

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA

Fitness Center
Great Basin College
1500 College Parkway, Elko
Thursday-Friday, June 3-4, 2004

Members Present: Dr. Stavros Anthony, Chair

Mr. Mark Alden
Ms. Marcia Bandera
Dr. Jill Derby
Mrs. Thalia Dondero
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: Mr. Douglas Seastrand

Others Present: Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers

Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Buster Neel

Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Richard Curry

General Counsel Tom Ray

Interim President Paul Gianini Jr., 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. Ann Johnson, CCSN; Dr. Vic Etyemezian, DRI; Ms. Kathy Schwandt, GBC; Mr. Edward Baldwin, NSC; Ms. Bridgett Boulton, TMCC; Dr. Jane McCarthy, UNLV; Dr. Leah Wilds, UNR; Mr. Michael Hardie, WNCC; and Ms. Sara Velez Mallea, System Administration. Student government leaders present included Mr. David Rosier, CCSN; Ms. Nichole Shaffer, NSC; Mr. Joel Gutierrez, TMCC; Mr. Henry Schuck, UNLV; Mr. Erin Lankowsky, UNR; Mr. George Ambriz, UNLV-GPSA; Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, UNR-GSA; and Ms. Jenny Gentine, WNCC.

Chair Stavros Anthony called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., on Thursday, June 3, 2004 with all members present except Regent Seastrand.

Mr. Elwood Mose of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone in Elko offered the invocation.

1. Introductions – President Gianini introduced Mr. David Rosier, Student Body President-CCSN.

President Ringle introduced Mr. Joel Gutierrez, Student Body President-TMCC.

President Killpatrick introduced Dr. Mike McFarlane, Vice President, Academic Affairs-GBC; Mr. Erik Seastedt, Director of Personnel-GBC; Ms. Kathy Schwandt, Faculty Senate Chair-GBC; and Ms. Michelle Hammond Urain, Student Body President-GBC.

President Lucey introduced Ms. Jennifer Gentine, Student Body President-WNCC.

President Romesburg introduced Dr. Edward Baldwin, Faculty Senate Chair-NSC; Ms. Nicole Shaffer, Student Body President-NSC; and Dr. Lois Becker, Vice President, Academic Affairs-NSC. President Romesburg thanked everyone for the incredible support over the last two years, adding that it had been a pleasure working with them. He related that he had accepted the presidency of Jacksonville University in Florida. Chair Anthony said he would be sorely missed.

President Wells said that President Romesburg had been a great colleague and that all of the presidents would miss him. He then introduced Dr. Vic Etyemezian, Faculty Senate Chair-DRI.

President Lilley introduced Dr. Leah Wilds, Faculty Senate Chair-UNR, and Mr. Erin Lankowsky, Student Body President-UNR.

President Harter introduced Mr. Henry Schuck, Student Body President-UNLV, and Dr. Kathleen Robins, Senior Advisor to the President-UNLV. She thanked Dr. John Filler for his service. She then introduced Dr. Jane McCarthy, Faculty Senate Chair-UNLV.

2. Chair's Report - Board Chair Stavros Anthony thanked President Killpatrick and GBC staff for hosting the meeting. He noted that this would be the last meeting for Dr. Richard Curry as Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs prior to retirement, adding that he would be missed. Chair Anthony reported that President Romesburg had accepted the presidency at Jacksonville University in Florida, adding that he had done an outstanding job in his short tenure at Nevada State College. Chair Anthony announced that a search committee for the president of Nevada State College would be formed in the near future. Chair Anthony reported that the latest issue of the *Regents' Review* included articles about the use of interactive video technology at Great Basin College, former Chancellor Jane Nichols, and current Chancellor Jim Rogers. He also mentioned the *UCCSN Quick Facts* that will be published twice yearly providing useful information about the UCCSN. Chair Anthony noted the passing of a dear friend and an incredible talent, Mr. Van Weddle, Vice Chancellor, Technology-UCCSN. A moment of silence was observed in honor of Mr. Weddle.

3. Presidents' Reports - Four UCCSN presidents (*DRI, NSC, UNLV, WNCC*) presented a progress report on their institution's activities over the past year to meet the targets for Master Plan goal six, Building Quality of Life, and their plans for continuing to meet this goal in the next year (*Ref. A on file in the Board office*).

President Wells, DRI – DRI promotes the general welfare of Nevada through widely shared benefits of scientific research to protect and enhance the environment and

3. Presidents' Reports – (*Cont'd.*)

President Wells, DRI – (*Cont'd.*)

continuously build the quality of life for Nevada residents. One of DRI's highest priorities is the use of the scientific arena to foster talent at both the student and professional level, produce broad educational experiences, and stimulate intellectual excellence in students and faculty. The Institute seeks opportunities for cultural exchange and public service.

- • Working closely with partners at the Nevada Test Site Historical Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration's Nevada Site Office, and Bechtel Nevada, DRI opened the Frank H. Rogers Science and Technology Building on the Las Vegas campus establishing a long awaited cultural and science center. This was stemmed in part by DRI's long term history of monitoring the environmental conditions at the Nevada Test Site. The Rogers Building houses the Smithsonian-affiliated Atomic Testing Museum that will open at the beginning of 2005 and will lead in the preservation of the Cold War period and world history, and serve as a beacon of accessibility and safekeeping for the nation. The Rogers Building also houses curation facility, document archives, public reading room, as well as laboratories used by scientists from DRI and other organizations. This was accomplished with the dedication and efforts of numerous organizations, staff, elected officials, donors, volunteers, and friends throughout the state, including the Board of Regents.
- • DRI researchers find ways to improve the state's air quality and have developed an advanced system to remotely measure vehicle emissions. This project was supported by the Federal Transit Administration of Clark

County and other agencies. The system has a significant advantage over competing technologies, as it can measure pollutants across an entire fleet, including vehicle type, model, year, and the location where the vehicle was registered. In order to address problems associated with vehicle pollution, it is important to have this capability of profiling the distribution of these gaseous emissions over significant portions of the real world fleet, since studies show that comparatively few vehicles cause the majority of emissions.

➤ • DRI is also working to establish major research efforts in improved meteorological measurements and models and to use this information to better understand factors affecting ozone and visibility degradation in southern Nevada. This work can also be used with the National Weather Service's studies of weather conditions that lead to flash flooding in the area and improved conditions for flash flood warnings.

➤ • DRI has a \$1 million appropriation in FY 2004 with the support of Senator Harry Reid and will continue working with the Army Corps of Engineers to address urban flooding in southern Nevada. With this funding, existing tools and technologies have the potential to control urban flooding and restore the flood channels that experienced damaging effects.

➤ • DRI's cloud seeding operation began just two years after DRI was established in 1959. These studies have shown the cost effective means of augmenting the snow pack and resultant runoff from that snow. The water primarily benefits agricultural areas, but ranching, municipal water supplies, and recreational lakes as well as environmentally threatened lakes (*i.e., Pyramid Lake, Walker Lake*) also benefit. The current drought conditions in Nevada and the western United States

3. Presidents' Reports – (Cont'd.)

President Wells, DRI – (Cont'd.)

emphasize the need for this type of a program. DRI believes they augmented between 49,000-86,000 acre feet over the past ten years at a minimal cost.

➤ • DRI also takes on opportunities for fostering community service. Through a joint effort with the U.S. Department of Energy's National Security Administration Office in Nevada and DRI, residents living in the rural community areas are playing a very important role in assisting DRI scientists to collect important environmental data. DRI manages the Community and Environmental Monitoring Program (*CMP*), which has a network of 26 radiation and meteorological monitoring stations setup in host communities throughout Nevada and Utah. These stations are capable of measuring radioactivity and meteorological conditions in real time to provide assurances that risks associated with the Nevada Test Site activities are not transported outside their boundaries. These stations are linked to the Internet and are maintained by DRI's Western Regional Climate Center where citizens can view the collected environmental data. *CMP* has received both national and international attention for innovative ways of involving stakeholders and environmental monitoring.

President Romesburg, NSC – In addressing the targets associated with Goal #6, NSC's curriculum requires every student to serve a community-based learning capstone course in their senior year. The students work with different agencies and school districts in the community.

➤ • Teacher education and education students are working with elementary schools in the valley serving as student tutors for those students having difficulty in reading, mathematics, and English.

➤ • Nursing students work with hospitals in the valley. They also provide nursing services for Basic High School in Henderson, funded through a partnership with the Clark County School District. This partnership provides NSC students experience while providing high school students nursing services they would not ordinarily have.

President Harter, UNLV – Each institution feels strongly that their services attempt to enhance the quality of life for Nevada's citizens and communities:

➤ • Each year, UNLV's College of Fine Arts presents offerings in music, dance, theatre, architecture, film, and art to over 400,000 people. The College averages four different cultural offerings per week ranging from world-class speakers on architecture to artists such as Itzhak Perlman, Sir James Galway, and the Boys Choir of Harlem.

➤ • Students and faculty in the School of Architecture are working with community entities to impact the students' learning experience while contributing to civic projects such as the Las Vegas Springs Reserve environmental project.

➤ • The Donna Beam Fine Arts Gallery offers an exhibit every month. Faculty and students work as docents

and interns at the various art galleries and museums in Las Vegas.

➤ • The Performing Arts Center serves as host to presentations by the CCSD Division of Fine Arts introducing thousand of children to the arts and music.

3. Presidents' Reports – (Cont'd.)

President Harter, UNLV – (Cont'd.)

- • The Department of Theatre has established the new Nevada Conservatory Theatre, which brings professional performers in contact with students and provides area residents with professional theatre offerings.
- • The Senior Adult Theatre program is unique nationally and offers theatrical training to senior citizens who train side by side with traditional students.
- • The university is home to the International Institute of Modern Letters. Nigerian Noble Laureate Wole Soyinka holds the institute's endowed Chair for Creative Writing, conducts public lectures and works with students. He is also past president of the City of Asylum, a growing literary phenomenon across the world in which writers who have been expelled from their countries for their political beliefs are housed and given stipends.
- • There are a variety of opportunities at UNLV for service learning and internships. The Division of Student Life, through the Rebel Service Council and Career Services, provides service-learning experiences for students.
- • The Boyd School of Law requires law students to work in legal clinics and to pursue externships.
- • The School of Dental Medicine operates three full-service clinics in southern Nevada providing Medicaid services in Clark County.
- • The Greenspun College of Urban Affairs offers a counseling center providing quality, low-cost counseling to the community.
- • An increasing number of academic departments require that their students acquire field experience hours, pursue internships, and perform service learning (*i.e., the Hotel College, the college of Education and College of Fine Arts*).
- • All students must take a course where the primary purpose is to “*examine the diversity and differences within and between ethnic and racial, sexual, religious, gender, or disabilities cultures within the United States*”.
- • Student Life offers a variety of programs to students with a diversity theme.
- • UNLV now enrolls 17 resident students per 1,000 Clark County residents 18 and older. Clark County's population explosion has translated into dramatic increases in enrollment at UNLV, however, UNLV has grown faster than the Clark County population (*5.7% vs. 4.7% in 2003*). Between Fall 2002 and Fall 2003, the number of new Clark County high school graduates increased by 37%, due in part to the Millennium Scholarship.

President Lucey, WNCC – Last week, WNCC graduated 371 students who received a total of 421 degrees and certificates spanning the gamut of preparation for baccalaureate programs to certificates which assist people currently in the workplace who wish to improve their skills. WNCC's primary focus is the aspirations and dreams of the individual students and the fulfillment of those dreams. All of WNCC's campuses are focused on developing relationships within the community bringing college to the minds of everyone in the service area. In addition to providing traditional college programs and training upgrades for business and industries, community colleges are also an important part of their communities' cultural life. At WNCC, that means providing a broad array of community services across its 18,000 mile service area.

3. Presidents' Reports – (Cont'd.)

President Lucey, WNCC – (Cont'd.)

- • This year, WNCC expanded its theater program beyond the bounds of Carson City to reach outlying rural communities. WNCC now offers a regular musical theater program at the Oats Park Theater in Fallon.
- • The College's “Wildcats” intercollegiate rodeo team has been embraced by the rural communities. This year, the team hosted its first rodeo in Fallon and was well attended by the community. The annual fund raiser netted \$25,000 this year, due in large to the overwhelming positive response of the ranching communities in the service area.
- • WNCC continues to offer an ongoing series of successful gallery shows in the fine arts at both the Fallon and Carson City campuses.
- • Engineering, allied health, and construction students all have opportunities to participate in internship

programs, apprenticeships, and clinical experiences as part of their educational programs.

