

BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
Northern Nevada Science Center Conference Room
Desert Research Institute
2215 Raggio Parkway, Reno
Wednesday-Thursday, June 18-19, 2003

Members Present:

Mr. Douglas Seastrand, Chair
Mr. Mark Alden
Dr. Stavros Anthony
Ms. Marcia Bandera
Dr. Jill Derby
Mr. Douglas Roman Hill
Mrs. Linda Howard
Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick
Mr. Howard Rosenberg
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Bret Whipple

Members Absent: Mrs. Thalia Dondero (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
President Paul Killpatrick, GBC
President Kerry Romesburg, NSC
President Philip Ringle, TMCC
President Carol Harter, UNLV
President John Lilley, UNR
President Carol Lucey, WNCC
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were faculty senate chairs Ms. Mitzi Ware, CCSN; Dr. Lynn Fenstermaker, DRI; Dr. Joel Shrock, GBC; Ms. Bridgett Boulton, TMCC; Dr. John Readence, UNLV; Dr. Trudy Larson, UNR; Mr. Rick Van Ausdal, WNCC; and Mr. John Tully, System Administration. Student government leaders present included Ms. Evelyn Flores, CCSN; Mr. Steve Houk, GBC; Ms. Janell Mihelic, NSCH; Mr. Kiyoshi "Teddy" Noda, TMCC; Ms. Monica Moradkhan, UNLV; Ms. Jocelina Santos, UNLV-GPSA; Mr. Chul Yim, UNR; Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, UNR-GSA; and Mr. Billy Jennings, WNCC.

Chair Douglas Seastrand called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. on June 18, 2003 with all members present except Regent Dondero.

1. Introductions – Chair Seastrand introduced Dr. Noel Tiano from the Nevada Center for Ethics and Health Policy at the University of Nevada, Reno who offered the invocation.

President Killpatrick introduced GBC's newly elected Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Joel Shrock, and reelected Student Body President, Mr. Steve Houk.

President Ringle introduced TMCC's newly elected Faculty Senate Chair, Ms. Bridgett Boulton, reelected Student Body President, Mr. Teddy Noda, and Student Body Vice President, Ms. Christine Hansen.

President Lucey introduced WNCC faculty senate representative, Mr. Rick Van Ausdal, who was sitting in for the vacationing Mr. Michael Hardie, and newly elected Student Body President, Mr. Billy Jennings.

President Wells introduced DRI's outgoing Faculty Senate Chair Dr. Lynn Fenstermaker.

President Lilley introduced UNR's newly elected GSA Student Body President, Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, and two visiting interns from the Minority Undergraduate Fellows Program, Ms. Tiffany Labon and Mr. Jose Rocha.

President Harter introduced UNLV's Faculty Senate Chair Dr. John Readence, Student Body President Ms. Monica Moradkhan, and Graduate and Professional Student Body President Ms. Jocelina Santos. She related that Mr. Dick Jensen was attending his last meeting as Assistant to the President and would be replaced by Dr. John Filler.

President Remington introduced CCSN's newly elected Faculty Senate Chair, Ms. Mitzi Ware and Student Body President, Ms. Evelyn Flores. He reported that the CCSN Coyotes baseball team won the 2003 Junior College World Series and invited Coach Tim Chambers to the podium. He praised Coach Chambers and the players who maintain a team GPA of 3.0. President Remington presented the President's Medal to Coach Chambers. Coach Chambers said that he and the team were honored to represent the college and the state. The team is comprised of primarily local Nevada residents.

2. Approved-Resolution 03-09, CCSN Baseball Team – The Board approved a Resolution in honor of the CCSN Coyote baseball team for winning the 2003 Junior College World Championship. (On file in the Board office)

Regent Alden moved approval of Resolution 03-09 in honor of the CCSN Coyote baseball team. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Howard said that she was related (within the third degree of consanguinity) to a member of the baseball team staff and asked whether she could participate in the vote. General Counsel Ray replied that, since she had explained her relationship for the record, it would be acceptable to vote.

Motion carried.

1. Introductions (cont'd.) - Regent Sisolak noted that former Regent Dorothy Gallagher was present.

3. Chair's Report – Chair Seastrand reported that Chancellor Nichols' was the proud grandmother of a new baby girl. He explained that Regent Dondero was excused from the meeting due to health issues. Chair Seastrand said that presiding as Board Chair had been a good experience and that he would miss serving in that capacity. He noted positive synergies taking place and expressed his pride in the Board's efforts. He hoped the new Chair would consider implementing a State of the University System address. He thanked the Board for their support during his tenure. He thanked the Chancellor, Presidents, staff and fellow Regents for the opportunity to serve as Chair.

4. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Nichols stated that it had been an honor working with Chair Seastrand. One of her goals has been to be more active on the national scene. Last weekend she was invited to a meeting in Denver, Colorado regarding P-16 efforts with an emphasis on rural areas and states. She was accompanied by Regent Marcia Bandera, President Paul Killpatrick, Associate Vice Chancellor Chris Chairsell, Dr. Charlotte Peterson (a rural school superintendent), and State Superintendent, Dr. Jack McLaughlin. At the next SHEEO meeting Chancellor Nichols will discuss other states' practices in these difficult economic conditions. Chancellor Nichols then requested a report from DRI President Dr. Stephen Wells.

President Wells reported that science in extreme environments is being conducted at DRI. From the challenges of working in desert conditions to the rigors of extreme cold, DRI scientists are conducting vital research in every corner of the globe. Contributors to the presentation included:

- Dr. Nick Lancaster – studying the formation of sand dunes in deserts ranging from Africa to the American Southwest.
- Dr. Joe McConnell – studying pollutant deposition through collection of ice cores in extremely remote regions including Greenland and Antarctica. This research indicates how pollutants are released into the atmosphere through time.
- Dr. Bill Johnson – studying cold war archeology at the Nevada Test Site. His work theorizes on the effects of the bomb on our culture.
- Dr. Alison Murray – studying molecular microbial ecology using biotechnology and genomics to understand adaptations of microorganisms to extreme environments including the hot springs of Yellowstone National Park, the ocean depths off Costa Rica, and Antarctica.

President Wells thanked the four researchers for sharing their work and Mr. Roger Kreidberg and Ms. Morien Roberts for assembling the video presentation.

5. Public Comment – Regent Rosenberg commended President Harter on her letter to the Review Journal editor from June 16th regarding accuracy in the media. President Remington congratulated President Harter on UNLV's successful baseball team.

TMCC Student Body President Teddy Noda expressed sadness and condolences to the family of UNLV transfer student, Rie Shibuya, who was recently killed while pursuing higher education in Nevada. Dr. Robert Anderson, Vice President, Student Services-CCSN, noted that Ms. Shibuya had also been a student at CCSN. The results of an investigation regarding the incident will be reported to the Board at a future date.

6. Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #3 (Tenure, NSC), #4 (Handbook Revision, CSUN Constitution, UNLV), and #5 (Handbook Revision, Student Health Insurance Rates, UNLV & UNR), which were approved separately:

(1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the regular meeting held May 8-9, 2003 and the Board Orientation Committee meeting held April 11, 2003.

(2) Approved-Tenure on Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's recommendation for tenure upon hire for the following faculty members:

- Dr. Joanne Thompson, Full Professor and Director of the School of Social Work in the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs, effective July 1, 2003. The department faculty voted unanimously to recommend tenure upon hire (Ref. C-2a on file in the Board office).
- Dr. Ron Yasbin, Full Professor and Dean of the College of Sciences, effective September 1, 2003. The department faculty voted unanimously to recommend tenure upon hire (Ref. C-2b on file in the Board office).

(6) Approved-Handbook Revision, 2003-2004 Stipend Schedule, Resident Physicians and Resident Dentists, UNR – Board policy requires that on an annual basis the stipends for resident physicians and resident dentists be determined. The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request for the stipend schedule for 2003-04 (Title IV, Chapter 7, Section 2.3) (Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office).

(7) Approved-Handbook Revision, Unit Senate Bylaws – The Board approved Chancellor Jane Nichols' request for amendments to the Unit Bylaws (Title V, Chapter 5), which govern the organization of the System Administration and its faculty. The amendments were recommended by the System Administration Faculty Senate and approved by an affirmative vote of the faculty (Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office).

(8) Approved-Request for Permanent Easement, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol Lucey's request to grant a permanent easement to the City of Carson City for a sewer line to support the new Jack C. Davis Observatory. At the May 2003 meeting, the Board of Regents granted an immediate right of entry to the City and also granted permission to WNCC to negotiate the permanent easement (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #3 (Tenure, NSC), #4 (Handbook Revision, CSUN Constitution, UNLV), and #5 (Handbook Revision, Student Health Insurance Rates, UNLV & UNR). Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Dondero was absent.

(3) Approved-Tenure, NSC – The Board approved President Kerry Romesburg's recommendation for tenure for the following faculty member:

- Dr. Lois Becker, Professor of History (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak asked about the procedure for approving tenure. President Romesburg clarified that NSC faculty had approved the recommendation for tenure, adding that he had neglected to include that information with the agenda item request.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the tenure request for NSC. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Dondero was absent.

(4) Approved-Handbook Revision, CSUN Constitution, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for the proposed changes to the CSUN Constitution (Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office).

- Referendum 1 – Article III, D, 1d
- Referendum 2 – Article III, D, 1f
- Referendum 3 – Article III, D, 2c, 3a, 3b
- Referendum 4 – Article VII, F, 1b
- Referendum 5 – Article VII, C

Regent Sisolak suggested a clarifying change in the proposed language, which was accepted by Student Body President Monica Moradkhan. General Counsel Ray clarified that it did not constitute a material change but rather a rearrangement of

the wording.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Handbook revision as amended. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion as amended carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

(5) Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Health Insurance Rates, UNLV & UNR – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's and President John M. Lilley's request for the respective bids for student health insurance at UNLV and UNR/TMCC/WNCC and to add the new rates to the Board Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 17) (Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office). In March 2003, the Board approved special fees for 2003-2004, but it was noted at the meeting that competitive bids had not yet been returned for the premiums for student health insurance and would be brought forward at a later date.

