following a Board meeting. Chair Dondero agreed it was a great time to connect with the community. She said that she would appoint Board members to work with staff on a solution.

Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

22. Information Only-Budget Process Update - Vice Chancellor Dan Miles reported the proposed timeline and key dates for the next biennial budget process (Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005). (Ref. N on file in the Board office)

23. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Report - Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met January 24, 2002. Dr. Richard Curry, Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs, presented information regarding remedial education in the UCCSN. Dr. Sherwin Iverson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs, provided data from the Remedial/Development Enrollments Summer and Fall 2001 report. The next step includes a meeting of institutional research directors from each campus to assess the nature of information and studies available that would form discussions of policy. The Committee decided to focus on remedial instruction for the rest of the semester. A presentation will be made to the full Board. The campuses will provide information regarding their remedial programs at the March meeting. Dr. Shannon Ellis, Vice President, Student Services-UNR, provided an update on campus efforts for academic advisement. A formal proposal will be submitted at the March meeting. Chair Derby recommended the campuses be encouraged to find ways to reward advising that may be unique to their institutions. Dr. Curry reported that the process for review of new programs would be presented at the March meeting. Chair Derby requested Board approval of the following Committee recommendation:

Ø Proposed Handbook Revision - The Committee recommended approval of adjustments to Handbook language (Title IV, Chapter 14, Section 14.4) regarding the number of credits required for a baccalaureate degree that must be earned at a four-year institution. (Ref. ARSA-2 on file in the Board office)

Regent Derby moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

24. Approved-Audit Committee Report - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Audit Committee met January 24, 2002. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit, reported that the institution bank reconciliations were up-to-date. President Lilley reported on the status of the University of Nevada School of Medicine Practice Plan and the recommendation by PricewaterhouseCoopers to bring the Practice Plan into the university due to the accounting implications of an exposure draft by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. He reported that a working group has been formed to address the issue. They have made significant progress and will report back to the Audit Committee by the end of the academic year. Regent Sisolak requested that the working group seek input from the medical school faculty in making this decision. Dr. Lilley also reported on the financial status of the UNR Fire Science Academy (FSA). He indicated the deficit was currently

\$4.7 million. The FSA is hiring staff for a May 1st opening date. Regent Sisolak requested that UNR personnel prepare a month-by-month summary of the deficit for the past 18 months and continue to update the deficit for the Audit Committee through the first six months of operation. The deficit should be compared to the projections in the FSA business plan once operations are resumed. Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Internal Audit Reports - The Committee reviewed the following Internal Audit reports: (Ref. P on file in the Board office)
 - Payroll Department, UNLV (Ref. A-2 on file in the Board office).
 - Central Services, TMCC (Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office).
 - International Student Services, CCSN (Ref. A-4 on file in the Board office).
 - Theater Department, WNCC (Ref. A-5 on file in the Board office).
 - Audit Exception Report - The Committee reviewed the Audit Exception Report for the six months ended December 31, 2001. (Ref. A-6 on file in the Board office).
- Regent Sisolak complimented Mrs. Cardinal for her hard work and effort in keeping him apprised.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

25. Approved-Campus Environment Committee Report - Chair Doug Hill reported the Campus Environment Committee met January 24, 2002 and reviewed the Faculty Climate Survey. Chair Hill recommended that there be an opportunity for anecdotal data for each area on the survey. System staff will explore the possibility of adding comment lines. At the suggestion of DRI President Stephen Wells, the Committee agreed to add a line to #36 (Research Faculty-Non tenure track). A statement about the voluntary nature of the survey will be incorporated into the cover letter. The survey will be reviewed by legal counsel. Additionally, information regarding the feasibility of including part-time and LOA faculty and removing the second and third mailings from the proposals in order to reduce the cost will be presented at the March meeting. The Committee tabled action on the proposals for implementation of the survey (Ref. CEC-2 on file in the Board office). The Committee discussed how K-12 teachers might be allowed to observe remediation courses at no charge. Other methods were explored to encourage more dialogue regarding academic expectations between K-12 and UCCSN faculty. The Committee agreed to include these suggestions during the joint meeting with the State Board of Education. Dr. Lynn Fenstermaker, chair of DRI's Campus Environment Committee, asked the Board to consider adding the issue of benefits for domestic partners to the Committee's priority list. It will be addressed on the March agenda.