4. Public Comment – Regent Kirkpatrick noted that the University of Nevada, Reno had a very successful basketball season. He said that UNR also has a great football coach, and felt they would also have a successful football season. He observed that UNLV's Lady Rebels advanced to the NIT finals and the Rebel baseball team was in the regional finals. He felt the Rebels would also have a great basketball team with the new coach and that the football team was much improved. He asked that the Board consider a resolution at the next meeting encouraging the movement of the University of Nevada, Reno from their present conference to the Mountain West Conference. He asked that Presidents Lilley and Harter begin work toward that objective in the interim.

Regent Dondero said that she noticed one of Dr. Harter's adjunct professors mentioned in an international magazine. Five pages were dedicated to the professor's work in ceramics.

Regent Sisolak said that he really appreciated President Romesburg's dedication to Nevada State College and its students, adding that he had done a fine job. He felt the Board and the state owed him a debt of gratitude for getting the college this far. He said that President Romesburg's move to Florida was a loss for Nevada. He wished President Romesburg and his family well, adding that he would be sorely missed.

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of item #13 (*Capital Improvement Fee Funds, NSC*), which was approved separately:

(1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the regular meeting held March 18-19, 2004.

(2) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the CCSN Presidential Search Committee meetings held March 16, and 31, 2004.

(3) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's recommendation for tenure with hire for Dr. Connie C. Mobley retroactive to April 1, 2004. Dr. Mobley accepted UNLV's offer to assume the position of professor of Professional Studies in the UNLV School of Dental Medicine with tenure effective April

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (*Cont'd.*)

(3) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – (*Cont'd.*)

1, 2004. Of course, her offer letter stipulated that her hire with tenure was pending formal approval by the Board of Regents. The tenured faculty in the School of Dental Medicine unanimously endorsed Professor Mobley's tenure (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office).

(4) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's recommendation for tenure with hire for Dr. Michael LaTour effective July 1, 2004. Dr. LaTour accepted UNLV's offer to assume the position of professor and chair of the Department of Marketing with tenure. Of course, his offer letter stipulated that his hire with tenure was pending formal approval by the Board of Regents. Dr. LaTour will assume his position on July 1, 2004. The Department of Marketing faculty unanimously endorsed Professor LaTour's tenure (Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office).

(5) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's recommendation for tenure with hire for Dr. Carolyn Yucha effective July 1, 2004. Dr. Yucha accepted UNLV's offer to assume the position of full professor and Dean of the School of Nursing with tenure. Of course, her offer letter stipulated that her hire with tenure was pending formal approval by the Board of Regents. Dr. Yucha assumes her position on July 1, 2004. The School of Nursing faculty unanimously endorsed Dr. Yucha's tenure upon hire (Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office).

(6) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request for tenure upon hire for Cole C. Campbell as Dean of the Reynolds School of Journalism, University of Nevada, Reno. Mr. Campbell, former Editor-in-Chief of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and Editor of *The Virginian-Pilot*, has extensive experience in the field and an extensive and highly-respected professional service and publication record as shown on the curriculum vitae. The hiring of Mr. Campbell as dean was unanimously supported by the

college faculty. In addition, the appointment with tenure is supported by the tenured faculty in the college and by the Provost of the university (Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office).

(7) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for tenure upon hire for Dr. John McDonald as Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean of the University of Nevada School of Medicine. Dr. McDonald has exceptional academic and clinical credentials as evidenced by his curriculum vitae. He has over twenty-five years of experience and has been tenured at three other top-ranked medical schools. He is also board certified in both internal medicine and the subspecialty of pulmonary disease. Dr. McDonald also has an impressive history of grant-funding and has published extensively in the best referred journals in his field. This appointment is supported by the faculty, the chair of the department, Interim Dean of the School of Medicine, and the Provost as indicated in the reference memorandum (Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office).

(8) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for tenure upon hire for Dr. Patsy Ruchala to the Orvis School of Nursing, College of Human and Community Sciences, University of Nevada, Reno. Dr. Ruchala has over twenty years in nursing education and has been tenured at another university.

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (Cont’d.)

(8) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR – (Cont’d.)

Her experience includes nursing administration in both private and public education and in two schools of nursing located in universities ranked by the Carnegie Foundation as Doctoral/Research-Extensive. She has an extensive publication and research record as shown on her curriculum vitae. This appointment is supported by the faculty, chair of the department, Dean of the College of Human and Community Sciences, and the Provost as indicated in the reference memoranda (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office).

(9) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for tenure upon hire for Dr. Tamara Valentine to the Department of English in the College of Liberal Arts and as Director of the Honors Program, University of Nevada, Reno. Prior to joining the university, Dr. Valentine held the position of professor in the Department of Fine Arts, Language, and Literature, and her scholarly field is linguistics. She has an extensive publication record as indicated on her curriculum vitae. This appointment is supported by the faculty, chair of the department, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and the Provost as indicated in the reference memoranda (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office).

(10) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CCSN – The Board approved Interim President Paul C. Gianini’s request to expend Capital Improvement Fee funds for the purpose of remodeling Cheyenne Campus Classroom 1264 into a Nursing Lab to accommodate a part-time component to the CCSN Nursing Program (Ref. C-10 on file in the Board office).

(11) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, CCSN – The Board approved Interim President Paul C. Gianini’s request to expend Capital Improvement Fee funds for the purpose of remodeling the Sahara West site to accommodate Extended Programs, the Institute for Business & Industry, and Adult Basic Education/ESL programs (Ref. C-11 on file in the Board office).

(12) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, GBC – The Board approved President Paul Killpatrick’s request to expend \$60,000 in Capital Improvement Fee funds to relocate two modular facilities. One will be located at GBC’s Battle Mountain Center and the second will be located at GBC’s branch campus in Winnemucca. Once the modulars are placed, the regular maintenance and operational costs will be borne by Great Basin College for less than \$25,000/year (Ref. C-12 on file in the Board office).

(14) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey’s request to use up to \$50,000 from Student Capital Improvement Fee funds for energy projects at all WNCC campuses (Ref. C-14 on file in the Board office).



(15) Approved-Handbook Revision, Extension of Temporary Policy, Military Leave for Professional Staff – The Board approved staff’s recommendation to extend the temporary policy allowing members of the professional staff to be compensated for the difference in their UCCSN pay and their military pay through the end of the 2004-2005 employment contract (*Ref. C-15 on file in the Board office*).

(16) Approved-Handbook Revision, ASUN Constitution, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for approval of the constitution of the Associated

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (*Cont’d.*)

(16) Approved-Handbook Revision, ASUN Constitution, UNR – (*Cont’d.*)

Students of the University of Nevada, Reno. There will be neither a fiscal cost nor a reduction in revenue with the approval of the ASUN constitution (*Ref. C-16 on file in the Board office*).

(17) Approved-Handbook Revision, Deletion of Title IV, Chapter 13, Parking & Traffic Regulations – The Board approved deleting in its entirety Title IV, Chapter 13, of the *Board of Regents Handbook*. This chapter lists the parking and traffic regulations for UNR, UNLV, CCSN, TMCC, and WNCC. The chapter would be replaced by a new policy statement (*Title IV, Chapter 1, Section 11*), which would establish that the presidents shall have the authority to approve parking and traffic regulations governing the movement, operation, and parking of motor vehicles on institutional property (*Ref. C-17 on file in the Board office*).

(18) Approved-Intensive English Language Center, Foreign Language Program in China, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for a contract between the University of Nevada, Reno, Intensive English Language Center (*IELC*) and Global Training, Inc. (*Global*) to establish an English as a foreign language center under the direction of Global. IELC and Global wish to collaborate on this project, which will combine the language teaching expertise of the IELC with Global’s ability to establish and maintain a viable language school in China. The IELC hopes to recruit students from Global to study at IELC at the university. From the IELC, students may apply to UNR, UNLV, or TMCC (*Ref. C-18 on file in the Board office*).

(19) Approved-Intensive English Language Center, Foreign Language Program in Taiwan, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for a contract between the University of Nevada, Reno, Intensive English Language Center (*IELC*) and the El Paso English Language Institute of Taiwan (*Institute*) to establish an English as a foreign language center under the direction of the Institute. IELC and the Institute wish to collaborate on this project, which will combine the language teaching expertise of the IELC with the Institute’s ability to establish and maintain a viable language school in Taiwan. The IELC hopes to recruit students from the Institute to study at IELC at the university. From the IELC, students may apply to UNR, UNLV, or TMCC (*Ref. C-19 on file in the Board office*).

(20) Approved-Intensive English Language Center, Educational Representative in Vietnam, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for a contract between the University of Nevada, Reno, Intensive English Language Center (*IELC*) and ADC International Co., Ltd. (*ADC*) in Hanoi, Vietnam. As a representative, ADC may participate in educational fairs and contacting university counselors, students and student agencies for the purpose of providing accurate information and recruiting prospective students for IELC. From IELC, students may apply to the university and other Nevada schools (*Ref. C-20 on file in the Board office*).

(21) Approved-Intensive English Language Center, Educational Representative in South Korea, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s requests for a contract between the University of Nevada, Reno, Intensive English Language Center (*IELC*) and Study World Overseas Education Centre in South Korea. As a representative, Study

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (*Cont’d.*)

(21) Approved-Intensive English Language Center, Educational Representative in South Korea, UNR – (*Cont’d.*)

World Overseas Education Centre may participate in educational fairs and contacting university counselors, students and student agencies for the purpose of providing accurate information and recruiting prospective students for IELC. From IELC, students may apply to the university and other Nevada schools (*Ref. C-21 on file in the Board office*).

(22) Approved-Agreement with USAMV, Cluj, Romania, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for an agreement with USAMV, Cluj, Romania. The Board has an existing approved agreement with the University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine (*USAMV*) in Cluj, Romania, dated October 23, 2000. To further strengthen this agreement and to increase further research collaboration and graduate student training, the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (*CABNR*) at the University of Nevada, Reno proposes to admit up to two qualified Romanian graduate students per year with tuition paid by the College from research funds. All other expenses will be paid by the students or USAMV (Ref. C-22 on file in the Board office).

(23) Approved-University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC) Student Exchange Agreements, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for student exchange agreements with Yonsei University, The Hague University, and the University Iberoamericana that would allow students from these institutions to attend USAC programs and would allow USAC students to attend courses as visiting foreign students at these universities (Ref. C-23 on file in the Board office).

(24) Approved-Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps (AFROTC) Detachment, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for the Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada to complete the application and agreement for the establishment of an Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (*AFROTC*) detachment at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (*UNLV*). This request is in response to Senator Harry Reid’s initiative for Southern Nevada, through UNLV, to become a major contributor to the educational development and training of commissioned officers for the United States Air Force (Ref. C-24 on file in the Board office).

(25) Approved-Nevada Power Grant of Easement, CCSN – The Board approved Interim President Paul C. Gianini’s request for a permanent Grant of Easement to Nevada Power Company to install such electric system to provide power to facilities at CCSN-Charleston Campus (Ref. C-25 on file in the Board office).

(26) Approved-Mesquite Project Plan, CCSN – The Board approved Interim President Paul C. Gianini’s request to expend funding allocated by the 2003 Legislature for the purpose of securing facilities in the City of Mesquite to further expand CCSN program offerings to the citizens of this service area (Ref. C-26 on file in the Board office).

(27) Approved-Communications Shelter on Elko Campus, GBC – The Board approved President Paul Killpatrick’s request to place a small communications shelter on GBC’s Elko campus for a communication site per the request of the State of Nevada. There will be no cost to Great Basin College of the UCCSN for this project. All costs will be paid by the State of Nevada (Ref. C-27 on file in the Board office).

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (Cont’d.)

(28) Approved-Nevada Power Grant of Easement, Lynn Bennett Early Childhood Early Childhood Development Center, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for a Grant of Easement at the UNLV main campus between the Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada (*Grantor*) and Nevada Power Company (*Grantee*) in order to construct, operate, add to, and maintain electrical systems needed for the construction of facilities for the Lynn Bennett Early Childhood Development Center (Ref. C-28 on file in the Board office).

(29) Approved-Naming New Residence Hall, Dayton Complex, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request to name the newly constructed 466-bed residence hall “*Dayton Complex*” (Ref. C-29 on file in the Board office).

(30) Approved-Name of Knowledge Center, UNR Reno Campus – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for naming the “*Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center*” on the UNR campus (Ref. C-30 on file in the Board office).

(31) Approved-Naming of Student Services Building, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for naming the student services building the “*Lincoln and Meta Fitzgerald Student Services*”

Building” (Ref. C-31 on file in the Board office) .

(32) Approved-Naming of Nell J. Redfield Building, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for naming the first new building constructed as part of the Redfield Campus the “*Nell J. Redfield Building*”, the first building to be built between 2000 and 2021 (*Ref. C-32 on file in the Board office*).

(33) Approved-Cell Phone Antenna Space Rental, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for a proposed contract with Cingular Wireless Company of Pleasanton, California for rental of space on an existing, metal antenna tower to mount a new cellular antenna and associated equipment. The contract will be for fifteen (15) years with an initial monthly rental of \$1,500, and an escalator clause increasing the rent by fifteen percent (15%) every five (5) years. The contract may be renewed, by mutual agreement, for up to three (3) additional five- (5) -year terms (*Ref. C-33 on file in the Board office*).