Regent Sisolak noted a 20% differential between the premiums paid by UNR students vs. UNLV students for less coverage. Dr. Rebecca Mills, Vice President, Student Life-UNLV, replied that the difference in cost was due to the claims/loss ratio. UNLV refers more students to outside providers, which is more expensive, because UNLV's student health center is unable to offer some of the services that UNR can provide (UNR has a physician-run center, while UNLV's is a nurse-run center). She speculated that it also related to UNLV's older student population (student health insurance is mandatory for international students). Differences in medical costs between Washoe and Clark counties were also attributed. Regent Sisolak asked whether the same company bid on both institutions. Dr. Shannon Ellis, Vice President, Student Services-UNR, replied that an RFP was released and separate companies responded. UNR used Mega Health and Life last year and was pleased with their performance. Due to UNR's low claims ratio, they were offered a good deal.

Regent Howard asked about the requirement for students taking online courses to pay for health insurance. Chancellor Nichols replied that she believed the issue related to health services. Students are charged a health services fee, which entitles them to treatment at an institution clinic. The health insurance is voluntary (except for international students). Students taking distance education courses from a remote site are not charged the health services fee. Regent Howard said that she wanted to know more about UCCSN's policy.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning student health insurance rates for UNLV and UNR. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

7. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met June 18, 2003. Dr. David Charlet, Director, Nevada Collaborative Teaching Improvement Program (NeCoTip), presented an overview and summary highlights of NeCoTip (formerly the Eisenhower Program), which specifically addresses the needs of Nevada's K-12 teachers in English language arts, mathematics, and science. Regent Derby requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- New Unit Proposals – The Committee reviewed the following new unit proposals:
 - New Unit Proposals and Other Administrative Reorganization, UNR (Ref. ARSA-2 on file in the Board office). The Committee approved a request from UNR to form two new colleges, the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science, to replace the existing College of Arts and Science and the Mackay School of Mines.
 - Center for Disability and Applied Biomechanics, UNLV (Ref. ARSA-3 on file in the Board office). The proposed Center will serve as a resource for acquiring external funding, increase interactions between UNLV and the medical/rehabilitation sector in Southern Nevada and the region, and create the potential for UNLV to become a national focal point for disabled sports, recreation, and workplace performance research.
 - The Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution, UNLV (Ref. ARSA-4 on file in the Board office). The Saltman Center will: (1) serve as a center for scholarly research and exchanges on the nature of conflict and the methods for avoiding and resolving disputes; (2) serve the educational needs of law students by providing a high level of professional training in the theory and practice of dispute resolution; and (3) serve the community by offering assistance in understanding and resolving conflicts that affect the public interest and by providing information and educational opportunities for those interested in resolving public and private disputes.
- New Program Proposal - The Committee reviewed the following new program proposal:
 - BS, Visual Media and Computing, NSC (Ref. ARSA-5 on file in the Board office). The program will provide a unique educational opportunity that interweaves art and computer programming, graphic design, and multimedia production.
- Handbook Revision, Intellectual Property Policy – The Committee approved an amendment to the Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 12), which inserts additional language into the UCCSN Intellectual Property Policy (Ref. ARSA-6 on file in the Board office). The intent of the amendment is to: (1) incorporate distance education courses into the definition of "copyrightable works" within intellectual property and (2) stipulate that campus intellectual property policies and their implementation in terms of distance education courses shall require compliance with all federal copyright laws, including all provisions of the TEACH Act, 17 U.S.C. Sec. 110(2).

Regent Anthony left the meeting.

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

UNR Provost Dr. John Frederick provided a brief synopsis of his ARSA Committee presentation regarding college realignment.

Regent Kirkpatrick left the meeting. Regent Anthony entered the meeting.

Provost Frederick reported that UNR enrollments have grown 33% from 1999-2003. The College of Arts and Science carries a heavy workload and administrative burden. Instructional staffing shortages are the most severe in the College of Arts and Science (the largest college at the university), with 52.5% of total enrollments served by 44% of the faculty and staff.

Regent Kirkpatrick entered the meeting.

Provost Frederick related that overall the university has a 20% staffing shortage, which can be attributed to the 80% funding level. The Mackay School of Mines has a surfeit of faculty members. UNR has measured the effectiveness of the distribution of administrative support (defined as dean's office funding). Arts and Science administrative support accounts for 2% of the total budget (as compared with an average of 5.5% for all of the other colleges). This shortage impedes service to the students. State universities do not typically receive 100% budget funding from the state. Private fundraising must improve. Smaller and more focused colleges generally do a better job of fundraising. It will be necessary for the university to strengthen programs based on three primary objectives:

- (1) Use existing resources more effectively and more efficiently.
- (2) Develop other revenue sources to supplement state support.
- (3) Adopt new strategies to promote the visibility of the university's programs.

A major strategic planning effort occurred from Fall 2001 through May 2003, when the faculty senate approved the president's plan by a 2:1 margin. Provost Frederick related that proposals for new colleges were developed. Separate planning groups were asked to consider the mission, goals, structure and resource needs for a College of Liberal Arts and a College of Science. Reports were submitted and posted to the campus planning website on November 22, 2002. College realignment planning groups were comprised of representatives from liberal arts and science. The colleges primarily affected by the reorganization are Arts & Science, Mackay School of Mines, College of Engineering, and College of Education. A Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering will be formed under the new College of Science. UNR also proposes changes to the core curriculum, which is currently administered through the College of Arts & Science. All parts of the core curriculum will continue to be offered by the relevant colleges and departments as they are at present. The new administrative structure will utilize an executive director of the core curriculum reporting to the Provost, which will help strengthen the program's representation within the university as well as its access to resources. Within the College of Education, Curriculum and Instruction will be split into two departments: (1) Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning and (2) Educational Specialties. The Center for the Application of Substance Abuse Technology will move to the College of Human and Community Sciences where it will be linked with other health-related programs. Provost Frederick outlined several performance measures developed to measure the effectiveness of these proposed changes.

Regent Hill asked about an analysis of teacher deficit following the reorganization. Provost Frederick replied that the teacher deficit in Arts and Sciences was split relatively evenly between liberal arts and science. Regent Hill asked about the resulting effect with the addition of Mackay faculty. Provost Frederick replied that Mackay's excess faculty had been split between the College of Engineering and the College of Science. Regent Hill asked whether the College of Engineering would be sufficiently staffed as a result of the move. Provost Frederick replied that it would not, adding that engineering remains understaffed even with the reorganization. Regent Hill asked whether the new colleges would be sufficiently staffed. Provost Frederick replied that the change would result in smaller teaching deficits, however there would be a positive change in the level of administrative support. Regent Hill felt that smaller colleges were more successful in fundraising due to an emphasis and focus placed on raising money. Provost Frederick stated there was no correlation between the size of a college and the amount of money it raises (Mackay School of Mines is ranked first in fundraising and the College of Arts and Sciences is ranked second). This suggests that deans are relatively equally capable fundraisers. Since the deans are the primary fundraisers for their colleges, the larger the unit the less benefit per capita is realized. Regent Hill asked whether that hypothesis suggested the need for more deans. Provost Frederick felt that it suggested that equally-sized colleges would realize better results. By incorporating school structures within the two largest colleges, fundraising efforts will be augmented by the directors of those schools.

Regent Howard asked about the literacy studies program. Provost Frederick replied that the program was currently in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and considered a premier program in the College of Education that explores reading literacy. There is also a special Center for Literacy Studies that has received private funding. They are interested in further developing curricula specific to that effort as part of the new Department of Educational Specialties.

Motion carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

8. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Audit Committee met June 18, 2003 and received follow-up responses for eight internal audit reports presented at previous meetings. The Committee requested that additional information on complimentary athletic tickets and telephone charges for the UNLV Consolidated Students audit be presented at the next meeting. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit, reported that the institution bank reconciliations are up-to-date. Mr. Tom Judy, Associate Vice President for Business & Finance-UNR, reported on the financial status of the University of Nevada School of Medicine Practice Plan. The net profit of the Practice Plan is \$1.6 million as of April 30, 2003. The balance on the letter of credit has been reduced from \$381,000 to \$302,000 during this fiscal year. Ms. Denise Baclawski, Executive Director, Fire Science Academy-UNR, reported on the financial status of the FSA. She indicated the number of students is below that projected in the business plan. Ms. Baclawski stated that the deficit for the fiscal year is expected to be \$7.4 million compared to the budgeted amount of \$7.5 million. Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee reviewed the following Internal Audit reports (Ref. A on file in the Board office):
- Construction Audit, CCSN (Ref. A-2 on file in the Board office).
- Presidential Exit Audit, CCSN (Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Dondero were absent.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

9. Approved-Finance & Planning Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the Finance & Planning Committee met June 18, 2003 to review two budget status reports for Fiscal Year 2003, approve the fiscal 2003-2004 Self-Supporting budgets, approve additional student fee collections for the Dental School, and a Handbook revision. The Committee reviewed the Third Quarter All Funds Report as well as the Third Quarter Fiscal Exceptions Report. The All Funds Report is an un-audited statement of current operating fund revenues and expenditures through the third quarter. In general, revenue collection and expenditure activities through the third quarter of fiscal 2002-2003 seem to be normal with no material variations between periods noted. The Fiscal Exception Report is used to provide quarterly updates on self-supporting budgets that experience deficits or negative cash balances. Accounts reported in deficit include the Fire Science Academy at UNR, the men's and women's basketball and women's soccer programs at CCSN, and the Hospitality Institute at CCSN. In each case the institutions involved have in place a plan to remedy the problems. Regent Hill requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- FY 2003-2004 UCCSN Self-Supporting Budget – The Committee approved the Self-Supporting budgets for fiscal 2003-2004 for all UCCSN institutions. Total budgets approved provide for expenditure of \$266 million, which is up from the current year's budget of \$240.9 million, an increase of 10.4% (Bound Report on file in the Board office).
- IFC Approval for Additional Student Fee Collection, FY 2002-2003 – The Committee approved the UNLV Dental School request to approach the Interim Finance Committee to authorize the expenditure of \$38,573 in excess student fees. The Dental School intends to use the funds to enhance teaching capabilities in the classroom (Ref. FP-6 on file in the Board office).
- Handbook Revision (Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 7) – The Committee approved a revision to the Board Handbook to incorporate the new revenue assessment methodology which will be used to support the Board/System self-supporting budgets in fiscal 2004. This change, which was approved by the Board at the May meeting, replaces the Board/System's share of investment income (Ref. FP-7 on file in the Board office).