Regent Hill moved acceptance of the report. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

26. Approved-Finance & Planning Committee Report - Chair Tom Kirkpatrick reported the Finance & Planning Committee met January 24, 2002 to review information previously requested and three budget reports. The Committee reviewed reports from UNLV and UNR, which detailed the share of state support in the athletic budget of each of the state supported schools within each institution's respective conference. The Committee reviewed the 2001-2002 Mid-Year Self-Supporting budgets and 2002 Summer School budgets. Mid-year self-supporting budgets are those created after July 1, 2001 and were not included in the budget approved by the Board for fiscal year 2002. Summer school 2002 budgets are the self-supporting budgets for next summer, totaling some \$13.5 million in anticipated revenue System-wide. The Committee reviewed the 2nd Quarter Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Budget Transfers in state appropriated accounts. Transfers exceeding \$25,000 from one functional area to another must be reported. WNCC reported transfers during the quarter of about \$127,000. He requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- Mid-Year FY02 Self-Supporting and Summer School Budgets for Calendar Year 2002 (Bound Report on file in the Board office).

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

27. Approved-Committee on Estate Tax Report - Chair Dorothy Gallagher reported the Committee on Estate Tax met January 23, 2002. Vice Chancellor Miles reviewed the current status of the Estate Tax fund. The balance in the fund at July 1, 2001 was \$123 million. In the 97-99 biennium, \$37 million was spent; during the 99-01 biennium, \$55 million was spent; and \$75 million has been appropriated for spending during the current biennium. In fiscal 2000, Estate Tax receipts were \$41 million. In fiscal 2001 they were \$21 million. For the six months of the current fiscal year, \$7.3 million has been received. Vice Chancellor Miles also reviewed the phase out of the Estate Tax over the next four years. The Committee reviewed two projections of the Estate Tax fund. If spending continues at \$38 million per year, the fund will disappear in fiscal 2006. If only income and estate tax receipts are spent, the fund should grow each year from market appreciation. The Committee discussed the areas that are currently being funded from the Estate Tax fund. It was decided that there was not enough information to proceed with a recommendation for the next biennium. The Committee asked that additional information be provided for the next meeting. (Ref. ET-2 on file in the Board office)

Regent Gallagher moved acceptance of the report. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Alden urged Board members to attend the February meeting as decisions would be made that would have a direct effect on the budget to be presented to the Legislature. He thanked Vice Chancellor Miles for the information provided.

Motion carried. Regents Seastrand and Wiesner were absent.

28. Public Comment - Mrs. Ellie Mills stated that she was a student at CCSN. She said that she paid a minimum of \$48 in student fees for herself and over \$100 for her children, but was not allowed at the UNLV campus because they "had not paid their fees". She asked why her family was not allowed to attend functions or activities on the UNLV campus.

Regent Sisolak asked about the nature of the activities. Mrs. Mills replied that she had received a letter telling her to stay off the campus. Regent Sisolak requested a copy of the letter. Mrs. Mills agreed to provide him a copy.

Mr. John Kinkella from CCSN acknowledged the proactive efforts of Regent Howard regarding the Millennium Bound Outreach Center.

29. New Business - Regent Rosenberg commended Mr. John Kuhlman and his staff for the latest edition of the Regents Review, which he felt was only getting better.

Regent Howard commended the article on President Lilley in UNR's Silver & Blue magazine.

Mr. Carlos Ledon reported that this would be his last meeting in his official capacity. He related that he had accepted a position in Las Vegas. He offered his services to help the System in any way, adding that he wanted to continue his support. Regent Sisolak expressed his appreciation for Mr. Ledon's participation and student input at the meetings. He commended all of the students for taking the time to attend the Board meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board