(34) Approved-Grant of Easement, Traffic Signal, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for a Grant of Easement for the North Virginia and 15th Street signal from the Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada (*Grantor*) to the City of Reno (*Grantee*) (*Ref. C-34 on file in the Board office*).

(35) Approved-Acquisition of Real Property, Located at 895 N. Center Street, Reno, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request for the purchase of real property located at 895 N. Center Street, Reno. Subject property(*APN 007-183-04*) comprised of one house located on one 6,300-square foot parcel currently zoned Commercial, Multi-Family (*Ref. C-35 on file in the Board office*).

(36) Approved-Construction of Facility for University of Nevada Cooperative Extension in Las Vegas, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley’s request to construct a building for University of Nevada Cooperative Extension in Clark County on land to be

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (*Cont’d.*)

(36) Approved- Construction of Facility for University of Nevada Cooperative Extension in Las Vegas, UNR – (*Cont’d.*)

acquired from the Bureau of Land Management (*BLM*). The land acquisition was approved at the March 2004 Board of Regents meeting (*Ref. C-36 on file in the Board office*).

(37) Approved-Request to Finalize Land Purchase, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey’s request for permission to contract with a Nevada real estate firm to assist in finalizing a purchase agreement for the property adjacent to the WNCC Fallon Campus. The fee for services will be paid through funds donated to the WNCC Foundation (*Ref. C-37 on file in the Board office*).

(38) Approved-Re-Name WNCC Fallon Campus Building, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey’s request to permit Stillwater Hall at the Fallon Campus to be re-named “*Virgil Getto Hall*” in honor of Mr. Getto’s contributions as a Nevada legislator, Foundation member, advisory committee member, and longtime friend to Western Nevada Community College (*Ref. C-38 on file in the Board office*).

(39) Approved-Math Admissions Requirement, NSC – The Board approved President Kerry D. Romesburg’s request to revise Nevada State College’s math admissions requirement to reflect the change of the Nevada standard diploma requirements (*Ref. C-39 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Sisolak requested that item #13 (*Capital Improvement Fee Funds, NSC*) be considered separately.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of item #13 (*Capital Improvement Fee Funds, NSC*). Regent Bandera seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Seastrand was absent.

(13) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, NSC – The Board approved President Kerry D. Romesburg’s request to use \$135,000 in Capital Improvement Fee funds for the lease purchase option of two modular buildings and constructing a foodservice area in NSC’s current building (*Ref. C-13 and handout “Consent Agenda Item*

13" on file in the Board office).

President Romesburg explained that the original estimate for this project was \$20,000 in site work and two modular units at \$55,000 each. When the bids were opened in May, the low bid for site work was \$69,582 and the modular cost was \$70,767 for the first unit and \$65,168 for the second. Nevada State College will not have sufficient funds in Capital Improvement Fees to purchase both units this fiscal year and to fund the remodel for the bookstore and food service area. This request covers two approvals; one for the use of funds in 2003-04 and one for use of funds in 2004-05. The intention is to submit the purchase order for the second unit on July 1 to assure delivery and setup for the Fall semester and to contract for remodel of space during the summer months. Both modular units are for the nursing program. There currently is no bookstore or food service space at the college.

(13) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Funds, NSC – (Cont'd.)

Regent Hill moved approval of the expenditure of Capital Improvement Fee Funds for NSC. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Chancellor Rogers explained that he was well aware of this situation, that he supported it, and that it was absolutely required.

Regent Bandera asked whether President Romesburg had contacted the Clark County School District about a reduced price for the modular units. President Romesburg replied that he had spoken to Superintendent Carlos Garcia who had indicated that the College could not piggy-back the request on their bidding approach. President Romesburg said they also tried with the City of Henderson who responded in similar manner. He said the bid had been let through UNLV and it was the low bid. With all of the construction in the valley, firms do not want to work on such a small project without a potential for incredible profit. Regent Bandera suggested contacting the Southern Nevada Central Labor Council for a community donation.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

6. Approved-Appointment, Assistant Chancellor, UCCSN – The Board approved Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers' recommendation for the one-year appointment of Dr. Trudy Larson as Assistant Chancellor. Pursuant to the *Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 2, Section 3)* this position will be a grade 3 with a salary range of \$107,220.00 to \$182,563.00. The recommended salary was \$165,000.00 with no prerequisites recommended (*Ref. B on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the one-year appointment of Dr. Trudy Larson as Assistant Chancellor. Regent Derby seconded.

Chancellor Rogers said that he understood the breadth of the job when he assumed the position. He said the System was years behind in raising money through capital campaigns and private/public partnerships. He said it was essential for him to be free to handle the outside aspects of the job and that he requires a partner. He felt that he and Dr. Larson are very compatible and that she could handle the day-to-day responsibilities while leaving him free to handle the outside duties of the chancellor. He requested the Board's support, adding that he thought she was a superstar and that they would accomplish great things together.

Regent Rosenberg questioned a number of things regarding the description of the position. He asked whether the position had been posted and whether attempts had been made to obtain other recruits. Chancellor Rogers replied that he had spoken with various people for advice regarding who they thought would be most qualified for the position. He did not believe the position had been posted. Regent Rosenberg asked whether the Board had ever approved this kind of position, noting that Ms. Nancy Flagg had been Deputy to the Chancellor. He said there are several dictionary definitions indicating that "deputy" and "assistant" are interchangeable. He felt there was a major perceptual and actual difference between the terms. He asked whether this formal position had been

6. Approved-Appointment, Assistant Chancellor, UCCSN – (Cont'd.)

approved by the Board. General Counsel Ray replied that, to his knowledge, this was not an existing position. It would be the creation of a new position implicitly approved if the Board approved the request. Regent Rosenberg asked whether other people had applied for this position. Chancellor Rogers replied that no one had asked him to take the job. He spoke with other people about the job and them taking the job. Regent Rosenberg asked how this particular candidate appeared. Chancellor Rogers replied that her name was recommended to him. He met with her in Reno. He said he was looking for someone who would be a support system for him in order for him to accomplish the expansion of the chancellor's job. Regent Rosenberg said that what the chancellor was looking for in a chancellor's assistant needed to be congruent with the Board's desires. Chancellor Rogers replied that he was unsure whether anyone could actually define what the future role of the chancellor and the deputy chancellor are going to be at the moment. He said the Board needs to trust him that he would develop this position as he sees fit, reporting to the Board and notifying them what he is doing. He said they would have to work this out together. He said the current job description may not be relevant in the next 5-7 months, but felt that reasonable people could meet and amend as necessary. Regent Rosenberg asked whether the appointment had been discussed with the presidents or other Regents. Chancellor Rogers replied that he had not discussed the appointment with the presidents, but had discussed it with some other regents. Regent Rosenberg asked how long Chancellor Rogers had known that he would be making this recommendation. Chancellor Rogers replied that he had held the position for 4 weeks. He replied that he had known for something less than 4 weeks. Regent Rosenberg said that he viewed this as two issues; 1) Wanting as a Board to support the chancellor's recommendations, particularly a new chancellor doing the best he can and 2) The recommendation for an assistant. He said that he had received a number of calls telling him that this is not a good idea. He has suggested to the callers that they call Chancellor Rogers and tell him that. He established that they are not willing to speak out at the Board meeting. He said he did not intend to impugn the integrity or the qualifications of Dr. Larson, noting that her qualifications were largely medical and not academic. He felt that it seemed the Board was approving an appointment for a defacto Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Chancellor Rogers disagreed. Regent Rosenberg noted that the job description stated that, "*the assistant will keep the chancellor informed of national trends in higher education and provide such information to the chancellor in a timely fashion*". It also says, "*the System studies and external reports by consultant will be organized and directed by the assistant with the assistance of the vice chancellor*". Regent Rosenberg assumed that meant the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Chancellor Rogers replied that this was a moving project and would be so. He intends to continue to be the chancellor and does not intend to abdicate any of the authority in that area. He said he was the final decision maker in so far as anything below the Board status. She would report to and be responsible to him. Her exact duties are not outlined at this time. He suggested that anyone who had contacted Regent Rosenberg did not know what she is going to do and how her qualifications will apply because she and he will continue to develop this chancellorship concept. Thus far, no one has been able to conclude his job description because they are feeling their way along. Regent Rosenberg was greatly disturbed that the assistant "*will review all agenda items submitted and determine if they are ready to go before the Board and coordinate Cabinet members' response*". He submitted that, in essence, indicated the position was Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Chancellor Rogers said he understood Regent Rosenberg's concern with that wording, adding that it

6. Approved-Appointment, Assistant Chancellor, UCCSN – (Cont'd.)

was probably not wisely chosen. He said that he is his own man. He is not abdicating nor turning over any of the responsibility of the office to anybody. He said that she would be his subordinate and that he would be making the final decision. He said that he did not treat people as if they were steps below him. He views most of the relationships that he has in a partnership manner. He wants her free to advise him so he will not be caught up in the minutia. The decision will be made by him. If he is to function in this job, the Board must give him some tolerance for the person with whom he chooses to work. Otherwise, the Board needs to hire a person who is accountable to them and not to the chancellor. He noted that he is accountable to the Board and that she would be accountable to him. He asked the Board to allow him to select the person with whom he feels comfortable working. He said he was confident in her abilities. Regent Rosenberg said that the quality of advice that Chancellor Rogers receives is in direct proportion to the experience and ability of the person advising him. Chancellor Rogers asked who better than him to make that decision about the quality of the advice when he would be making the initial decision. If he is wrong, the Board will hold him accountable. Regent Rosenberg said he would not argue if it were a question of a corporate decision, but this affects lives and students. Many

times education moves very slowly. Damage can be done and not undone that easily. He suggested that the best thing would be to talk to a large variety of people in order to determine the best choice for the position. He said he was not impugning Dr. Larson's ability or qualifications, but simply felt there may be others who could do a better job. Chancellor Rogers replied that was theoretically possible. After the investigation that he made, he felt very comfortable with her and asked for the Board's support. He said that if Regent Rosenberg was right, and he was wrong, that he would do something about it.

Regent Sisolak asked whether this was a temporary appointment while Mr. Rogers serves as Chancellor. Chancellor Rogers agreed. Regent Sisolak stated that the position would no longer exist after a permanent chancellor was selected.

Regent Alden observed that Nevada and its education system had grown radically and that the times and governance principles had changed. The Board now has a CEO in place. The Board appoints and removes that CEO. The CEO is in charge and should make those decisions about what he feels is best to run the higher education system. Regent Alden said that he briefly reviewed Dr. Larson's credentials. Because the chancellor cannot do everything, he requires the flexibility to do the job. Regent Alden indicated his support for the appointment.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that the comments and concerns expressed by Regent Rosenberg were real and needed to be said. He thanked Regent Rosenberg for expressing them. Regent Kirkpatrick said that he did not want anyone between the chancellor and the presidents or between the chancellor and the Regents. Under normal circumstances, he would be voting against this, but he wanted to support Chancellor Rogers and indicated that he would support the appointment. He asked Chancellor Rogers to continue to think about what Regent Rosenberg had said. Chancellor Rogers said that the presidents would continue to report directly to him. Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the job description indicated that the assistant chancellor would handle the Council of Presidents.

6. Approved-Appointment, Assistant Chancellor, UCCSN – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Rogers said that was not true and that he would continue to deal directly with the presidents and they would continue to deal directly with him.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of order, stating that he could not understand what was being said. Chair Anthony encouraged everyone to speak directly into the microphone.

Regent Kirkpatrick explained that he wanted to make sure there was no person between the chancellor and the presidents or between the chancellor and the Regents, to which Chancellor Rogers indicated there would not be. Regent Kirkpatrick said that the job description indicated that the new assistant chancellor would conduct the Council of Presidents meetings and presidents' agenda reviews.

Regent Bandera was irritated that discussions regarding process or job descriptions were not separated from the individual person. If there is a problem with process or details, the Board should consider that first before they begin discussing the person. She felt there was a problem with the process. If it is not an approved position, or if there is a need for the Board to have known about this in some formal sense for input, the Board should have done that. She said that she believes the chancellor hires his staff and the Board hires the chancellor, if a position description is in place. She said she would support the Chancellor but felt the process had been bungled. She hoped that none of this discussion would negatively impact Dr. Larson's name. She noted that it was a one-year appointment. She urged the Board to ensure that the people are separate from the process and to try to get the process right from now on. She encouraged the Board to move on.