Regent Hill moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Howard seconded. Motion carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

10. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Mark Alden reported the Investment Committee met May 30, 2003. Mr. Lindsay Van Voorhis, Cambridge Associates, reviewed the asset allocation and performance for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds of the UCCSN for the quarter ended March 31, 2003. Endowment investments returned -1.6% for the quarter (compared to the -1.6% benchmark) and -6.1% for the fiscal year (compared to the -6.0% benchmark). The total return for the pooled operating funds was 0.4% for the quarter (compared to the -0.3% benchmark) and 1.0% for the fiscal year (compared to the 1.4% benchmark). For the month of April 2003, endowment assets returned 4.6% (compared to the 5.2% benchmark) and the operating funds returned 1.8% (compared to the 2.3% benchmark). The Committee reviewed the performance of the small cap equity manager, Navalier & Associates. For the quarter ended March 31, 2003 their return was -10.8% (compared to the -5.1% benchmark). Since inception (05/29/98), their performance was -2.2% (compared to the 0.7% benchmark). The Committee decided to interview new managers and to transfer the securities held by Navalier to the new manager. The Committee also reviewed the current status of the operating pool reserve, which was at -\$8.6 million on May 29, 2003. Regent Alden requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Handbook Revision, Allocation of Investment Income – The Committee approved amendment of the Allocation of Investment Income Earned on UCCSN Pooled Cash Assets (Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 5) to eliminate the payout to the Board and System Administration (Ref. B on file in the Board office).
- Handbook Revision, Operating Funds – The Committee approved amendment of the Statement of Investment Objectives and Policies for the Operating Funds (Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 6) to eliminate the payout to the Board and System Administration (Ref. C on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Whipple seconded.

Regent Bandera requested that video connection be provided at the Elko site for future Investment Committee meetings.

Motion carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

11. Accepted-Ad Hoc Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee Report- Chair Steve Sisolak reported the ad hoc Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee met June 4, 2003 and heard a report from staff on best practices in executive evaluation, including the results of a survey of evaluation practices used in other higher education systems. This data will frame the Committee's further deliberations on the current processes for annual and periodic review, reporting lines, and contract terms. Staff also presented information on executive perquisites. The Committee discussed some preliminary conclusions about perquisites, which it will discuss at a future meeting. The Committee spoke by telephone with Dr. Bernard Machen, President of the University of Utah, who provided information about executive compensation practices in other states. In particular, the Committee asked President Machen about compensation provided by foundations or other external sources and how it is typically handled. He discussed some of the more common types of extra compensation, such as deferred compensation, paid service on foundation or athletic boards, and endowed chairs. These matters will receive further attention from the Committee after it has an opportunity to evaluate national salary data. The Committee was provided an update on the System's efforts to compile national salary data from which the Committee can determine market competitiveness for UCCSN executives. UCCSN Human Resources Director Carla Henson provided a sample of how the data will be constructed and discussed some of the variables that may affect the survey results. The Committee directed Ms. Henson to use a common set of peers for the universities and to establish peers for the community colleges, the state college, and Desert Research Institute. Regent Sisolak requested Board approval of the minutes from the April 24, 2003 meeting.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the April 24, 2003 minutes and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

12. Information Only-National Forum on College-Level Learning Project, UCCSN - In response to Master Plan Goal #2 (Quality Education), the UCCSN recently joined with several other states in a national project designed to gather and analyze data from a variety of sources on student learning. The project is intended to lead to strategies for the assessment of the intellectual abilities of states' college graduates. Dr. Margaret Miller, Project Director of the National Forum on College-Level Learning, presented information to the Board on the goals, structure, and timeliness of this project. The project is funded by Pew Charitable Trusts and will be accomplished with the support of the National Center for Education Management Systems (NCHEMS).

Vice Chancellor Curry introduced Dr. Margaret Miller. Dr. Miller reported that all states received an "incomplete" in the measurement of "student learning" in the Measuring Up 2000 and 2002 reports due to the lack of comparable measures across states. The question has been broken into two separate parts:

- (1) What kind of educational capital is represented by the college educated residents in the state?
- (2) How do the state's colleges and universities (2- and 4-year, public and private) collectively contribute to that capital?

The Pew Charitable Trusts has funded a pilot project of five states to test a new model of assessment. The first indicator will be a composite indicator drawn from the average scores on licensing and graduate admissions tests taken in the state. This indicates the kinds of skills and abilities people bring to the workplace and how prepared they are for further study. Two direct measures of general intellectual skills will be administered to representative students (one at 2-year institutions and one at 4-year institutions). The 2-year college students will take a test known as WorkKeys, which will include the areas of applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information, and writing. The 4-year college test is called The Collegiate Learning Assessment, which focuses on core intellectual skills (communication skills, problem solving, and critical thinking). Students will also be asked about their college learning experience. A college results survey will also be offered online, which poses real-world scenarios and asks graduates how comfortable they feel with their skills to deal with those situations. Dr. Miller said that she was delighted that Nevada was participating in this effort. The participating states will become national leaders in addressing this issue. It will also provide an opportunity to use the best instruments on the market. She related that Nevada's Master Plan reflects what the study is looking for as well as a commitment to accountability and assessment.

Regent Derby asked whether higher education was providing the necessary teaching that supports an educated democracy. Dr. Miller replied that only indirect indicators existed (i.e., college graduates vote more frequently than people without a college education; charitable giving is also higher). She related that the critical thinking problems would provide a sense of where the students are, adding that it was only a beginning.

President Killpatrick asked about the difference in academic rigor between the tests given to community college vs. university students. Dr. Miller replied that the emphases were slightly different. The 2-year college test tends to focus more on practical skills for the workplace. President Killpatrick felt it would make sense for community colleges to administer both tests depending upon what the student is pursuing (Applied Science degree vs. transfer degree). Dr. Miller said that this would provide an opportunity to try both measures. She acknowledged that it could be determined that one test is an appropriate measure for both populations.

President Lucey asked about the reason for developing two different student engagement tests (NSSE and CCSSE) and how they differed. Dr. Miller replied that the community colleges felt the NSSE addressed residential student populations and did not reflect the reality of community college student life. The CCSSE attempts to be more sensitive to other commitments that community college students face.

President Harter asked which states were participating in the study and how were they chosen. Dr. Miller replied that participating states included Kentucky, Oklahoma, Illinois, South Carolina, and Nevada. Geographical representation was a key factor. Kentucky has aligned its accountability mechanisms with Measuring Up and had much of the data needed. Illinois asked to be included and represents a large Midwestern state. Oklahoma has also been aggressive about accountability and asked to be included. South Carolina asked to be included and represents a southern state. Nevada was included as the western state and was already doing many things in this area.

Regent Bandera asked about the total number of people that will be surveyed. Dr. Miller replied that approximately 5,800 students would take WorkKeys/CCSSE and approximately 7,000 students would take the Collegiate Learning Assessment/NSSE in the five participating states. Regent Bandera asked about administering both tests to both populations. Dr. Miller replied that RAND added several work-based tasks to the 4-year college test. More direct contribution from the business community is desired in developing the test. Due to financial limitations and concerns about ensuring a sufficient number of students to take the tests, doubling the work would have been a real challenge. She clarified that both tests would not be offered at both levels as part of this grant.

Chancellor Nichols noted that Nevada was one of the last states to join an established and financed project. Nevada will have the advantage of reviewing the results and how it compares to other states. It will provide valuable information on which to base important future decisions concerning student learning. Nevada could also decide to administer both tests at some time in the future. Dr. Miller agreed that each of the measuring categories provided valuable information. The Measuring Up report provides a sense of the areas in need of improvement.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked how participants would be selected and about reporting methods. Dr. Miller replied that random selection would be used and results would be reported for the state as a whole. Ultimately, consideration will be given to regional challenges, underserved areas and populations, however, sample sizes would not be large enough to provide that kind of analysis.

Regent Hill asked whether the Board would have access to individual data. Dr. Miller replied that participating institutions would receive aggregate results. Regent Hill said that he had mixed feelings about the report card. Nevada received a low grade in "affordability" in spite of its low tuition. Other factors (grants-in-aid and financial assistance) contributed to a skewed result. Nevada also ranked low with a 6-year completion rate. He observed that Nevada has a difficult student population, with many working their way through college. He was concerned that the report card reflected multiple factors. Dr. Miller agreed, adding that states must disaggregate the information to determine where the problem lies. Regent Hill said that it appeared to be a simplistic means of grading institutions that did not present an accurate picture. He felt the report card should be expanded beyond the six categories measured. Dr. Miller related that some states are expanding on the tests. She said the grades were instructive and not meant as a public embarrassment, but rather as a tool.

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Directory Information – The Board approved Chancellor Jane Nichols' request for an amendment to the Board Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 1, Section 24.3) regarding disclosure of student directory information. The proposed changes will bring Board policy into compliance with legislation approved by the 2003 Nevada Legislature (Ref. D on file in the Board office).

Chancellor Nichols reported that AB353 passed the Nevada Assembly. The proposed amendment will bring the Handbook into compliance with current legislation. The basic difference is that students will have the ability to opt-out for all purposes, commercial purposes only, or non-commercial purposes only. By Fall, each of the options will be available online. Each campus will continue to define what comprises student directory information and the consequences of opting out. The legislature adopted the definition of commercial purposes that was developed by System Administration legal staff.

Regent Derby moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning student directory information. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Alden asked whether the amendment addressed concerns expressed by the ACLU. Chancellor Nichols replied it would not, as they preferred an opt-in option. System Administration feels that such an option would not be in the best interest of students. Students have testified to that in the past. Regent Alden indicated that he would be voting no and requested a roll call vote.

Regent Hill observed that students opting out for commercial purposes would be denied valuable information (i.e., health insurance following graduation). He questioned the wisdom of the bill and the authority of the legislature to govern issues relating to higher education. He suggested tabling the matter in order to provide legal counsel an opportunity to provide a legal opinion on whether this action infringed upon the Board's jurisdiction.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the policy was legally defensible given the ACLU's position. General Counsel Ray replied that he felt it was defensible. He acknowledged the validity of Regent Hill's suggestion, but suggested the Board should be selective when picking their issues. He felt the UCCSN could live with the proposed language.

UNR GSA Student Body President, Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, stated that the students she canvassed favored the proposal. She said it was important for students to know they have the option to fill out a form and opt out for a variety of purposes. Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the information was included within the first five pages of every catalog. Chancellor Nichols stated that the information was included in every catalog, class schedule, and online registration.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Anthony, Bandera, Derby, Hill, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Rosenberg, Schofield, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Whipple voted yes. Regent Alden voted no. Regent Dondero was absent.

On behalf of the Board, Regent Bandera presented Ms. Angela Palmer with a cake and gift in recognition of her birthday.

The meeting recessed at 3:25 p.m. and reconvened at 3:45 p.m. with all members present except Regents Dondero, Howard, and Rosenberg.

Regent Rosenberg entered the meeting.

Chair Seastrand noted that Regent Whipple was featured in the current issue of Regents' Review.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Graduate Assistant Health Insurance – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's, President John M. Lilley's, and President Stephen G. Wells' request for an amendment to the Board Handbook chapter on graduate assistants (Title IV, Chapter 5, Section 2). The amendment permits the cost of student health insurance to be included in the total compensation paid to a graduate assistant, which will allow the institutions to attract highly qualified graduate students and remain competitive with other higher education institutions. The benefit would be phased in through Fall 2004 (Ref. E on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning graduate assistant health insurance. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Ms. Nancy Flagg, Deputy to the Chancellor, reported that the amendment provided an added incentive for recruiting graduate assistants.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked about the number of hours worked by graduate assistants as compared with part-time employees. Dr. Ray Alden, Provost-UNLV, replied that graduate assistants could teach two lectures or 1-2 labs like a part-time instructor. Regent Sisolak asked about insurance for part-time workers. Provost Alden replied that no insurance was provided. Ms. Flagg stated that one of the recommendations from the Part-Time Faculty Task Force was to look into providing health insurance for part-time instructors. That study is ongoing and HR directors are attempting to find a means of providing health insurance to part-time employees. Regent Sisolak recalled that part-time faculty had pleaded with the Board for finding a means of providing this benefit.

Chair Seastrand asked whether there were more part-time faculty than graduate assistants. President Harter replied that there were many more part-time faculty. She related that an increasing number of institutions are providing health insurance to their graduate assistants, whereas very few offer health insurance to part-time faculty.

Regent Hill questioned the number of graduate assistants that would waive the insurance, especially when offered at no charge. President Harter stated that one-third of the graduate assistants had indicated that they did not require the insurance and would not accept it. Regent Hill questioned the likelihood they would continue to do so. President Harter replied that

responses indicated that it likely would remain so. Regent Hill speculated that more than one-third would not refuse it next time and suggested consideration of a small fee.

Regent Sisolak asked about the funding. President Harter replied that it would be covered by offering fewer stipends.

Motion carried. Regent Dondero was absent.

15. Withdrawn-Handbook Revision, Student Union & Recreation Center Fee, UNLV – The item was withdrawn by UNLV.

Regent Alden observed that he and Regent Sisolak had devoted a lot of time to reviewing this issue and asked why the item had been withdrawn. President Harter replied that plans were contingent upon an approved budget with the requested tuition levels. Since the budget has not been approved, UNLV is unable to provide an estimate of student fees for the Board. She related that UNLV planned to bring the request forward for the August meeting. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether changes would be made to the proposal for the August meeting. President Harter said that it would likely be presented in the same format with slight adjustments made to reflect the most recent agreements.

16. Information Only-Legislative Update - Chancellor Jane Nichols reviewed actions taken by the Legislature concerning the UCCSN budget request as well as legislative bills of interest to the UCCSN that were approved by the 2003 Nevada Legislature (Handouts on file in the Board office).

Chancellor Nichols reported that the UCCSN's budget had been approved within the appropriation bill, but a revenue source had not been identified to support it. She related there was a strong possibility that higher education's budget could be reconsidered before the special session concluded. She said there had been an abundance of misinformation about higher education's budget and enrollment growth and she was hopeful that legislators would receive and act upon the correct information that had been sent to them. She urged Board members to stand solidly behind higher education and to lobby those legislators who were being pressured to cut higher education's budget. She related that higher education was in great jeopardy.

Vice Chancellor Miles reported that the governor had signed the general appropriations and general authorizations acts. A funding level of 84.45% of the formula for FY04 and 84.09% for FY05 was approved. The 2003 enrollment growth reduced the funding level from the 86% target recommended by Governor Guinn. The legislative approved budget for the biennium totals \$1,282,186,578 (a 24.5% increase). Vice Chancellor Miles then reviewed the list of Capital Improvement Projects approved by the legislature.

Regent Alden asked about contributions for the UNLV Greenspun College of Urban Affairs. President Harter replied that the Greenspuns had promised to contribute 40% (up to \$12 million).

Regent Howard asked whether individual institutions had requested the items added by the legislature. Vice Chancellor Miles stated that the Chancellor's office had not submitted them. He related there had been legislative support for some of those items. Regent Howard asked who had proposed the additions. Vice Chancellor Miles said he did not know. Chancellor Nichols stated that legislators listen to the people (and faculty) in the community. She had been surprised by faculty convincing legislators into some of these actions. She related that the additions came from different places. Regent Howard asked how many additions came from other places, adding that such initiatives displaced projects and put other projects in jeopardy. Chancellor Nichols agreed. She said that the legislature has a limited number of dollars and that UCCSN received more than was recommended by the State Public Works Board and the governor. Regent Howard asked about the projects with no money appropriated to them. Chancellor Nichols explained that they were System priorities that did not receive legislative approval. Regent Howard wanted to know why priority projects were not funded yet new/unknown projects received money. Chancellor Nichols said the SPWB recommends a list of projects within available funds. The governor does not always agree with the SPWB. The request then goes to the legislature. At that time, the additional 1-cent property tax increase had not been added. Some of these projects were important to specific legislators or their community. As long as the legislature controls the funds, this will occur. Regent Howard wondered how the Board could ensure that its priorities were funded. Chancellor Nichols said that she never supports anything that is not on the Regents' list, adding that System lobbyists also only addressed System priorities.

President Killpatrick observed that he had been unaware that GBC was associated with an Oral Health Clinic until the Chancellor brought it to his attention. The initiative was backed by a rural legislator who never discussed it with the president. Chancellor Nichols said that the Board could elect not to accept the money for these projects.

Regent Alden felt this represented one of the reasons for forming a budget committee that would meet eight times/year. He observed that the Board decides what programs to offer, but the legislature decides how or whether they are funded. He noted that often the System would receive funds for initiatives that had not been requested.

Regent Sisolak understood that the previous UNR president had committed to raising private funds for the Manogue facility. He asked whether the state was donating \$5 million for that project. President Lilley stated that this initiative came from community leadership. The original agreement for the 22-acre Manogue property was for private money. In this case, a new

decision was made requiring UNR to purchase property. Regent Sisolak asked who was donating the \$2.5 million. President Lilley replied that it was an anonymous gift. Regent Sisolak again recalled a commitment to raise private funds for trading the Manogue property. Chancellor Nichols agreed with his assessment. She explained that this was one of the things the legislature does without Board approval. Acquiring the Manogue property is part of UNR's master plan. Historically, it was part of an agreement between the university and the Catholic diocese for UNR to assist in raising money so the new high school could be built. The land was then to be gifted to the university. The diocese has had difficulty raising money and decided they could not afford to give the land to the university. Regent Sisolak asked about the price. Chancellor Nichols replied that the cost was \$5 million. The \$2.5 million donation is related to the land purchase and contingent upon state funding, but is not for the purpose of purchasing the land. Regent Sisolak asked whether UNR would purchase the 22 acres for \$5 million. Chancellor Nichols replied that it would require Board approval.

Regent Anthony asked whether there was a plan if the legislature failed to identify a funding source for the budget. Chancellor Nichols replied that higher education could proceed July 1st to spend money. If the session is still in, UCCSN's budget is not secure and could be changed. She has cautioned the presidents to be very conservative about making assumptions about new money until the session is over.

Chair Seastrand asked whether all institutions were on notice for contingency plans in case their budgets were cut. Chancellor Nichols said that each campus had been working on the assumption that new contracts are offered contingent upon funding. Effective July 1st, each campus will delay implementing the new budget if a legislative decision has not been rendered. K-12 will not have funds with which to operate. UCCSN would be in the same position if their budget were reopened. Chancellor Nichols contacted the University of Tennessee to discuss their actions last year when they were forced to close. She said that such action would require a special Board meeting.

Regent Schofield urged the Board to help by lobbying legislators to convince them the UCCSN really needs the money. He told Regent Howard that addition of these projects was not uncommon.

Regent Kirkpatrick was disturbed by the legislature adding/funding projects with no Board input. He recalled that the Board had been told there would be plenty of private donations to fund the Manogue project and wondered about additional costs associated with the project. He recalled a promise for \$30-50 million in donations for NSC yet the college was having difficulty raising \$10 million to complete their building. He observed there appeared to be a great deal of inequity with the legislative allocations to the individual institutions.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether summer school would be discontinued if a budget was not approved by July 1st. Chancellor Nichols said that it was highly unlikely that would happen. She related that Tennessee closed everything and locked the doors, which was horrible. She said that Nevada would not want to do that.

Regent Schofield reminded the Board that Chancellor Nichols had fought hard for the System during the legislative session, adding that the Board should now support her work.

Vice Chancellor Miles reported that erroneous information had been published by the media. He demonstrated that the information was wrong so Board members could respond to any questions posed. The state general fund appropriation increased from \$717,438,630 (2001-2003 biennium) to \$987,808,259 (2003-2005 biennium), which equated to an increase of \$270,369,629 (37.7%). After deducting the Estate Tax contribution to the state, the net increase is reduced to \$181,134,781 (25.2%). The total budget increased 24.5% from 2001-2003 to 2003-2005 while budgeted FTE increased 19,652 (19.7%). System Administration has offered to correct the Nevada Taxpayer's Association's erroneous numbers. The correct figures were e-mailed that morning. Chancellor Nichols said it was critical to correct this misperception.

President Romesburg said that it was difficult for the institutions to hire faculty under these conditions since often they were considering multiple offers. He related that the longer the uncertain budget situation prevailed, the more difficult it would become.

Regent Bandera asked about the Nevada Taxpayer's Association's response upon receiving the corrected information. Vice Chancellor Miles replied that the figures had been e-mailed that morning, so no response had yet been received. Chancellor Nichols did not believe that it was their intention to provide misinformation.

Regent Schofield said the legislature would likely base their decision on the erroneous information, adding that Board members must work diligently to correct the misinformation.