Regent Hill said there had been a feeling when Dr. Nichols became chancellor that, since she was from the north, she would favor northern institutions. Now there is a feeling that, since Mr. Rogers is from the south, he will favor southern institutions. Regent Hill observed that Dr. Larson would make decisions like the chancellor will. He felt that Dr. Nichols had been a very fair individual and that Mr. Rogers would be fair as well. He also felt that Dr. Larson would be fair. He hoped that Dr. Larson would become "the cornerstone of the temple", adding that he was thrilled to have her service.

Regent Howard said that Chancellor Rogers had provided an example of how things work in the corporate world. She asked whether he had the final approval on hires (*of a lower level than he*) made by employees (*also of a lower level than he*). Chancellor Rogers replied that, technically speaking, he did. But he has never in nearly 40 years declined a recommendation from a senior administrator. He said the Board had to trust the people who are hiring the people that work for you. He said he only goes down one level to those people who report directly to him. They are accountable to him for everyone below them. He said he could not deny them the right to pick the people they felt would provide the support necessary for them to do their job. He said he did not second-guess his people. Regent Howard established that he does have the final approval. He agreed that he did. He said that he felt very comfortable after reviewing her abilities that he would be able to work with her. He felt he should be given that choice. Regent Howard agreed. She asked whether he chose this person or whether someone recommended her. Chancellor Rogers replied that she had been recommended to him. No one forced her upon him. If he had felt that she would embarrass him or the Board, he would not have recommended her. Regent Howard said she did not know whether this person was

6. Approved-Appointment, Assistant Chancellor, UCCSN – (*Cont'd.*)

qualified or not, adding that was his job. She said she trusts his leadership. She asked whether he would be available to Regents when they want to discuss matters directly with him rather than with his assistant. Chancellor Rogers asked whether in the four weeks she had ever found it difficult to locate him. Regent Howard replied she had not. He said he would be accessible.

Regent Rosenberg asked how many people had been chosen from the interviews of candidates for Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Regent Sisolak noted a point of order. Chair Anthony said this was not part of the current discussion. Regent Rosenberg asked Chancellor Rogers to personally assure him that he would interview each of the candidates before making a decision. Regent Sisolak noted a point of order. Chair Anthony said it was not part of discussion the discussion and encouraged Regent Rosenberg to discuss the matter with Chancellor Rogers privately. Regent Rosenberg said he would like it on the record.

Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg voted no. Regent Seastrand was absent.

TMCC Faculty Senate Chair, Ms. Bridgett Boulton, presented Dr. Larson with a certificate of appreciation from the previous year's outgoing faculty senate chairs, acknowledging Dr. Larson's leadership as the chair of faculty senate chairs in helping them to move forward and resolve a number of important issues.

7. Accepted-CCSN Presidential Search Committee Report - Chair Tom Kirkpatrick reported the ad hoc CCSN Presidential Search Committee met March 31, 2004, and approved the materials to be used in the search process, the hiring of ACCT as the search firm, and ACCT to complete the reference checks on the candidates. On May 6, 2004, Dr. Narcissa Polonio of ACCT presented semi-finalist candidates. The Committee then selected finalists for the position. On May 10, 2004, the finalists were interviewed by the Committee and made campus visits on May 11th. The schedule was prepared to allow Regents not on the Committee to meet the finalist candidates. On May 12, 2004, the Regents' Committee and the Advisory Committee met to review the three finalist candidates. Both committees unanimously recommended Dr. Richard Carpenter for the position of President of CCSN. Dr. Carpenter has accepted the position. Regent Kirkpatrick thanked Dr. Polonio, each of the 14 participants of the Advisory Committee, and Mr. Jim Johnson, Chair of the Advisory Committee for all of their hard work. He also thanked the Regents who served on the Committee.

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

Regent Alden said that he attended a few of the meetings, adding that Regent Kirkpatrick did an excellent job with the search and that the Board owed him a debt of gratitude.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

8. Approved-Appointment, President, CCSN – The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Richard G. Carpenter as President of the Community College of Southern Nevada,

8. Approved-Appointment, President, CCSN – (Cont'd.)

effective August 1, 2004. The proposed salary and terms of the contract were identified at the Board meeting (Ref. AA on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the appointment of Dr. Richard G. Carpenter as President of the Community College of Southern Nevada. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Chancellor Rogers said that he interviewed all of the candidates privately at length, adding that he was impressed by all of them. He felt that Dr. Carpenter is a potential superstar and he indicated his support for the recommendation.

Regent Kirkpatrick reviewed the terms of the contract:

- • A 4-year administrative (*12 month*) renewable contract with academic tenure at CCSN.
- • Starting annual base salary of \$190,000; contract to begin on August 1, 2004.
- • Benefits as provided for all professional UCCSN employees.
- • Two trips to southern Nevada for Dr. Carpenter and his spouse prior to his first day of employment. In conformity with State of Nevada guidelines, air fare, rental car, and associated expenses (*i.e., airport parking, taxi*) with receipts will be reimbursed.
- • Responsible moving expenses as approved by the chancellor that conform to the State of Nevada guidelines and limits. Approval for moving expenses must be obtained from the chancellor prior to incurring any expenses.
- • Should Dr. Carpenter leave employment within the first 12 months, the moving expenses must be repaid.
- • Annual housing allowance of \$12,000 to be provided and paid in two equal payments of \$6,000 in July and January. The housing allowance will be appropriately prorated to reflect the contract start date.
- • Annual automobile maintenance allowance of \$8,000/year, which shall be in lieu of reimbursement for use of a private vehicle on official business for a 50-mile radius of the college. Payments of \$4,000 in July and January will be made. The automobile allowance will be appropriately prorated to reflect the contract start date.
- • Use of a \$5,000 host account.

Regent Rosenberg said he could not support this appointment, noting that the System was in litigation which could conceivably determine previous action taken against the former president illegal. He asked what the Board would do if they had to replace those individuals into their former positions. He said he could not support the recommendation because of process.

Regent Sisolak asked whether, in the future, the Board could do something about longevity bonuses or compensation to help dissuade the loss of presidents. Chancellor Rogers said that Regent Sisolak knew his position regarding the adequacy of the presidential compensation packages for the past 4-5 years. He said they started working on that at UNLV and that it would continue across the System. He said the System was

8. Approved-Appointment, President, CCSN – (Cont'd.)

woefully behind in adequately paying the presidents. He said that it would be reviewed in the next several months.

Regent Howard felt that Regent Rosenberg's concern was addressed about the litigation. She said she wanted to know what would happen if the court ruled that the former president must return to his position. General Counsel Ray replied there are a number of issues and defenses. Because it was pending litigation, he did not want to discuss that in a public forum. Regent Howard asked whether the Board should be voting on the matter. Chancellor Rogers said that staff believed the Board should. General Counsel agreed. Regent Howard said she had some concerns if the Board was voting on something they could not discuss due to litigation. She said she would be voting no or would abstain from voting.

Regent Alden said he made a decision in January to bring in an interim president at CCSN. Today the Board will make a decision to bring in a permanent president. The institution, students, and faculty are the highest importance. Whether or not there is litigation, the Board must move forward, though he shares Regents

Rosenberg's and Howard's beliefs. He felt it was important to vote in the affirmative. He felt the action was correct, adding that the institution was more important and they needed to move forward.

Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg voted no. Regent Howard abstained. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of making the motion unanimous. Regent Bandera seconded.

General Counsel Ray said the motion must be made by unanimous consent.

Regents Sisolak and Rosenberg asked Regent Howard to please agree. She agreed to do so.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Dr. Carpenter said he was honored by the vote of confidence and the trust placed in him with this appointment. He felt the search process had been very thorough, professional, and very well done. He thanked the search committee for their unanimous recommendation. The unanimous support cemented his decision to leave his previous institution. He said that he looked forward to becoming part of the UCCSN family.

Regent Hill thanked Regent Kirkpatrick and those serving on the search committee for a superb job.

Chair Anthony thanked President Gianni for his honor and leadership during his interim appointment.

8. Approved-Appointment, President, CCSN – (Cont'd.)

Ms. Ann Johnson, Faculty Senate Chair-CCSN, welcomed Dr. Carpenter on behalf of the CCSN faculty and staff. She also thanked Dr. Gianni for his support during his time at the college.

9. Approved-Resolution 04-13, UNR Men's Basketball Team – The Board approved a resolution to honor the UNR Men's Basketball Team for their exemplary performance during the 2003-2004 season. The team tied the school record for victories with a 25-9 record for the year, won the Western Athletic Conference tournament, and advanced to the Sweet 16 round of the NCAA tournament in March for the first time in school history (Ref. D on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak moved approval of Resolution 04-13 in honor of the UNR men's basketball team. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

President Lilley accepted the resolution on behalf of the basketball team.

10. Approved-Resolution 04-14, UNLV Women's Basketball Team – The Board approved a resolution to honor the UNLV Women's Basketball Team for their exemplary performance during the 2003-2004 season. The team advanced to the championship game of the Women's National Invitation Tournament and finished the season with a 26-8 record, their best mark since the 1988-1989 season and a tie for the third-most victories in one season in school history (Ref. E on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak moved approval of Resolution 04-14 in honor of the UNLV women's basketball team. Regent Dondero seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

President Harter accepted the resolution on behalf of the basketball team.

11. Information Only-Handbook Revision, Board Bylaws, The Seal of the University - Staff recommended an amendment to the *Board of Regents Bylaws (Title I, Article II)* to standardize the use of the official seal of the University of Nevada on students' diplomas. Because Bylaws amendments require two hearings, this item is for information only. Final action will be recommended at the August 2004 meeting (Ref. F on file in the Board office).

Ms. Ernst explained that the seal had "University of Nevada-1874" on it. This change would allow the institutions to have their name on the seal for use on their diplomas.

Regent Alden said he was very familiar with the item and thanked the chancellor's office for bringing the item forward.

Regent Howard asked whether the Board had seen the seal and about the change. Regent Bandera said the seal was used on everything. Ms. Ernst explained that the change would allow each institution to replace those words with the name of their institution for use on their diplomas.

12. Information Only-Handbook Revision, UCCSN Code, Appointment of System Administrators - Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers recommended a proposed amendment to the UCCSN Code, (*Title II, Chapter 1, Section 1.6.1 (c)*) to eliminate the requirement that the appointment of all administrators reporting to the Chancellor must be approved by the Board of Regents. This proposed amendment would give the Chancellor the authority to make such appointments. This is the first reading of a proposed amendment to the Code and, therefore, is for information only (*Ref. G on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden indicated his support for the recommendation. He felt the Board should move in this direction and get out of micromanaging.

Chancellor Rogers said the change would give the chancellor the right to appoint his own administrators.

Regent Dondero asked whether these positions were included in the budget and that any additional positions would be reported on a budget item before the Board, so they would know what impact it has on the budget. Chancellor Rogers agreed.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether the chancellor would appoint the vice chancellors for academic affairs and finance. Chancellor Rogers replied that it did. Regent Rosenberg felt that the Board's responsibility and authority was being eroded. He did not feel that it was micromanagement and that it was important for the Board to have a say in what happens in the chancellor's office. He said he did not like this.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked how many of these appointments the Board considered per year. He estimated no more than 1 or 2. He said it was not a burden as a Board member. Ever since the Board stopped approving institution vice presidents, he no longer knows who they are. He said it did not bother him to take the time to review and approve such appointments once or twice per year. While he did not believe that he would ever act against the chancellor's recommendation, he likes to look at them.

Regent Howard said that she had the same concern. She viewed this as the Board having final approval on such hires. She said it would be the chancellor's appointment subject to the Board's approval. She was still unclear why the chancellor would not want this to be subject to Board approval. Chancellor Rogers said he had no problem with that.

Regent Bandera said it was not a matter of the time it takes, but more the culture that they hoped to develop. She agreed with Regent Alden about not micromanaging. The Board hires a chancellor based upon the philosophy, the expectations they hold, and the standard the Board wants them to meet. From there, it is the chancellor's right and privilege to put together a team that meets the same parameters established by the Board. She felt the Board should approve the job descriptions and not the people, since it would be the chancellor/superintendent/president that has to fire the individual. She felt the item made good sense and helps straighten out the order of things. If the Chancellor picks badly, it will go badly for him.

Regent Schofield felt that something like this was long overdue and that the chancellor should be able to pick his own people.

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, UCCSN Code, Credential Verification and Pre-Employment Screening – The Board approved staff's recommendation for a System-wide policy on credential verification and pre-

employment screening (*Title II, Chapter 5, New Section 5.10*) . An initial hearing on this time occurred at the March Board meeting (Ref. H on file in the Board office) .

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning credential verification and pre-employment screening. Regent Hill seconded.

Ms. Carla Henson, Director, Human Resources-UCCSN, reported that at the December 2003 Board meeting, staff was instructed to draft a credential verification policy. It was first presented at the March 2004 meeting. As this is a proposed amendment to the Code , it requires two hearings. After the March meeting, in consultation with the institution presidents and faculty senate chairs, a minor revision was made in the language. She asked whether there were any additional questions or concerns.

Regent Alden thought this was originally proposed by Regents Howard and Hill and he thanked them for bringing this to the Board's attention.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Chair Anthony noted that items #14 (*Handbook Revision, Parking Policy, CCSN*) and #15 (*Handbook Revision, Parking Policy, WNCC*) had been removed due to the approval of Consent Agenda item #17 (*Handbook Revision, Deletion of Title IV, Chapter 13, Parking & Traffic Regulations*) . He said the Board was no longer involved in parking issues.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of clarification, asking whether the Board was not involved except as it related to parking fees. General Counsel Ray replied that he would check the policy.

The meeting recessed at 2:46 p.m. and reconvened at 3:12 p.m. on Thursday, June 3, 2004 with all members present except Regent Seastrand.

It was established that the Board does not approve parking fees.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Rebel Yell Operating Policy Revisions, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for revisions to the *Board of Regents Handbook* (*Title V, Chapter 22*) to reflect changes in the *Rebel Yell* newspaper operating policies to clarify responsibilities of the *Rebel Yell* Advisory Board, the *Rebel Yell* Business Manager and the *Rebel Yell* Faculty Advisor (Ref. K on file in the Board office) .

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning revisions to UNLV's *Rebel Yell* operating policy. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick said there had been some concerns about the *Rebel Yell* and the faculty advisor. He asked President Harter to provide a brief overview so the Board would know exactly what is going on. President Harter replied that this policy makes an attempt to tighten up some of those issues. The changes to the policy make more clear the role and

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Rebel Yell Operating Policy Revisions, UNLV – (*Cont'd.*) authority of the business manager (*a UNLV employee reporting to the university controller*) , the editor, and the advisor (*a UNLV employee paid a stipend by the Rebel Yell*) as well as clarifying disciplinary options available to the editor, defines plagiarism, and specifies how plagiarism will be addressed. President Harter said that Vice President, Student Life-UNLV, Dr. Rebecca Mills, believes that further refinements are necessary to clarify accountability and final authority. A reorganization in the School of Communications will enhance the number of practitioners and the emphasis on journalism practice. Another revision may be brought forward in the future. Regent Kirkpatrick was concerned that these changes would enhance the operation of the *Rebel Yell* and would remove some of the minor problems that had occurred in the past. President Harter said that they hoped so as well. They have a fairly independent advisory board to the *Rebel Yell* . She said that she was also concerned about that, adding that, ultimately, the university has authority, responsibility, and liability. She and Vice President Mills are concerned about ensuring the university gives an absolute maximum amount of freedom in the content of the student newspaper, while administrative checks and balances are in place. They are working in that direction to clarify

those matters.

Vice President Mills felt the recommendations would allow UNLV to address some of the issues with which they had difficulty this year. With additional work with a new editor and the advisory board, they will come closer to some of things about which he is concerned.

Regent Schofield suggested that these people need to have their feet held to the fire in order to clean these issues up and move forward. He said he would always support measures that hold people's feet to the fire.

Regent Hill said that he was not current on the problems associated with the newspaper and asked President Harter to provide a brief overview for him later. He said that he used to receive the *Rebel Yell*, but no longer does, adding that he really enjoyed it. He asked that a copy of both university student newspapers be mailed to him in the future. President Harter said she would send it to all Board members.

Regent Howard asked whether the operating policies included embezzlement of the funds that were taken from the *Rebel Yell*. President Harter said that it had to do with clarifying the relationship of the business officer with the university's controller. Vice President Mills said that she was not aware of any embezzlement. President Harter said that it occurred years ago. Regent Howard asked whether anything happened lately. President Harter replied that nothing like that had occurred lately. Regent Howard asked whether there were policies to prevent that from happening. Vice President Mills replied there were, explaining that the business manager for the *Rebel Yell* is a professional staff, university employee who reports through the controller to the Vice President for Finance for exactly that reason.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that he used to receive the *Rebel Yell* regularly. Then he received a notice discussing their financial problems and requesting a \$5 donation. He hasn't received a copy since. Vice President Mills said that she would try to ensure that the Regents receive a free subscription to the *Rebel Yell*.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, *Rebel Yell* Operating Policy Revisions, UNLV – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked whether this item could have been included on the Consent Agenda. He said that he really enjoys the *Rebel Yell*, but was unsure whether the Board should be involved at this level. Chair Anthony agreed to look into the matter.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

15. Approved-Handbook Revision, Sliding Fee Schedule for Federally Supported Teacher Training, UNLV –
The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for the addition of the following language to the *Board of Regents Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 17, Section 13)* (Ref. L on file in the Board office).

“Federally funded teacher training programs will carry an exception to in-state and out-of-state fee and tuition rates for contiguous, WICHE and Good Neighbor States. UNLV may accept federally funded teacher training programs with mandated reduced per-credit fees; undergraduate, minimum \$15 per credit; graduate, minimum \$30 per credit; all course offerings will be approved and delivery overseen through the usual academic processes.”

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning a sliding fee schedule for federally supported teacher training at UNLV. Regent Bandera seconded.

Regent Alden asked whether it had been reviewed by the chancellor and general counsel and that it met all of the guidelines for a proper policy statement. President Harter replied that she believed that it does. It was brought forward because it was outside the normal tuition charges, which requires Board action.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked about the fiscal impact. President Harter estimated that UNLV will make approximately \$530,000 additional because they will be able to train more teachers who can afford to pay the price at this grant-funded tuition amount. UNLV should be able to considerably increase the number of teachers

processed through continuing education and professional development activities. Because it runs through the continuing education programs, they must be self-supporting. She felt it should be a positive thing by increasing the number of people going through the programs, as well as potentially bringing additional income to the university. Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether they could break even at \$15/credit. President Harter replied that they could because so much of the cost is federally provided.

Provost Alden reported that individuals were previously forced to go to Utah to accomplish the program. The federal grant pays for the instructor and the tuition, but only covers a certain amount of tuition. UNLV is requesting reduced tuition. The expenses are fairly low, while the number of people involved is considerable, and it leads into some of UNLV's master's degree programs.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

16. Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Fees, CCSN – The Board approved Interim President Paul C. Gianini's request to establish per credit fees for the recently approved four-year program in dental hygiene (*Title IV, Chapter 17, Sections 3 and 4*) (Ref. M on file in the Board office).

Ms. Patty Charlton, Vice President, Finance & Administration-CCSN, reported that CCSN was requesting approval of the upper-division per-credit fee to be consistent with both GBC's upper division program and NSC. At the March 2004 meeting, the Board approved CCSN's baccalaureate program in dental hygiene. They anticipate starting that program in the Fall semester, but need to ensure the appropriate fees are assessed to those students entering the upper division courses.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning per credit fees for the recently approved four-year program in Dental Hygiene at CCSN. Regent Hill seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether an adjustment would be made for the Millennium Scholarship. Currently, community college students can only receive a certain amount. Ms. Charlton replied that she believed that community college students receive \$2,500/year and \$40-\$41/credit reimbursement. She said that the Millennium Scholarship reimbursement was defined for the community colleges and did not believe there would be a varied reimbursement. Regent Sisolak said he had a problem with that because it was defined at a much lower number. Regent Sisolak wanted to ensure that the students would have their tuition covered. If the fees are increased and the scholarship is not adjusted accordingly, they will be out of pocket.

Chair Anthony stated that the Millennium Scholarship was \$2,500/year. Regent Sisolak asked whether they could get \$10,000 at the community college. Chair Anthony replied that they could, adding that it was \$10,000 total for any Nevada institution. Regent Sisolak thought there was a difference between the community colleges and the universities. Associate Vice Chancellor, Dr. Chris Chairsell, replied that community college students are paid \$40/credit. Usually the Millennium Scholarship will cover the first two years. Since this is an upper-division fee for students in their third or fourth year, those student will likely have used most of their scholarship by the time they take these courses. Dr. Chairsell said it was \$60/credit at the universities. Regent Sisolak thought that it was \$80/credit. Regent Sisolak said that university students paying their tuition over four years at \$80/credit would receive \$1,200/semester (*15 credits @ \$80/credit*). They receive \$600 at the community colleges. He was concerned that by charging \$70/credit, the students would be unable to afford the classes. He thought the Board should approach the legislature to allow greater expenditure for four-year degree programs. Dr. Chairsell replied that it was \$40/credit for lower division and \$60/credit for upper division at the state college. Regent Sisolak noted that was not at the community college. Regent Rosenberg felt it would carry over and that students would be reimbursed according to course number and not where the course was taken. Regent Sisolak felt the statute differentiated between the community colleges, the state college, and the universities. With the advent of offering four-year degrees at the community colleges, he did not want those students to be prevented from using their scholarship by

16. Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Fees, CCSN – (*Cont'd.*)
some bureaucratic mix-up. He wanted to insure the students would be covered. Chancellor Rogers agreed to

review the matter.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked what GBC's Millennium Scholars received in the third and fourth year. Ms. Star Thompson, Controller-GBC, replied that GBC's students receive \$40/credit until they reach the \$10,000 maximum in the third and fourth years. Regent Kirkpatrick felt the law should be changed. Regent Rosenberg agreed.

Regent Alden noted that certain non-residents and good neighbor discounts paid less than Nevada residents. President Harter replied that the registration fee was added to the tuition for out-of-state students. Ms. Charlton said that was the premium added on top of the per credit fee (*\$70 + \$35 for distance education courses*). Regent Alden said it was not clear in the document.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the item could be brought back. He asked whether it needed to be approved that day. Ms. Charlton replied that it did. Chair Anthony said the item could be deferred until the next day to allow time for more information.

Regent Kirkpatrick said the problem was not what was wrong with Board policy, but rather that the legislature needs to change the reimbursement schedule. He said the Board needed to approve the item if they were going to start classes in the Fall.

Chair Anthony said there was a motion and second on the floor for this item.

Regent Alden said he would approve the motion, but felt the way it was written was confusing. He established that good neighbor tuition was \$70 + \$42 and that non-residents pay an additional \$35 (*for a distance education course*). He asked how much a good neighbor would pay for a distance education course. Vice Chancellor Curry replied that it was a matter of the method of presentation. These are premiums added to the basic charge, and are in alignment with the tuition schedule in the Handbook.

Chair Anthony offered the Board the option of voting now or withdrawing the motion and second and delaying the item until the next day. Regent Kirkpatrick said that nothing would change from one day to the next. The college needs to prepare to start the classes in the Fall. He said the Board could approve it so it was consistent with Nevada State College and Great Basin College. The Board will need to approach the legislature to ask them to change their reimbursement schedule for upper-division courses offered at the community colleges.

Regent Rosenberg suggested that they ask the legislature to reimburse at upper-division credit rates. He did not think they would object to that.

Regent Hill felt that with Vice Chancellor Curry's clarification, that Board members were aware of what they were voting upon and encouraged the Board to vote on the matter.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Chair Anthony said that the chancellor had some direction on this and that he would follow-up on it.

17. Approved-Resolution 04-15, Spanish Springs Center, TMCC – The Board approved President Philip M. Ringle's request for the following resolution (*Ref. P on file in the Board office*) :

Resolution 04-15

The Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada do hereby resolve that the TMCC Higher Education Spanish Springs Center proposed by Truckee Meadows Community College conforms to the college's strategic plan and facilities master plan. Be it resolved that the governing board does approve the submission of the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation Summary Proposal as prepared by Truckee Meadows Community College.

Regent Alden moved approval of Resolution 04-15 regarding the Spanish Springs Center for TMCC. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

President Ringle explained that the Reynolds Foundation requires a resolution from the governing board to support the grant submission.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – The Board reviewed and approved a revised set of operating budget priorities for the 2005-2007 UCCSN budget request. The final discussion will include a review of projected enrollments. Final action on the 2005-2007 operating budget will occur at the August 2004 meeting (*Bound Report on file in the Board office*).

Vice Chancellor Neel stated that this was the next step in the budget process. Based on this meeting's feedback, changes will be made and the budget will be presented again at the August meeting for final approval. Page 1 allowed the Board to view the base budget proposal from two perspectives; 1) The base budget with any needed adjustments and 2) To look at the issue of growth and change in the System. Much of that will be generated and developed through formula. The base budget begins with the 2005 base and is adjusted for merit increases, classified step increases, rent/lease, other contract agreements, and the DRI weather modification (*cloud seeding program*). Currently, must request slightly more than \$1 million from the Interim Finance Committee to support the cloud seeding program. System staff proposes building that amount into the base budget so as not to have to request the amount every year from the IFC.