Regent Derby asked whether the heart of the message should be not re-opening the budget. Chancellor Nichols agreed that it should be. UCCSN is the fastest growing system of higher education. UCCSN will not be able to serve the needs of those wanting to go to college if the budget is cut further. UCCSN will need to turn students away. If the budget is not approved the nursing initiative will not happen.

Chancellor Nichols then provided a review of the bills:

- AB203-Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs (12 voting members and 4 non-voting members). The Board Chair will name 3 Regents to that committee. The Assembly Majority Leader will name 3 members; the governor 3; and the Senate 3. The governor will also appoint 1 UCCSN student and three employees (2-UCCSN and 1-Department of Administration budget division). That process will begin after the legislative session is over.
- There will be an interim study of the Public Employees Benefits Program.
- AJR11 passed. Nothing will happen until the next session.
- AB148-UCCSN will undergo an audit. Chancellor Nichols recommended the Audit Committee track that activity throughout the entire biennium.
- Center for Crime Statistics at UNLV (not requested; legislative add-on).
- Minor change in legislation related to the transferability of community college credits.
- AB510 passed. The bill requires high schools to include information about preparation for college. This provides UCCSN an opportunity to work with K-12.
- AB534-may impact some UCCSN projects.
- AB555 carry-forward of salaries. Includes a mandate for a study of UCCSN security officers. The study will allow those salaries to be increased effective January 1, 2004, though no additional funding was provided.
- The bill that mandates electronic information for students with visual disabilities passed.
- A committee was established by the legislature for participatory democracy in which UCCSN will be asked to participate.
- Designation of the Nevada Cancer Institute as the official cancer institute of the state (not a System operation). Both universities are developing partnerships.
- The Millennium Scholarship changes are in place. The Board will approve those changes in August.

Chancellor Nichols thanked Mr. John Pappageorge and the other lobbyists, as well as the institutional lobbyists who worked so hard during the session. She suggested the Board should begin work for the 2005 session including: the taxonomy, UCCSN's relationship with the SPWB, health insurance for employees (rates have escalated drastically), and what issues the Board wants to bring forward next session.

Regent Schofield asked about legislation affecting the Board makeup. Chancellor Nichols stated that the resolution passed that would change Board membership to nine members. Each congressional district would elect one member of the Board (3). The remainder (6) would be governor appointed. Regent Schofield asked how the resolution passed. Chancellor Nichols replied that it passed unanimously in the Assembly and by an 11-10 vote in the Senate.

The meeting recessed at 5:05 p.m. and reconvened at 8:00 a.m., on Thursday, June 19, 2003 with all members present except Regents Derby, Dondero, and Schofield.

17. Information Only-Closed Personnel Sessions

17.1 Approved-Closed Personnel Sessions - In compliance with NRS 241.030, closed sessions were held for purposes of discussion of the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or physical or mental health of certain executive employees of the UCCSN.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of moving to a closed session. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Derby, Dondero, and Schofield were absent.

The meeting recessed at 8:10 a.m. and reconvened at 11:10 a.m. with all members present except Regents Alden, Dondero, Hill, and Schofield.

17.2 Information Only-Return to Open Session - The Board returned to open session. Regent Hill entered the meeting.

18. Approved-Sale of Property, Babbitt Building, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol Lucey's request to sell the Babbitt Building to REV Technologies "as is" for the purchase price of \$1.00, the same amount WNCC paid when it bought the Babbitt School from Mineral County School District for its Hawthorne Center. As part of the approval to sell, the Board also approved the transfer of the deed to REV Technologies (Ref. M on file in the Board office).

President Lucey reported that the County was not interested in owning the building. A new industry is moving to Hawthorne that is interested in purchasing the building.

Regent Hill moved approval of the sale of property for WNCC. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked for a balance sheet on REV Technologies. He wanted to know who would personally indemnify the purchase and about the financial assets of the company. Mr. Kenneth Peterson, a representative of REV Technologies, replied that the assets were comprised of inventoried vehicles. The net worth of the company is \$353,000. Regent Sisolak asked whether the officers of the company would personally indemnify UCCSN against personal liability. Mr. Peterson replied that the company was purchasing the building "as is" with no stated warranty.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak said that he was concerned because the building has asbestos. He asked whether the company was moving in immediately. Mr. Peterson said the company had earmarked \$99,000 for remodeling the building, adding that those concerns would be addressed by the company (asbestos floor tiles). Regent Sisolak expressed concern for System liability. Chair Seastrand asked General Counsel Ray to describe an "as is" condition of sale. General Counsel Ray said there were two issues. The buyer is purchasing the building "as is", which eliminates any claims by the buyer. He said that Regent Sisolak was concerned about possible third party claims, which was a separate issue. The agreement does provide that the buyer would be responsible for indemnifying the System for any such claims. Mr. Peterson said that REV was prepared to buy the building under those conditions. Regent Sisolak was concerned that if someone became ill they would sue everyone. He asked about protection for the System. General Counsel Ray replied that the purpose of the indemnity clause was to provide that protection. He noted that Regent Sisolak had expressed concern about the corporation's financial ability to make good on that claim. Chair Seastrand asked whether a bond could be posted as an insurance policy. General Counsel Ray said that it could be a possibility.

Regent Hill asked for clarification regarding what claim Regent Sisolak was concerned about, adding that he could not think of any possibilities. Regent Sisolak said that he feared a claim regarding exposure to asbestos. Even though the buyer doesn't have a problem with the asbestos, a third party might. Regent Hill said there was no relationship between a third party and UCCSN once the building was sold. General Counsel Ray said there was always a possibility for being named in a lawsuit like that, but he felt the liability risks were relatively small given that the buyer was aware of the asbestos. He observed that the EPA could require the prior owner to pay for cleanup costs. Regent Hill did not believe there was any System liability since the asbestos had been disclosed.

Regent Bandera asked about current liability for the empty building. General Counsel Ray said that the issues raised were valid, but he felt that the sale of the building put UCCSN in a better position than it was in currently.

Mr. Bus Scharmann, Dean, Fallon Campus and Extended Programs-WNCC, said that some of the asbestos problem had been resolved by WNCC re-carpeting certain areas. The main reason for relinquishing the property is due to costs with the heating system. The new owner will now take care of the remainder of the asbestos.

Regent Sisolak asked whether Mr. Peterson or the corporate officers would personally indemnify UCCSN. Mr. Peterson said that he would make arrangements with General Counsel Ray to work out a satisfactory arrangement. He observed that since UCCSN had disclosed the danger there would be little recourse for anyone. He noted that a state occupancy certificate would be required once the renovation was complete, so the state would inspect the building. Regent Sisolak again said that he was concerned about the potential exposure to third party liability.

Motion carried. Regents Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak voted no. Regents Alden and Dondero were absent.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

19. Information Only-Review of Tenure Approval Process - As requested at the March 2003 meeting, Chancellor Jane Nichols made a presentation on the current process and procedures for awarding tenure to academic faculty, and led a discussion about whether changes were desirable (Ref. G on file in the Board office).

Chancellor Nichols reported that System staff sampled other institutions' practices. There is a general pattern that tenure is finally approved by the Board, though there are instances where tenure is approved by the Chancellor or president. A UCCSN president cannot grant a contract longer than 3 years (except in limited circumstances). If authority to grant tenure was given to the presidents, other policies regarding presidential powers would need to be reviewed for congruency. She reported that General Counsel Ray has begun notifying faculty (recommended for tenure) that they may be discussed and requiring them to sign the form required by the Open Meeting Law. It was the Chancellor's recommendation that the Board retain final approval for tenure of faculty. The Board sets the policies and process for tenure and works hard to protect faculty. Granting tenure at the institutional level would eliminate a level where faculty would be able to raise issues. She could not imagine a president arbitrarily granting tenure, but once granted, it cannot be taken away. She felt this layer of protection was good policy and recommended the current policy remain in effect. She felt that, with leaving tenure recommendations on the Consent agenda and notifying faculty, there was still work to be done in determining how to handle those instances when questions arise about a particular faculty member. She recommended no Board action at this time.

Regent Anthony established that the faculty senate agreed with the current process. He suggested providing background information on those recommended for tenure. He also thought it would be nice for the Board to send a letter to the individuals once tenure was granted. Regent Alden agreed.

Chancellor Nichols said that the Board normally receives a vita on the recommendations for tenure with hire, but not on existing faculty. She suggested that System staff could include a brief synopsis as part of the work that needs to be done. She related that tenure was a discretionary act, but there were many reasons for not denying tenure. She felt that further discussion with legal counsel was needed.

Chair Seastrand felt it would be helpful to have the reasons why an individual should be given tenure.

Regent Bandera respectfully disagreed with the Chancellor's recommendation. She noted that the Board had previously discussed foregoing Board approval of tenure recommendations, yet now was asking for more information, and was cautioned that there were many reasons for not denying tenure.

Regent Kirkpatrick said there were several processes that an individual goes through before being recommended for tenure. He felt the Board should rely upon the process in place.

Regent Derby said that the Board recognized that overturning a recommendation for tenure would be extreme given the process that individuals go through. She said that Board approval was actually pro forma. A suggestion was made that Board approval was not really necessary since it really was a campus decision. She felt it would be inappropriate for the Board to second-guess a recommendation given the rigorous process. She understood the Chancellor's recommendation for the Board to put its stamp of approval on the recommendations, rather than scrutinize whether or not an individual should be given tenure.

Chancellor Nichols said that it had been a difficult decision for her. The process works well, because the faculty and presidents know that ultimately questions could be raised if the proper process is not followed. She encouraged the Board not to delve into the area of making individual decisions about whether or not someone should be given tenure.

Chair Seastrand concurred with the Chancellor. He asked whether it was within the Board's preveue to assess whether or not tenure should be granted. He felt it would be useful to know why the Board was granting tenure rather than just being a rubber stamp. He felt that would be a reasonable compromise and not for purposes of scrutiny.

Regent Whipple appreciated and concurred with the Chancellor's assessment. He agreed with Regent Anthony's suggestion for sending a congratulatory letter and that a brief synopsis of each individual would be helpful.

Regent Howard said that she felt justified in raising questions about a prior tenure recommendation. She said that she was not a rubber stamp and never intended to be one. She felt that she has the right to ask questions and deserved to have them answered. She agreed that it was inappropriate for the Board to evaluate whether or not to grant tenure, but felt that Board members had the right to ask questions about individuals that caused them concern and to have those questions answered.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Hill hoped the Board would continue to be a rubber stamp in such proceedings. He felt the Board should only concern itself with whether the entire process was followed and complied with. He felt it would be interesting and educational to see resumes, but felt that the Board should only be concerned about whether the proper process was followed in order to maintain the integrity of the entire System.