Vice Chancellor Neel then reviewed the areas related to System growth. The formula allows for the projection of enrollment growth and changes in the System. System staff is still working on the enrollment numbers and changes to physical plant. As additional square footage is added to facilities, the state helps fund and maintain those facilities. He said the numbers would be provided in August. Computing services is also reviewed. With continued growth and development, a tremendous stress is put on existing technology in trying support what is needed in the System. Network needs are reviewed for the universities and in the rural areas. UCCSN must continue upgrading those

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – (*Cont'd.*) networks in order to continue to function. Administrative functions are also reviewed, particularly student support, finance system, and student services system. He said that continued upgrades are required in that area. Built into this request over the biennium is slightly over \$9 million to address that portion.

Vice Chancellor Neel then addressed the professional schools. He felt it important to note that the School of Medicine is very interested in increasing its capacity. The recommendation before the Board was that, over the biennium, an additional 10 students/year would be added, with the ultimate goal of eventually adding an additional 40 students. It would also require the addition of new professional faculty and classified staff. Both the law school and dental school have growth issues, which have been included in the budget.

Vice Chancellor Neel said that Business Center South had incurred tremendous growth and development and required help in that area. He cautioned the Board to keep in mind that this is a very important business function of their operation. The System needs to be sure that things are being done correctly and within law and state policy. As the System continues to grow and develop it continues to become more difficult without additional resources. A request for an additional \$3 million (*approximate*) has been included for Business Center South. He related that there was no formula to help DRI develop any administrative positions (*faculty positions are funded through research*). A request has been included for \$730,000 to help DRI with its tremendous growth. He said the law school required some assistance with its library. Additionally, a degree audit system needs to be developed to enable students to follow their program automatically without having to come to the campus.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of clarification, asking Vice Chancellor Neel to what page he was referring. Vice Chancellor Neel referred him to pages 5-9. He related that the degree audit system was desperately required,

noting that most institutions throughout the country had already implemented such a system.

Vice Chancellor Neel then discussed the budget enhancements, where Board input was required. The enhancements were developed by the Council of Presidents and former Chancellor Nichols and were listed in priority order.

➤ • Double Nursing Capacity (*2001 legislative mandate*) - Recommend looking at four elements to reach this goal. 1) Increase the nursing ratio at the community colleges to 8:1, allowing faculty increases to serve more students; 2) Continue funding summer courses for nursing, which helps generate nursing graduates; 3) Develop a bachelor's degree in nursing at GBC; 4) Offer a Ph.D. program at UNLV.

➤ • Research Support, Retain Indirect Cost Recovery – A request has been included for the upcoming biennium for UNR, UNLV, and CCSN to seek to retain the 25% allocation of indirect costs received through grant funds. The retained allocations will be used by the institutions to supplement competitive research activities.

➤ • Research Support, State-Match for Endowed Chairs – A request for endowed chairs has been included, which is patterned on the model established by the State of Georgia. As proposed, a total of \$7.5 million over the biennium is requested to

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – (*Cont'd.*)

match donations from the private sector on a dollar-for-dollar basis in order to create endowed faculty chairs at UNR, UNLV, and DRI. A maximum of \$1,000,000 in state funds can be used to match private funds for any single endowed chair.

➤ • Economic/Workforce Development and MAP – To address growth in the general population of Nevada, and the need to expand and diversify the economy, the UCCSN seeks \$4.0 million over the biennium to assist the new state college and the four existing community colleges with implementing new academic, technical, and occupational programs. The request also includes \$1.0 million in state funds to replenish the loss of federal grants that support the services provided through the Management Assistance Partnership (*MAP*) program.

➤ • Technical Support, Technology Infrastructure, Phase 1 (*Priority 2*) – For the 2005-07 biennium, the UCCSN seeks \$10.0 million to finance 100% of the second priority recommended by the Technology Task Force, which addresses the first phase of the information technology infrastructure and security deficiencies. The infrastructure and security deficiencies were segregated by the Task Force into a total of three phases.

➤ • Technology Support, Technology Mediated Instruction (*Priority 1*) – The Technology Task Force recommendation is segregated into two parts, and represents both the ongoing and one-time costs associated with the initiative. On-going costs total \$2.92 million over the biennium, and will be used to hire eleven System support positions for the UCCSN institutions, and three new programmers for System Computing Services. The on-going costs also support modifications to the annual maintenance fees, contractual agreements, and software support services.

➤ • Safety and Security – DRI seeks \$1.0 million to establish and maintain a System-wide program focusing on Nevada's security and science. The funding will be used to establish an active monitoring network for critical facilities within the state in order to minimize, contain, and remediate incidences. The UCCSN campuses request a total of \$4.5 million to address specific safety and security needs, to include the hiring of new campus police and security officers, upgrades of on-site communications systems and dispatch services, and the upgrading of institutional security systems for doors and windows in existing laboratories, instructional centers, faculty offices, and cashier stations.

➤ • Student Services, Retention – Ongoing support for aggressive counseling and advising programs have been shown to improve retention rates for higher education students. For the upcoming biennium, the UCCSN seeks funding to support the development of an aggressive system of academic advising modeled and recommended by Noel-Levitz consultants to increase the retention of students in Nevada's institutions of higher education.

➤ • Professional Schools and Health-Related Initiatives – The UCCSN seeks funding to address expansions for the existing professional schools and to support new statewide health-related initiatives:

✓ • School of Public Health, UNLV.

✓ • Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution, Boyd School of Law, UNLV.

✓ • School of Pharmacy – Recommendation for funding is pending the results of the consultant's study.

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – (Cont'd.)

Regent Bandera suggested that the School of Public Health for UNLV be marked as pending as it will be discussed at the June 21, 2004 ad hoc Health Education Task Force meeting. Vice Chancellor Neel replied that he looked forward to her feedback.

Vice Chancellor Neel continued his review of the request for professional schools and health-related initiatives:

- ✓ • School of Medicine Expansion – The School of Medicine seeks a total of \$9.0 million to establish new initiative and expand existing programs at the professional school (*Bound Report Ref. 22, page 13 on file in the Board office*).
- ✓ • Rural Emergency Medical Services – UCCSN seeks \$372,000 to support rural emergency medical services at GBC.
- ✓ • School of Dental Medicine, Equipment – A request for \$7.11 million has been included to provide a patient management system, audio/visual for instruction rooms, clinical operations and sterilization equipment, furniture, and dispensing equipment and supplies. A one-time expense.
- • Statewide Programs, Research and Public Service – The UCCSN requests funding for UNLV's research-based and public service programs, which are accounted for in the Statewide Programs budget.
- • Formula Ratio for Part-Time Faculty Salaries – Historically, legislative funding for part-time faculty has not kept pace with the actual expenditures made by the campuses each semester. The UCCSN Part-Time Faculty Task Force and the Board of Regents approved a unified part-time faculty salary schedule model that is indexed to the full-time faculty salary schedule at the universities.
- • "One Shot" Enhancements –
- ✓ • General Equipment (*Non Formula*) - \$10.0 million for equipment to be distributed amongst the campuses.
- ✓ • Technology Equipment (*Non Formula*) - \$2.0 million.
- ✓ • Technology Mediated Instruction (*Priority 1*) - \$2.88 million.

Vice Chancellor Neel said that System staff required the Board's direction as to whether to continue with these priorities, whether the priorities need to be changed, and pending matters.

Regent Alden said that it was quite obvious that the legislature feels that nursing is critical. He felt that doubling the nursing capacity should be the Board's first priority. He also suggested retaining 100% cost recovery. He agreed with Regent Bandera about waiting on developing a School of Public Health until the Health Education Task Force reviews the matter. He observed that the School of Dental Medicine equipment should be moved to one-shot enhancements. He said the Board would be getting a report from the ad hoc Health Education Task Force regarding the School of Pharmacy. Nevada is first in the nation for pharmacists. He said that \$750,000 in seed money was provided for that last time from the pharmacy industry, but we did not make a commitment. He said that everything else was mostly enrollment-driven. He said the structure was in place to create a School of Pharmacy. He felt that new programs should be developed to address demand areas of need (*i.e., nursing, teaching, pharmacy, increasing the number of students in the School of Medicine*).

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – (Cont'd.)

Regent Bandera asked whether the Board needed to ensure that the \$89 million in Estate Tax expenditures were covered by the general fund. She felt that should be kept at the top of the list. If that money is not received, none of the rest of this will make much sense. She asked which maintenance and growth projects had been requested in the previous session. Vice Chancellor Neel said he would check with his budget director, Mr. Larry Eardley. Regent Bandera felt that items that had been previously requested should be moved to the top of the list and made clear that Business Center South and others require a really high priority and be highlighted. Otherwise, other items are placed in a higher priority order and previous years' requests are not addressed. She spoke in favor of the 8:1 nursing ratio for community colleges and hoped that it would be a very high priority. She said that they might have difficulty in locating faculty that are qualified to teach even if the initiative is funded and the ratio is approved. She also hoped that they would fund the Ph.D. in the nursing program in order to provide qualified faculty to teach.

Regent Whipple asked why this item did not come to the Budget & Finance Committee first. Regent Alden replied that if it was his error he would accept it. Regent Whipple said he was concerned that this is likely the

most important issue that the Board will consider. He wanted to know why some of these decisions were made and to know a little history in order for him to make a better decision or to ask pertinent questions. Regent Alden said that a special meeting was held to discuss these issues. Vice Chancellor Neel stated that the Board had previously seen the general priorities. At this point, the numbers are being applied. He was said it would be acceptable with staff to present the item in committee first. He said this was the normal process that had been followed. Regent Alden explained that this had been previously discussed during a special Budget & Finance Committee meeting.

Regent Derby stated that this item comes to the full Board due to the impact of the decision. She felt they should continue to request indirect cost recovery and that it was important to stress that nearly every other state allows the institutions to retain these funds. She asked about the student services retention money, whether it was enough, and for what efforts it was intended. She noted that Nevada ranks very low in terms of retention and participation rates. Vice Chancellor Neel said that this would be a start in terms of hiring individuals to help counsel and guide students and provide them every opportunity for success. He doubted that it would be enough. Regent Derby asked whether the money was particularly targeted to personnel. Vice Chancellor Neel replied that it was targeted for personnel and programs. President Harter explained that this item was driven as the result of an extensive study by Noel Levitz regarding retention. UNLV discovered that the advising structure is one of the key and core issues to retention. Students need better, more intensive academic advising. Several areas of UNLV are very thin on advising, making it difficult or impossible for students to receive the guidance they require.

Regent Howard said that she shared the same concern. She noted the small amount of money devoted to retention, which contrasts with Board priorities. She thought that retention was one of the Board's more pressing priorities, yet a small amount of money is devoted to that area. She said she did not understand how the enhancement lists are

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – (Cont'd.)

determined. She said that she did not see anything in the budget relative to need-based scholarships. She was also concerned about the Millennium Scholarship issue and students possibly being short of funding while trying to obtain their four year degree. She wondered if some funding could be set aside for that. President Harter recalled that a percentage of tuition increases was dedicated to increase need-based aid. As enrollment and tuition increases, a percentage of that increasingly goes to need-based financial aid. It is automatically built into the tuition structure and the maintenance budget on the revenue side. She explained that the dental equipment expenditure was a one-time only expense. The retention dollars are in the base. The one-time only dental equipment is listed in the wrong place. It should be listed under "one shot" equipment. She said it was part of the startup package for the dental school. The line showing student services retention is base dollars.

Regent Hill requested an explanation for the enhancement for a Ph.D. in nursing, which he thought the formula funding would address. President Harter replied that, in order to start an accredited Ph.D. program, at least an additional two Ph.D. prepared nursing faculty, plus dollars for graduate assistantships are required upfront in addition to the formula funding. Two additional faculty are required to increase the total number of students in addition to the graduate assistantships, who will teach baccalaureate students which actually enhances the full nursing teaching capacity significantly. Regent Hill said he did not understand why the request was considered an enhancement. President Harter replied that UNLV has the core faculty in many other programs to create Ph.D. programs in those disciplines. Because nursing educators are often taken out of the academic environment by competitive practitioner salaries, it is difficult to maintain the level of Ph.D. prepared nursing faculty sufficient to support a Ph.D. program in nursing.

Provost Alden explained that most faculty in the nursing program (20-25) were master trained; only six or seven have Ph.D.'s. When offering Ph.D. programs, a certain number of Ph.D. trained faculty are required for accreditation. Regent Hill observed that other Ph.D. programs were created without an enhancement. Provost Alden explained that most disciplines already had the Ph.D. trained faculty in-house. He related that nursing faculty are difficult to recruit and retain, adding that nursing accreditation was more rigorous than most accreditation programs. Regent Hill said he could not recall any previous enhancements to create a Ph.D. program. President Harter replied that it was an unusual situation with UNLV not having the resident Ph.D. faculty to start the program, adding that very high salary premiums were required (*i.e.*, \$100,000) in order to attract

them. She said they were very difficult to recruit. Regent Hill said he did not have the expertise for this matter. He said that President Harter was claiming that UNLV would never have the money to hire the Ph.D. faculty under the formula in nursing to ever attract them. Provost Alden said it was more an issue of timing. If it could be spread out over a period of time, UNLV could allocate funds from the base budget. In order to double the nursing in a timely manner, UNLV estimates the need for a two-year start-up to get the program running in that period of time. Regent Hill suggested perhaps he needed to see more detail on it next time in order to understand it. He said he had the same question about the School of Public Health. He said he did not understand why the formula funding did not work. Vice Chancellor Neel said he would provide more information.

18. Accepted Report on Operating Budget Priorities, 2005-2007 – (Cont'd.)

Regent Kirkpatrick said he hoped the one-time expense for dental equipment would be moved to “one shot” expenditures. He wondered about the cost-per-student to train a dentist when considering the money devoted to the building and equipment. President Harter said it was less than the cost to train other professional students in the System. She said there was only 46% state funding in the School of Dentistry. She felt they should consider the entire range of professional programs and the dollars in those programs relative to tuition. The dental school has the highest tuition of any of the other professional schools. The entire renovation of the dental facility and its purchase was done by the university, and not by the state. When considering the state dollars in the dental program, it is very modest by comparison to other professional programs. She very much regretted a long-ago conversation that continued to arise. She said that UNLV never said they could do a dental program for free. UNLV proposed \$12 million in equipment in its original proposal. Thus far, UNLV has received \$3 million in dental equipment money. UNLV is simply trying to get what it originally proposed. UNLV said that they needed the startup dollars for dentistry, just as they were provided for the law and medical schools. She said that a major professional program could not be started without it. She said that approximately one-third of the dental program was paid for by tuition, one-third by clinic revenues, and one-third by state dollars. She said it was a fairly modest amount of state support, though the one-time expenses are high. Regent Kirkpatrick recalled that the Board was told that the money UNLV would make off of Medicaid would pay for the dental school. President Harter corrected that it would pay one-third. Regent Kirkpatrick asked Regent Sisolak for verification. President Harter said that she never claimed that it would be paid for entirely by the clinics.

Regent Howard returned to her previous question about need-based scholarships. She recalled that the Board had approved an increase for need-based scholarships. She asked about the percentage. President Harter did not recall. Regent Howard suggested it may have been 0.5%. Assistant, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Mr. Tyler Trevor, reported that it was 50% of all tuition increases. Just last March, 90% of that was devoted to need-based aid. Regent Howard wondered if the Board could consider increasing the percentage to address the growth and what was discussed previously with the Millennium Scholars. Mr. Trevor said it was a possibility, adding that the Millennium Scholarship covered \$40/credit for lower-division courses and \$60/credit for upper division at the community colleges, adding that it did not cover the full tuition. Regent Howard suggested the Board could review increasing that percentage.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved acceptance of the report. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

19. Carry Forward-Review of UCCSN Admission Application Forms – In response to a request from Regents Mark Alden, Linda Howard, Howard Rosenberg, and Steve Sisolak, a discussion was held regarding the UCCSN applications for admission used by each of the System’s constituent units with regard to (1) conformity with System and legislative policy, (2) the possible need for standardization of the applications for admission between constituent units, (3) issues arising over information required (*questions asked*) on the

19. Carry Forward-Review of UCCSN Admission Application Forms – (Cont'd.) applications, including but not limited to citizenship, residency, alien status, and visa number (*Ref. R on file in the Board office*). The item was carried forward to the next meeting.

Regent Alden moved approval of the item. Regent Sisolak seconded.

A discussion ensued regarding what specifically the Board was approving. Vice Chancellor Curry clarified that the Board had requested information in order to have a discussion, which could possibly lead to a recommendation for action. He explained that staff had reviewed one part of the question on current application admission forms. He also assembled information from System officers and provided a summary statement in the reference material.

Regent Sisolak stated that, in a March 19, 2004 letter to the Chair following the previous meeting when the Board lost its quorum and was unable to take further action, there was discussion about removing the social security number from the applications and making the college and university System's applications consistent throughout Nevada. The request included removing the social security number requirement, as well as the citizenship category.

Regent Alden withdrew his motion.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of standardizing the applications for admissions between all constituent units, eliminate the need for the social security number portion on the applications, and eliminate the citizenship category. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak clarified that the motion was to include residency, alien status, and visa number. Regent Rosenberg agreed.

Regent Kirkpatrick said there could be a great deal of difficulty in standardizing one form for all units. He did not object to removing the social security number, citizenship status, etc. He was concerned about the ability of one form to meet the needs of all institutions.

Regent Derby said that she wanted presidential feedback regarding the feasibility of a standardized form. She said that she was open to discussing the elimination of some categories.

Dr. Juanita Fain, Vice President, Administration-UNLV, said that she was not aware of the social security number issue. The Student Affairs Council reviewed the issues of citizenship and a combined application and agreed it would be difficult to accomplish. Different questions are asked, some institutions use electronic forms. If one uniform application were used it would need to be web-based allowing individualized questions for the respective campuses. While UNLV does not require citizenship information for determining admission, it is required for establishing residency. It is helpful to ask that

19. Carry Forward-Review of UCCSN Admission Application Forms – (Cont'd.)

question because it moves the process along in a more timely manner. Citizenship is not used to determine admission. Dr. Fain said they did not discuss the social security number requirement. President Harter noted that it is required to have a valid social security number in order to be eligible for federal financial aid and the Millennium Scholarship.

Ms. Lynn Mahlberg, Vice President, Student Services-GBC, reported that GBC's policy was basically the same System-wide. Students can opt not to provide their social security number and a student information system "N" number is assigned. Citizenship information is required in order to be eligible for federal financial aid and the Millennium Scholarship. It is not used at all in the admission process, but is used for various reporting purposes (*tax identification, IPEDS*). Chair Anthony asked whether they needed the social security number. Ms. Mahlberg replied they did not. Ms. Mahlberg noted that GBC does not have any international students, but the social security number is required for international students. Regent Rosenberg noted that international students complete a different form.

Dr. Shannon Ellis, Vice President, Student Services-UNR, reported that citizenship information is very important for students attending on visas (*over 800 at UNR*), who must indicate their visa status and a resident alien number as part of post-911 requirements. Student feedback indicates a feeling that there are too many forms (*residency, application for scholarship and need-based aid, admissions*). UNR combined the three forms into one admissions form, which is also used for scholarships and need-based aid and residency determination. One

question asked is whether the student is a graduate of a Nevada high school. That is all that is necessary for UNR. Nevada high school graduates will be considered for in-state residency. Citizenship is not a requirement. The information must be gathered on the students coming from foreign countries.

Regent Sisolak said that they had been asked to bring this issue forward and the people who were there to address it were present at the previous meeting. He asked whether the campuses could prepare a one-page summary identifying the problem for the next meeting.

Regent Sisolak withdrew his motion and asked that the item be carried forward to the next meeting.

Regent Dondero felt that the social security number and other identification was required for insurance and tax purposes.

Regent Howard said she did not know this was so complicated, adding there were several issues that need to be addressed. She liked the way that UNR had consolidated their form and asked whether a social security number was required. Vice President Ellis replied that they did request it as the one identifier to be used as a common thread back to the student (*prior enrollment at institutions, financial aid, federal income tax*). It is then converted to an "R" number that becomes the student's ID number for the remainder of their time at the institution. She said the information was carefully safeguarded and that only certain people had access. Regent Howard said that she hoped that all of the institutions were as careful. She asked what problems were foreseen with standardizing the form across the

19. Carry Forward-Review of UCCSN Admission Application Forms – (*Cont'd.*)

System. Vice President Ellis replied that she believed that students access in different ways (*i.e., on paper, web access*) and that each institution has its unique population that it is trying to attract and enroll. Information required by the UNR is not required by some community colleges.

Chair Anthony said the item would be carried forward to the next meeting. He asked the chancellor to determine: 1) Can the application form be standardized across all eight institutions? If not, explain why.; 2) Is a social security number required on the application? Consider issues of identify theft. What security is provided?; 3) Is the citizenship box necessary and why? He asked that the information be provided at the next meeting.

Dr. Fain said that provision of the social security number is optional. The campuses have already discussed one application form and the issue of citizenship. They did not address the social security number. Chair Anthony said they would fine tune it, get the chancellor up to speed on the matter, and address the social security number issue.

Regent Rosenberg noted that a letter dated June 1, 2004, from Peter Ashman, Chairman, American Immigration Lawyers Association-Nevada Chapter, very clearly delineated the problems with asking for citizenship and why it might be a good idea to eliminate the requirement. Chair Anthony said he would provide a copy to the chancellor. Regent Rosenberg asked whether a petition had also been received. Chair Anthony said he had not received it. Regent Rosenberg said there was a signed petition as well as a letter from Thomas Rodriguez (*May 28, 2004*). He felt it should be put together more carefully and that a full discussion was necessary.

Regent Hill observed there might still be a good reason to keep the social security number.

Regent Bandera wanted the Board to be very specific with their request since time had been spent to provide the reference material for this meeting.

20. Approved-2005-2007 Bill Draft Requests – The Board approved the UCCSN bill drafts for the 2005 session. Nevada Revised Statutes 218.2455 permits the Board of Regents to request up to five bill drafts on behalf of the UCCSN at each legislative session. An initial hearing on this item occurred at the March 2004 meeting (*Ref. S on file in the Board office*).

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the 2005-2007 Bill Draft Requests. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked about the practice for assisting the families of police/firemen killed in the line of duty. He said the Legislature funded it, but it is running out of money. Ms. Ernst recalled that former Regent Tom Wiesner helped raised the money that was donated to the Legislature. She did not believe that the Board actually funded it. He recalled that the Legislature funded it, but he believed that it was expiring or out of money. He wanted to have someone look into renewing it. It was for the children of either firefighters and/or

20. Approved-2005-2007 Bill Draft Requests – (Cont'd.)

police officers killed in the line of duty. He said the Board missed the deadline for extending it last time. Chair Anthony agreed to research the matter.

Dr. Bob Dickens, Director, Government Relations-UNR, reported that a very small appropriation was provided by the Legislature, which was intended to be endowed. Private money was also raised. Former President Crowley provided a commitment to cover the institution's commitment to cover the survivors of slain police officers and firefighters with grants and aid from the institution's 3% allotment. The intent was to endow the money, however it was insufficient to do so. Chair Anthony asked whether it applied to police and firefighters throughout the state. Dr. Dickens replied that it did. Chair Anthony asked whether legislative action was necessary from then Board. Dr. Dickens replied that he did not realize this was of concern to Regent Sisolak, adding that he needed to give it some thought. He said the Board would be requesting a special appropriation. He was not sure about the political feasibility. Regent Sisolak said there was a special appropriation that he believed was running out of money. Dr. Dickens said that it was a one-shot appropriation. Regent Sisolak said that, if that was the case, if general counsel could research it and put in a bill draft to replenish the funds. Dr. Dickens said that during the legislative process it was difficult to determine the number of eligible individuals historically in order to drive the appropriation. Chair Anthony observed that the Board already had five BDR's. Regent Sisolak said that he would get the bill sponsored by somebody else. He asked if the System could do the research on it.

Regent Alden observed there was no request for the roll-over issue. He asked why it was not included. Chancellor Neel did not know. He said these were the five that came forward from a discussion on some level. Regent Alden said that it was up to the Board and chancellor. He strongly recommended that the Board again ask the Legislature that they be allowed to roll over the funds that were not expended. He said that "use it or lose it" was not a smart way to operate. Chair Anthony said that the chancellor was on board in pursuing that.

Regent Derby thought they should also consider how many times the Board had requested that and it had been turned down, since they were limited to five requests.

Regent Bandera asked which proposed request should be eliminated in substitution of Regent Alden's request. Chair Anthony said that the motion and second were to approve the proposals in the reference material. He said the other two could be pursued by the chancellor through some other legislative process.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Regent Bandera said that the Board was now talking about going outside the process and getting someone else to introduce legislative bill drafts for the Board, yet the Board criticized the presidents for doing this. She said the Board had not yet taken a position as a Board that they think those are good ideas, which was the same thing the Board criticized institutions for going out and doing things the Board had not approved. Chair Anthony suggested putting the request on as agenda items for the next meeting. Regent Sisolak observed that, if an individual legislator wanted to sponsor a bill that he happened to agree with, he did not have a problem with that. Regent Bandera clarified that the

20. Approved-2005-2007 Bill Draft Requests – (Cont'd.)

Board had taken a clear stand. Since the Board had discussed two ideas that were probably wonderful and good, the Board needed to take a position on going ahead with them. Regent Sisolak asked who proposed the five requests, adding that the Board had not discussed which five to select. Regent Bandera replied that the Board discussed them in March.

Dr. John Frederick, Provost & Executive Vice President-UNR, suggested that the rollover issue was important for the System, but could be pursued through the AB 203 committee.