Regent Sisolak said that he chose not to think of it as rubber stamping. He wanted to ensure that the entire, rigorous process was followed when he pulled a tenure request from the Consent Agenda the previous day. He said he trusts the judgment of the deciding group to follow the proper steps.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

Chair Seastrand recommended the Chancellor take the Board's discussion into consideration.

20. Accepted-Common Course Numbering Report - In response to Master Plan Goal #3 (Opportunity for All), Vice Chancellor Richard Curry requested acceptance of the 2002-03 Common Course Numbering Committee Report, including recommendations for future steps to be taken to complete and implement the system (Ref. H on file in the Board office).

Vice Chancellor Curry acknowledged the strong leadership of co-chairs Dr. Jannet Vreeland and Dr. Tim Haller, the good work of the Common Course Numbering Committee, and the cooperation of more than 400 faculty in 47 disciplines across the System. He related that it was a complex project. Some systems have abandoned the process or worked around the situation. The committee studied other models, noted possible pitfalls, and designed a process with the best chance for success. There were disagreements, but in most cases, consensus has been reached. He related that at the conclusion of the presentation Mr. Tyler Trevor, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, would discuss implementation.

Dr. Vreeland requested questions from the Board.

Regent Hill observed that the motion the Board passed was more extensive than the motion cited in the report. Dr. Vreeland replied that the citation used had been developed by the previous chair of the committee. Regent Hill said that the other part of the motion related to the classification of upper- and lower-division courses. He noted that the report did not appear to address that issue. Dr. Vreeland said that it appeared some "mission creep" had occurred. She related there had also been a lot of interaction among faculty and that many courses had been reclassified. The various discipline committees have

resolved most issues. A system needs to be put in place now so the good work of the committee is not lost. A master course list and a system is required to track courses in order to avoid institutions changing a 200-level course to a 300 without going through the system, which allows for proper input. An ongoing committee will monitor the system. Dr. Vreeland said there had already been decay in the work completed. Dr. Haller related that WNCC was concerned about "course creep". He assured the Board that community college representatives addressed those concerns in every discipline meeting. The committee was successful in reclassifying a number of courses that had crept to the junior level. He said the problem was not completely resolved, but the process would prevent it from happening in the future. He said that all courses would need to go through the database and all institutions would need to agree. Regent Hill recalled that he had requested a definition for an upper- and lower-division course. He has been told that it cannot be done. He suggested that a working definition should be determined. He questioned whether 300- and 400-level courses recommended for the first two years should be reclassified or not taught at the community college level. He asked about the departments that had not made much progress. Dr. Vreeland said that some of those departments required constant reminding. She recalled that Dr. Haller worked on a UNR department for a couple of years. Once Dr. Vreeland called the department in her new position as Vice Provost the issue was resolved. There are philosophical differences in some discipline's approach. She gave full credit to the Provosts, Academic Vice Presidents, and their offices. As larger problems arose, they assisted in achieving compliance. Regent Hill said that the original motion was intended to get everyone's attention. He asked Dr. Vreeland to get the attention of those who have not cooperated and let them know the Board is paying attention. He recognized there could be courses that are not equivalent. He felt there should be a policy that courses with a certain number can transfer to another institution (as if taken at the institution). He noted that some students had taken such courses and were told they had to take it again after transferring. Dr. Haller said that should not be happening with common course numbering. The larger problem is whether or not a course applies to a specific program. He said that Accounting 201 should be the same course at each institution.

Regents Schofield and Sisolak left the meeting.

Regent Hill recalled that UNR would not accept an anthropology course from TMCC. He was hopeful that sort of problem had been addressed. Dr. Haller said that the various departments had agreed upon what constituted the same course.

Regent Howard left the meeting.

Regent Hill said there appeared to be a problem with coordination and efficiencies. He felt there should be adequate communication, advisement, and availability of courses for those students who wish to complete their degree in the least amount of time.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Regent Hill asked whether some departments were requiring too many courses in an effort to ensure accreditation. He asked whether some requirements (in excess of 120 credits) could be reduced. Chancellor Nichols said that the issue regarding the number of credits required to graduation had been discussed at length. She offered to begin a process of reviewing the number of credits required to degree (by major) as well as exploring the number of credits completed to degree. She said that System staff could bring forward this information at a future date.

Regent Whipple thanked those responsible for their work on this project. He asked how long it would take to fully implement the process. Dr. Vreeland said that it was difficult to predict since a database was not yet in place. She estimated that all of the work completed in 2002 would be implemented by the end of 2003. The remainder should be completed and implemented by Fall semester 2004. The only real problem is interior design. She expressed concern for determining which institutions were using 1- or 2-year catalogs. The process has been streamlined to facilitate a speedy implementation.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

Dr. Vreeland was hopeful that the 2004 catalogs would reflect System-wide numbering.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Trevor reported the data management system would provide three basic functions: (1) Compilation of a master course file, (2) Development of a data system through a web-based interface for quick course reference, and (3) Provision of an automated method for proposing new courses or changes to courses. This would control access to entering courses that have not been approved. Each semester a process of data monitoring will occur to ensure integrity of the data by matching the master course file to all of the courses offered in the System. Those courses that do not match will be pulled aside, analyzed and investigated, and given to the Common Course Numbering Committee to follow-up.

Regent Whipple asked how the decay had occurred. Dr. Vreeland replied that the database was in the process of development. At this point, institutions can offer new courses that the other institutions have not seen. The database is one of the controls being put in place to avoid that. Regent Whipple asked whether articulation agreements would be needed in the future. Dr. Vreeland replied that the process should facilitate those agreements, adding that such agreements would still be necessary.

Chair Seastrand thanked Regent Hill for bringing this matter to the Board's attention. He said the Board supported the process and was pleased with the progress made. He asked whether the committee should continue into perpetuity. Dr. Vreeland said that their (Dr. Vreeland and Dr. Haller's) work was completed, but they strongly advocated the creation of a System-wide committee to facilitate problem solving. Ongoing discipline meetings were also recommended. She felt the institutions should collaborate on (rather than duplicate) high cost programs.

Dr. Joel Shrock reported that faculty had very intense discussions about history, adding that it required a great deal of work to write the report. He emphasized the need to get a process in place soon. He said that community college faculty had been very forceful in those discussions.

Regent Hill thanked committee members for their work and hoped the results would be worthwhile for the faculty in the long run. He was pleased with the progress being made.

Dr. Haller stated that more than 450 faculty participated as discipline representatives and that 10,000 courses had been reviewed. There is only one course upon which the faculty has not reached agreement. He thanked the faculty for their collaboration. Chair Seastrand acknowledged the effort and thanked the faculty for their cooperation.

Regent Hill moved acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Rosenberg noted that faculty had accomplished this. He felt that much of the resistance was due to the appearance of such a large task. Knowing that the new catalogs had to be processed urged the faculty into action. He said there were three courses in art that he was unsure how to handle. He observed that some 100-level courses had moved to the 200-level, adding that course creep moved in both directions.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero and Sisolak were absent.

The meeting recessed at 12:20 p.m. and reconvened at 12:40 p.m. with all members present except Regents Derby, Dondero, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak.

21. Approved-Interlocal Agreement with City of Henderson, NSC – The Board approved President Kerry Romesburg's request for an interlocal agreement between the City of Henderson and the University and Community College System of Nevada to finalize the conveyance of public lands identified for the state college campus. The 2002 Public Lands Act requires that the City of Henderson and the UCCSN enter into an agreement that sets the terms for the conveyance and use of the land (Ref. P on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the interlocal agreement for NSC. Regent Bandera seconded. Motion carried. Regents Derby, Dondero, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak were absent.

22. Information Only-Lease Amendment, Center for Academic Enrichment & Outreach, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's requests to: (Ref. O on file in the Board office)

- Execute a Third Amendment to an existing office and classroom space lease at the Executive Center West, 1455 East Tropicana Avenue, for the Center for Academic Enrichment and Outreach (CAEO). The Third Amendment will provide 2,189 additional square feet, for a total of 16,140 sq. ft., in order to accommodate up to 100 new full- and part-time CAEO employees. A provision of the Third Amendment gives UNLV the "First Right to Negotiate" for additional suites in the future, but places a 45-day deadline on completion of the negotiations. Thus, UNLV also requested the following:
 - Grant the Chancellor authority to approve future amendments to the CAEO lease in order to meet the 45-day clause. This authority will provide flexibility for the Center to expand into additional suites as they become available, per the terms provided in the Third Amendment.

Fiscal Impact: Lease rent will begin at the prevailing rate of \$1.59 per square foot/month with annual increases to a ceiling of \$1.89 per square foot/month in 2010. The annual rent for CAEO will increase by approximately \$37,000 per year beginning July 1, 2003. Rent will continue to increase as additional suites in this complex become available and are added to the lease by amendments. The Additional rent will be funded from existing CAEO federal grants that began September 1, 2002.

Regent Alden asked why the item required Board action. Chancellor Nichols said that Board action was not required. The item was presented to ensure the Board was informed, but the lease could be accomplished without Board action and, implicitly, it would allow the Chancellor to approve amendments. She related that the Board had already approved the 10-year lease. Chair Seastrand said the matter would be referred to the Chancellor.

Regent Anthony felt it would be wise to provide the Board updates on future lease expansions. President Harter related that the programs were federally supported. Regent Bandera suggested that a Regents' Alert would be sufficient. All members present agreed.

General Counsel Ray asked that the record reflect that the reason the Board did not take action was because the action was within the authority of the Chancellor.

Regent Kirkpatrick entered the meeting.

23. Approved-UCCSN Master Plan, Space Utilization Improvement Plans - In response to Master Plan Goal #4 (Accessible Education), Chancellor Jane Nichols provided a summary of space utilization improvement plans that were developed by each UCCSN institution through a collaborative process that included faculty, staff, and students. The Board approved recommendations from the Chancellor related to the findings (Ref. I on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols reported that one of the targets for providing accessible education is to expand the use of facilities for the most cost-effective delivery of instruction. A national consultant was hired to verify UCCSN space. It was discovered that UCCSN's overall utilization was good by national standards, but the patterns of use raised questions. It appears that not as many classes are offered on Friday as on other weekdays. As a result of the System study, the presidents were asked to work collaboratively with faculty and students to study campus trends and to develop a plan for increasing usage of instructional space. Chancellor Nichols clarified that Ref. I did not comprise a space utilization study, but rather an institutional analysis of available space and future space requirements. She reported that DRI prepared a thorough report regarding their use of facilities for research and offices, but their information was not included with the classroom utilization reference material. NSC was excluded because they have yet to establish a track record on utilization. Instructional space accounts for only one-third to one-half of all assignable square footage at the institutions. Buildings are used for many things besides assignable classroom space. UCCSN's distribution of assignable space for classrooms (14%) and labs (16%) is much higher than the national average (5.3% and 7.1% respectively). The institutions were provided four guiding principles:

- Student access to classes and optimal use of existing space must guide scheduling practices. Faculty preference and historical practices cannot be used.
- Quality instruction is an important consideration in all scheduling. New and innovative ways of scheduling are welcome within a context of high quality in teaching and learning.
- Practices that ensure efficient and effective use of space must be established and institutionalized to accommodate future growth in numbers of students and faculty. Buildings cannot be constructed quickly enough to keep pace with enrollment growth. The institutions must use existing space more efficiently to accommodate the students.
- Implementation of the improvement plan and system changes must occur no later than January 2004.

Regent Derby entered meeting.

Chancellor Nichols reported that each institution was asked to examine detailed questions in a variety of areas: (review of current data; current scheduling software/practices; market data; determination of course offerings; Friday classes; afternoon, evening, and weekend courses; room usage; System policies required to help campuses). Underlying issues discovered included the following:

- Physical condition of space (i.e., classrooms with no technology, unfavorable physical layout or condition of space). Faculty and students will avoid and/or not want to use such space; considered not efficient space.
- Course scheduling blocks and instructional format affect utilization and room availability. A commitment to common scheduling is necessary (classes ending on the hour or on the half hour).
- Student work schedules, family commitments, and class-standing affect scheduling blocks.
- Increased evening/weekend usage creates the need for altered work schedules for support services and custodial employees.
- Increased room usage affects overall O&M costs for utilities, repairs, maintenance, etc.
- The current UCCSN space utilization study does not track and quantify non-credit and non-instructional activities that are scheduled in classrooms. The formula does not reflect the total overall use of instructional spaces. The funding formula allocates O&M dollars based on square footage and the age of the facilities, but does not factor in the hours of use or the type of use.

Regent Schofield left meeting.

Chancellor Nichols noted that the reports indicate that all institutions are heavily data-driven in their approaches to space utilization. They have all moved toward centralized, standard scheduling blocks and are moving from manual, paper-based room scheduling to software. The institutions are conducting regular surveys of students, faculty, and staff to track attributes, needs and concerns. There is less evidence they are tracking the market outside the institution and potential students who would attend if certain courses were offered at desired times. Adjustments are continually made to class offerings and locations based upon survey findings. New approaches have been adopted at every institution. The larger institutions have moved toward a two-day format (longer class times on either Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday, or Friday only) to increase weekly room usage. One- and two-day blocks also help students coordinate work schedules and decrease their commute times. GBC and WNCB have placed an emphasis on standardized Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes to meet the needs of their students. All institutions are scheduling Fridays and Saturdays primarily for 3-hour classes, lab sections, and discussion groups. A one-size-fits-all approach to scheduling does not work because each

institution is different. Students will need to be introduced to new course taking patterns and possibilities early in their college attendance so they begin to adjust work schedules accordingly. All institutions noted a need to track actual classroom usage in System reports as well as to reexamine and update the definitions for each type of space.

Chancellor Nichols recommended the following actions:

- Formally accept the institution reports.
- Direct staff to make recommendations for possible changes to the System space utilization model and bring it back to the Board for action in October.
- Encourage all institutions to continue to improve classroom utilization and track progress with an update on progress reported to the Board annually.

President Lilley said that it was a vexing issue. Before the institutions can get new facilities they will need to offer classes all day and on weekends. UNR experiences peaks of great efficiency. He felt they could and would do better.

President Harter said that students were more willing to re-think attendance patterns than faculty were. There was always enough faculty willing to try unusual potential schedules that would make varied offerings possible. UNLV is trying to get the two days/week model exactly parallel in time (aligning the timing of classes to start at the same time so students can move with maximum flexibility). Forcing Friday attendance was the least favorite option. She said that UNLV would encourage Friday afternoon classes by offering incentives.

President Lilley said that every institution was facing renovation issues. Smart classroom technology is now required in all classes, which is a major challenge.

President Ringle said that TMCC formed a committee, which suggested offering 3-hour block courses on Friday as well as experimenting with Monday-Wednesday-Friday offerings. A commitment was made to quadruple (from 24 to 96) the number of sections offered on Fridays over the next several years. The committee also addressed the issue of "zoning" (departments "owning" classrooms whether used efficiently or not) and provided a recommendation for discontinuing such practices and scheduling based upon priority of use.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of space utilization improvement plans developed by UCCSN institutions. Regent Whipple seconded.

Regent Alden noted that the space utilization study did not consider collaborations with the school districts or private partnerships. He felt the institutions should seek partnerships to utilize classroom and lab space not located on UCCSN campuses. Chancellor Nichols agreed. She suggested that the campuses could offer a report on usage of partnerships and alternate classroom space. One of the weaknesses of the current classroom utilization model is that it does not recognize classes taught in partnerships or in other places. Regent Alden predicted that the state audit would consider classroom and laboratory utilization as well as FTE. He felt that UCCSN should determine a method for internally auditing classroom and lab usage annually. Chair Seastrand asked about a previous committee that had determined common methods for measuring space. Chancellor Nichols replied that the Board had approved a space utilization format with definitions for every type of space as well as benchmarks for space usage. This report has suggested the need for some changes.

Regent Kirkpatrick thanked the Chancellor and presidents for preparing the reports, which he found very interesting. He felt that UCCSN would need to utilize class space more effectively, which would likely upset some students and faculty, prior to requesting money for new buildings. He asked whether UNLV would initiate the Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday, and some Friday-Saturday classes prior to October. President Harter said they would try to do so. Dr. Juanita Fain, Vice President, Administration-UNLV, reported that UNLV hoped to have the revised schedule in place by next Fall. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the current Fall schedules had been released. Dr. Fain replied that they were. She related that they were working on changes for the January schedule.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, Schofield, and Sisolak were absent.

24. Accepted-UCCSN Master Plan, Accountability Model Design Report - In response to Master Plan Goal #2 (Quality Education), System staff provided a progress report on the core accountability indicators and sub-indicators developed to date in order to monitor the progress that the System and its institutions make toward the goals and targets of the UCCSN Master Plan for Higher Education in Nevada. Included in the report was an example of the design proposed for the first report (Ref. J on file in the Board office).

Vice Chancellor Curry reported that the accountability model would match performance measures directly to master plan goals. There are six overarching, interrelated goals, with associated targets. The model is designed to guide UCCSN as it strives to meet the educational needs of Nevada with an emphasis on continuous improvement and public accountability. The accountability measures serve as a vehicle for monitoring progress in relation to UCCSN's mission and goals, provide a limited number of critical indicators, cover the diverse attributes of UCCSN institutions, and must be understood by a variety of constituent groups (students, the public, and the legislature). Dr. Curry reported that the development process included:

- April 2002 - master plan development concluded.
- Summer 2002 - campus representatives began meeting to discuss the structure of the accountability plan. A suggested list of preliminary measures was developed, which resulted in a suggested list of measures.
- Spring 2003 – the measures were consolidated and refined and were reviewed by the Academic Affairs Council, Student Affairs Council, and the Council of Presidents.

Dr. Curry related they were seeking Board input since the measures were still under development. Significant progress has been made with 13 well-defined measures currently in place. Six more are under development. The first annual report is expected in the near future. He assured the Board that the detailed research reports (financial aid, faculty workload, remedial education, progress with diversity) would continue to be produced.

Mr. Trevor discussed the parameters behind the measures. A fundamental set of principles was developed:

- Core set of higher-level measures (dashboard indicators) linked to the master plan.
- Sub-indicators established to depict diverse campus attributes.
- Measurement of indicators rely upon existing data collection efforts.
- Chancellor's Office charged with data collection and measurement responsibilities.
- Measures associated with comparable data (regionally or nationally) to establish benchmarks.
- Information displayed longitudinally and disaggregated by institution when appropriate.

The first measure (college continuation rate) indicates the UCCSN's ability to attract recent Nevada high school graduates. The sub-indicators measure in-state vs. out-of-state college continuation rates, the percent of Millennium Scholars enrolling immediately after graduation, and a review of the local service area and capture rates by community college. The second measure (remediation rate) indicates the percent of recent Nevada high school graduates enrolling in developmental math and English.

Regent Bandera asked why they were reviewing the percent of recent Nevada high school graduates rather than comparing it with recent Nevada high school graduates who completed a college prep curriculum who also enrolled in developmental math and English. Mr. Trevor replied that an existing data stream was being used. He related that the scope could be expanded to include Regent Bandera's suggestion as a sub-indicator. Regent Bandera said that she would like it incorporated as a sub-indicator. She felt the additional information would be necessary. Mr. Trevor agreed to do so.

Mr. Trevor continued his review of the sub-indicators for the remediation measure; remedial enrollment broken out by ethnicity, success and persistence rates of remedial students, and number of P-16 cooperative programs.

Regent Bandera asked whether information would be included in each report identifying which programs had been put in place since the previous report as a result of a need indicated by the data. Mr. Trevor replied that he hoped the report would include such information. Regent Bandera said that it would be helpful to identify changes and the responses to those changes. Mr. Trevor said that the report included a level of detail that attempts to answer the macro indicator as well as explore some of the sub-indicators and the correlation between them.

Mr. Trevor continued his review of the measures. The third measure (diversity) indicates the ethnic racial distribution of UCCSN student population (Nevada residents only) as compared to the ethnic racial distribution throughout Nevada. Sub-indicators include enrollment by ethnicity at five-year intervals, the percent change in minority enrollment, the ethnic distribution of UCCSN student population as compared to the Nevada high school graduates, the ethnic distribution of UCCSN student population as compared to local service areas, and the percent of System-wide diversity goals obtained. The fourth measure (financial aid) indicates the percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students receiving financial aid during an academic year. Sub-indicators include the percent of full-time degree seekers receiving aid by type of aid received and the student financial aid awarded per student FTE. The fifth measure (degrees/certificates awarded) indicates the number of associate and bachelor degrees awarded per 100 public high school graduates.

Regent Derby asked about a measure for unmet need. Mr. Trevor replied that the financial aid report included that information. Regent Derby said that she would like to see that measure included with this report. Mr. Trevor agreed to do so.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Mr. Trevor continued his review of sub-indicators for degrees awarded, which includes the number and type of degrees awarded, the number of degrees awarded per 100,000 state residents, and the percent of population with degrees by degree level. He reported that the master plan goals were tied to each measure.

Regent Hill discussed the 6-year degree completion rate. He asked whether Nevada's unique situation had been included. Mr. Trevor replied that this was included in another measure (graduation rate).

Regent Bandera asked about data that would indicate the percent of population with degrees by degree level based upon the amount of time spent as residents of Nevada. Mr. Trevor replied that it would be difficult to locate that data. These data are

not normally broken out by length of residency. President Romesburg noted a difference between awarded and attainment. He related that attainment in census was determined in a different manner. Mr. Trevor said that the population statistics were simply based on U.S. Census counts.

Chancellor Nichols noted that it was often assumed that a goal would be improved by setting measures. She felt a tremendous difference would be seen in the length of time to graduation for Millennium Scholars vs. traditional students. She related that by providing limited financial assistance in a limited period of time to complete the degree the students would likely complete more quickly. She observed that full-time students who remain enrolled are more likely to graduate. UCCSN will lose fewer students over time if they are encouraged to attend full-time and remain enrolled.

Mr. Trevor continued his review of measures. The sixth measure (persistence and transfer) indicates the percent of first-time degree-seeking students returning for a second year within UCCSN. Sub-indicators include persistence by ethnicity, percent of first-time student cohorts transferring to UCCSN institutions, and percent of transfer students from community colleges who have earned a degree prior to transfer. Mr. Trevor related that this data focused more on the student. There is a high rate of mobility between institutions, which creates complications when trying to track time to degree completion. The seventh measure (graduation rate) indicates the percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students graduating within 150% of their completion time (3 years-community colleges, 6-years-universities/state college). The eighth measure (distance education) indicates the headcount and FTE of students receiving instruction via distance education. The ninth measure (space utilization) indicates the utilization of instructional space by day of the week, disaggregated by classroom and labs as compared to the UCCSN Board of Regents' standard. The tenth measure (workforce development/employment) is one of the most difficult measures to quantify. The unemployment insurance wage database will be used. Sub-indicators include the percent of graduates employed in high-skill, high-wage occupations in the state of Nevada six months following graduation.

Regent Bandera asked about the definition for high-skilled, high-wage occupations. Mr. Trevor replied that the definition was set by the federal government for the nation.

Mr. Trevor continued his review of sub-indicators, which included areas of critical shortage. The eleventh measure addresses non-state resources (total revenue generated by grants and contracts). The twelfth measure (faculty characteristics) measures the percent of faculty with doctoral or terminal degrees at the four-year institutions and the percent of faculty with master's degree or higher at the two-year institutions. The thirteenth measure (participation rates) indicates the enrollment in UCCSN institutions per 1,000 Nevada residents. Mr. Trevor indicated there was some difficulty in determining core indicators for some goals (i.e., student learning). He felt the UCCSN's affiliation with the National Forum on College-Level Learning would provide an opportunity for comparative data. The sixth goal (increased quality of life due to education) will be addressed by exploring opportunities for the Community Educational Experiences Survey to relate quality of life and educational experiences. Measures are yet to be developed for research and development, efficiency, and faculty productivity. Mr. Trevor then provided a sample of the report.

Regent Derby asked whether national data would be provided to compare the data. Mr. Trevor replied that it would be where and when appropriate. The institutions are concerned about being compared with institutions they shouldn't be. He related that regional and national data would be included. Regent Derby said the information would be most helpful for the Board.

Regent Anthony asked about determining the quality of the education provided and the type of citizen produced. Mr. Trevor replied that the student learning measure and the National Forum for College-Level Learning would provide direct measures of the knowledge that students were receiving. Citizenship and values are a little more difficult to measure. He related there were different tactics that could be taken. Regent Anthony said that he approved of the idea of contacting alumni. Mr. Trevor stated that every UCCSN institution follows that practice as part of the accreditation process. Regent Anthony asked about a measure for ensuring that UCCSN is accountable to the taxpayers and spending their money wisely. Chancellor Nichols said that a measure of efficiency was under development as well as the committee to study higher education. She related that each of the measures reviewed would answer the taxpayer's question.

Regent Bandera thanked Vice Chancellor Curry, Assistant Vice Chancellor Trevor, and the institutions for providing valuable information on which to base policy decisions.

Mr. Trevor reported that final approval of the measures for the first year would be requested at a future Board meeting, followed by a report in December or January.

Regent Derby moved acceptance of the report. Regent Bandera seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, Schofield, and Sisolak were absent.

25. Approved-Board Meeting Calendar 2004 - The Board approved proposed dates for the Board of Regents' meetings in 2004 (Ref. K on file in the Board office).

January 29-30 (Thurs.-Fri.) August 19-20 (Thurs.-Fri.)
March 18-19 (Thurs.-Fri.) October 14-15 (Thurs.-Fri.)

May 7 (Fri.) December 2-3 (Thurs.-Fri.)
June 3-4 (Thurs.-Fri.)

Regent Alden was willing to reserve the proposed dates. He suggested the full Board should meet quarterly on Wednesday-Thursday (3 meetings-Las Vegas, 1 meeting-Reno/rural). He suggested the Board should meet in January, April, July, and October. He felt committees should be expanded to meet eight times per year. He suggested that a budget committee of the whole should be formed as well as an athletic committee. He felt the Board should receive Board meeting materials 30 days in advance of the meeting. He felt the new Board Chair should determine the calendar. Chair Seastrand suggested that some of Regent Alden's ideas required discussion, which could be entertained under New Business. Regent Alden said that he would agree to reserve the dates, but he would not support the proposed calendar.

Regent Derby moved approval of the proposed 2004 meeting dates for the Board of Regents. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Alden requested a roll call vote.

Regent Whipple asked whether the dates could change in the future once a new chair was elected. Ms. Ernst replied that the campuses needed to schedule their calendars around the Board meeting dates. She observed that the Board formerly scheduled meetings three years in advance. The longer the Board waited to decide on its 2004 meeting dates, the more difficult it was for the presidents to prepare their own schedules. She said that it would be more appropriate for the Board to use four of the proposed dates if they determined to reduce the number of meetings. Regent Derby felt it was important for the Board to establish a calendar and to hold a separate conversation about making changes. General Counsel Ray reported that Board Bylaws require that a calendar be established at the last regular meeting of the fiscal year.

Regent Anthony established that meeting dates could be cancelled following Board approval of the proposed dates. Chair Seastrand noted that additional meetings could not be scheduled (except special meetings).

Chair Seastrand affirmed that General Counsel had confirmed the Board needed to make a determination at this meeting.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Anthony, Bandera, Derby, Hill, Kirkpatrick, Rosenberg, Schofield, Seastrand, and Whipple voted yes. Regent Alden voted no. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

26. Approved-Resolution 03-10. Letter of Credit, DRI – The Board approved President Stephen G. Wells' request to obtain a letter of credit, in the amount of \$2,087,841, for the purpose of fulfilling a revenue bond covenant approved by the Board of Regents in May 2002 (Ref. L on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of Resolution 03-10 for a letter of credit for DRI. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

27. Approved-Sale of Land, DRI – The Board approved President Stephen G. Wells' request to enter a purchase agreement for the sale and land transfer of parcel APN-004-061-13. The parcel is needed by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) for improvements to the Clear Acre/395 highway interchange. President Wells was previously granted approval to negotiate the land sale with RTC at the January 2003 Board meeting (Ref. N on file in the Board office).

Regent Hill moved approval of the sale of land for DRI. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

28. Approved-Acquisition of Artemesia Way, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request to accept the street abandonment of Artemesia Way from the City of Reno to provide space for a landscaped Pedestrian Plaza at the south side of the university's new Residential Complex/Dining Commons (Ref. Q on file in the Board office).

Fiscal Impact: There are no acquisition costs associated with this transaction although the university would assume the ongoing cost of improvements and maintenance of the street. Funds for the construction of the Pedestrian Plaza will come from Residential Complex/Dining Commons Phase II project funds previously earmarked for street repairs.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the acquisition of Artemesia Way for UNR. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

29. Approved-Election of Officers - In accordance with Regents' Bylaws (Article IV, Section 2), an election of officers for FY 2003-2004 was conducted. These officers will serve from July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004.

Chair - Regent Alden nominated Regent Stavros Anthony as Board Chair.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that he had some real concerns about the length of time that Regent Anthony had served on the Board and whether he fully understood the depth, breadth, and time requirements incumbent with the duties of chair. He was

concerned that Regent Anthony's job might also interfere with his ability to serve as chair. He indicated that he would vote against the motion and requested a roll call vote.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Alden, Anthony, Bandera, Derby, Hill, Schofield, Seastrand, and Whipple voted yes. Regents Kirkpatrick and Rosenberg voted no. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of making the vote unanimous. No objections were expressed. Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

Regent Anthony said that he was honored to serve as chair. He stressed the importance of team work, adding that he realized that nothing could be accomplished alone. He said that he would do the best job possible.

Vice Chair - Regent Derby nominated Regent Marcia Bandera as Vice Chair. No other nominations were offered.

Motion carried. Regents Dondero, Howard, and Sisolak were absent.

30. New Business – Regent Alden requested a discussion of the number of meetings, the meeting dates, the time for materials to reach Regents, the number of committees, and the establishment of new committees at the next meeting.

Approved-Resolution 03-11 – The Board approved a resolution honoring outgoing Board Chair Douglas Seastrand (on file in the Board office). Chair Seastrand thanked the Board, adding that it had been a pleasure serving with them.

President Lilley noted that UNR won a national championship in rifle in 1956 and in women's swimming in 1979. Recently the American Marketing Association held the World Series of Marketing competition and UNR's team won. The team was comprised of and coached by Ms. Bourne Morris, Reynolds School of Journalism, and Ms. Judy Strauss, College of Business.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board