21. Information Only-Student Health Insurance Rates, UNLV - President Carol C. Harter informed the Board of Regents of the student health insurance rates to become effective 08/15/04. All optional rates were deleted from the Handbook, leaving only those offered to an individual student on an annual basis. Rates for spouse and family, as well as varied payment plans, are offered as a convenience to the students and are purely elective (*Ref. T on file in the Board office*).

President Harter reported that insurance was provided as a service to the students. Health insurance is only required for international students. A listing of the rates was provided for informational purposes.

The meeting recessed at 4:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:00 a.m. on Friday, June 4, 2004 with all members present except Regents Schofield and Seastrand.

Chair Anthony thanked Mr. Greg Gardella, Coordinator, Audio Visual Technology-UNR, for helping with the sound for the meeting.

Vice President Mahlberg clarified the rates for Millennium Scholars: \$40 for lower-division and \$60 for upper-division courses at the community colleges and \$80 at the universities. She provided copies of an explanation from the Treasurer's Office and a copy of the NRS.

22. Approved-Strategic Plan, GBC – The Board approved President Paul Killpatrick's request for approval of GBC's Strategic Plan (*Ref. N on file in the Board office*).

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

President Killpatrick thanked Dr. Cliff Ferry, consultant, who helped with the preparation and presentation of the strategic plan. He also thanked Mr. Danny Gonzales, Deputy to the President-GBC, and the faculty, staff, students, and community members who participated in creating the strategic plan. GBC has seen a steady increase in enrollments, largely due to baccalaureate degree programs introduced in 1999, and the residence hall which will open in September. Millennium Scholarships have also helped increase enrollments. GBC staff has a continued commitment to the community college mission. Three-year graduation rates for associate degrees is nearly 27%, higher than any other two-year degree colleges in the western United States. The college is making inroads to serving underserved constituents, primarily Hispanics, Native Americans, and first-generation college students. GBC reviewed the UCCSN's six goals and incorporated them into the academic master plan. President Killpatrick reported that

22. Approved-Strategic Plan, GBC – (*Cont'd.*)

strategic planning is a systematic process through which an organization agrees and builds commitment among key stakeholders to priorities which are essential to its mission and responsive to the environment. The major point of the mission statement is to have a superior, student-centered, post-secondary education, with several types of educational opportunities (*university transfer courses, occupational and technical courses, developmental courses, community education, select baccalaureate degree programs, student support services, and special business education partnerships*). The four major goals include:

- • Serving students: What we do.
- • Resources: What it takes to do what we want to do.
- • Culture: How we do what we do.
- • Economic and community development.

Serving Students : GBC has developed an effective means for evaluating student outcomes and has begun a process of identifying student learning outcomes across the board. The college is instrumental in offering baccalaureate degree programs that integrate a multimedia digital portfolio. GBC has a strong commitment to using distance education as a delivery system to address its 45,000-sq. mile service area. The baccalaureate degree programs have developed as the community develops. GBC provides student services and enrollment

management via an orientation course offered to all students, which creates students with a desire to receive academic advising and provides a bonding relationship between students and faculty so that goals are clearer and retention is addressed. GBC is working on a TRIO and a Title III grant for an Upward Bound-type program to expose first-time students to a college environment in the summer. As student enrollment grows, the college must do more than just offer courses. They must also offer a student life program. More students are attending full-time than ever before. Residence halls, a summer concert series, a visual and performing arts club are but a few of the offerings.

Resources : A top priority is the workload issue, which is being addressed by the college's ad hoc committee. GBC faculty teach a myriad of courses (*upper- and lower-division*) . Therefore, an equitable workload policy must be determined. Faculty evaluations were also revamped this year. The electrical instrumentation building will be a much-needed resource to address the college's growing enrollments. A student learning center is being created in McMullen 103, where the English and math labs will be combined. Physical education facilities will also be expanded. The college is also considering a fine arts and performing arts building on campus, as well as enhancing and expanding the diesel and welding facility. Conversations are ongoing regarding acquiring the fairgrounds property next to the campus. A new recruiter has been hired to fulfill a commitment to reach 2,222 FTE by 2012. A marketing plan has been developed and Dr. John Patrick Rice will serve as the Public Information Officer. GBC is very proud of the partnerships developed with UNR and CCSN in delivering a baccalaureate degree in social work and a B.A.S. degree in surveying. The partnership allows Reno, Carson City, and Las Vegas to benefit by GBC's rural delivery expertise. The college has also done a lot of work with its foundation. Physical education facilities will be expanded to support inter-mural and intercollegiate athletic programs. The college is also working with the foundation regarding endowed chair positions.

22. Approved-Strategic Plan, GBC – (Cont'd.)

Culture : There is a lot of support for current student organizations. President Killpatrick said he was interested in the college becoming a data-driven institution. Hard data is necessary to demonstrate demand for certain offerings. GBC has continued partnerships with local industry, other UCCSN institutions, K-12, and others.

Economic and community development : Economic development is even more important in the rural areas of northeastern Nevada. The college is working with a business incubator project and other activities that promote entrepreneurship. The college is involved with community events (*i.e., Great Basin Festival, Oktoberfest, Balloon Festival, Artists in Residence*) .

If the Board approves this plan, President Killpatrick will then discuss with his managers an action plan for the next year. Each year new goals will be determined. The work plan will feature detailed tasks, responsible parties, and completion dates for priorities selected from 2004-2009 strategic plan.

Regent Alden asked whether the Vice Chancellor Curry had reviewed the strategic plan. President Killpatrick replied that it had been submitted.

Regent Alden moved approval of GBC's strategic plan as long as it met the goals and objectives of the System and the System office had reviewed it. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Derby commended President Killpatrick and the college for the work they had done. She said it was rewarding to see the major step forward it represented in just a few years.

Regent Howard said that she too was impressed with the sophistication that President Killpatrick brought to the college and with his administration. She said she was really impressed and that he was doing a great job. She appreciated that he was working in conjunction with the Regents' goals.

Regent Schofield said it was a beautiful piece of work.

Regent Bandera congratulated President Killpatrick and his staff. In two short years they reviewed the institutional memory and determined what the community wants. She said it was clear to her that members of

the community helped write the strategic plan with the college.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation - The Board was updated on No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and their potential impacts on school districts and higher education. Information will also be provided on what UCCSN institutions are doing to respond to NCLB mandates and to provide quality teacher education (Ref. O on file in the Board office).

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation – (Cont'd.)

Dr. Curry stated that several areas of particular interest were mentioned to help guide the development of the report: the issues of enhancing communications and partnerships with schools, assisting schools with some of their responsibilities (*making adequate yearly progress*), addressing the highly qualified teacher requirement, discussing the status of 2+2 programs among 2- and 4-year institutions, addressing the challenges of teaching diverse and English language learners, and to assist with the teacher aid certification requirements. He thanked the leaders of the institutions' teacher education programs for their contributions in developing the report. He introduced the following representatives: Ms. Francine Mayfield, NSCH; Ms. Bonnie Hofland, GBC; Ms. Martha Young, UNLV; Mr. Vern Luft, UNR; and Dr. William Sparkman, UNR. Dr. Curry reported that he was struck with the energy that UCCSN institutions have invested in the reorganization of their programs to help prepare teachers who are ready to assist public schools in meeting current mandates. Many changes in curriculum have taken place. These changes are aligned with the best research available and with recognized disciplinary standards and practices. UCCSN institutions are making a special effort to prepare students to collect and use data from learning assessments and other sources to reorganize learning experiences when necessary so that all children may best learn according to their needs and background.

Dr. Chris Chairsell, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs-UCCSN, reported on the No Child Left Behind Act 2001 and the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. There are three mandates to the NCLB Act:

Mandate #1 - Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT).

Specifications for Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT):

- • Fully licensed by the state.
- • No waivers on an emergency or temporary basis.
- • Demonstrate competency equivalent to a major, graduate degree, or advanced certification.
- • New teachers must pass a state test on subject matter and teaching skill.

Recent Changes to NCLB:

- • There is more flexibility for:
- ✓ • Rural teachers have an additional year to earn their certification. Changed from 2006 to 2007.
- ✓ • Science teachers may teach individual topics in science (*i.e., chemistry, biology, physics*).
- ✓ • Teachers who teach multiple subjects.

Mandate #2 - Adequate Year Progress (AYP).

Specification for Adequate Year Progress (AYP):

- • All students must improve their performance each year and achieve at a state-defined "proficient" level by 2013-14.
- • All grade 3-8 students test annually in math and reading/language arts.
- • Students test several times in science.
- • In each school and school district:

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation – (Cont'd.)

- ✓ • Student performance on tests must be disaggregated by a number of demographic factors (*i.e., gender, English language learner; race; special needs*).

- ✓ ▪ Test scores for all categories of students in each school must improve each year.

Mandate #3 - Schools in Need of Improvement (SNI) .

Specifications for Schools in Need of Improvement (SNI) :

- ▪ 36 different *cells* have been identified for disaggregating.
- ▪ Schools must make AYP in all 36 cells each year. Failure to make AYP in any one category will place school on SNI list.
- ▪ 95% of the students in a school must be tested.

Direct Consequences of NCLB for Higher Education in Nevada:

- ▪ Highly qualified teacher definition heavily rests upon the need for deep content knowledge.
- ✓ ▪ Rather than knowing how to teach.
- ✓ ▪ Rather than knowing how to teach to different kinds of students, like English Language Learners (ELL) .
- ▪ The act does not accommodate the diversity that ELL presents.
- ✓ ▪ In multi-cultural education, the UCCSN institutions agree that it must be community-based as families approach education very differently.
- ✓ ▪ Education must be as diverse as the populations we teach.
- ▪ The standardized testing associated with NCLB is not flexible.
- ▪ A recent NCLB change allows English Language Learners to take the reading/language arts assessment, English language proficiency exam, and the mathematics exam with appropriate accommodations.

Potential Impact on Special Education Teachers:

- ▪ NCLB takes a one size fits all approach.
- ▪ Difficult to earn a dual degree as disciplines are not well aligned.

Teacher Aid Certification Programs:

- ▪ Enrollments have been low in Nevada.
- ✓ ▪ Aids are opting to take weekend preparation courses for the certification test rather than taking the course work towards an associate's degree.

Schools in Need of Improvement (SNI) :

- ▪ Federal funding to promote excellent teaching in these schools has yet to materialize.
- ▪ The State Department of Education may not have sufficient resources.
- ▪ Will there be an assumption/expectation that UCCSN institutions will reassign resources to assist SNI schools?

Greatest Potential Impact of NCLB and HEA:

- ▪ Use of data to bolster instruction of education majors/administrators how to analyze data and provide instructional intervention in their K-12 classrooms.

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation – (Cont'd.)

- ▪ This embodies the concept of assessment and outcomes which is the heart of the NCLB and HEA acts.

UCCSN Response to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) :

- ▪ The creation of the P-16 Council and establishing on-going dialog between UCCSN, the Nevada State Department of Education, rural and urban school district representatives, and community and business representatives throughout the state.
- ▪ Created Nevada State College to specifically address the teacher and nursing shortage.
- ▪ The Board of Regents adopted criteria by which community colleges may offer select baccalaureate degrees.
- ▪ Great Basin College is the first community college to offer a baccalaureate degree in teacher education.

Retention Rates among Teachers in Nevada are still very low:

- ▪ Pressure to produce teachers continues to be a very high priority.

Ms. Bonnie Hofland, Elementary Education Instructor-GBC, reported that the goal is to produce highly qualified teachers. All of the community colleges offer transferable courses to ensure that students are academically prepared to seamlessly transition into 4-year programs. All of the community colleges are working with UNR and UNLV as they make curriculum changes. They are offering the associates degrees, which can be utilized to prepare paraprofessionals. They also offer short courses to prepare paraprofessionals to pass the certification tests. All of the courses at the community colleges are aligned with the NTASC standards and are assessing their students to mastery of these teaching standards. They are providing early classroom observation and field experiences, reflections, and portfolio development toward effective teaching. They are including research based educational practices in all of their coursework. They are educating their students about NCLB.

➤ • TMCC recently added a second full-time professor devoted to teacher preparation. They have a 100% admission rate to UNR's teacher education program. They have created a teaching assistant and paraprofessional training program.

➤ • WNCC utilizes early field experiences and the portfolios. They have begun discussion with Carson City School District on a paraprofessional certification program.

➤ • CCSN has dedicated four faculty members to teacher preparation. They have created a student campus organization, ACARE, a cadre of aspiring research based educators society. They have formed a partnership with the Clark County School District to assist schools who have been placed on the watch list through consultation and tutorial services. They have developed an associate of arts in teaching degree and new courses to meet the paraprofessionals' needs.

➤ • GBC is offering the 4-year degree in elementary education and now has four full-time faculty. They require at least one content area endorsement and have developed courses in the English language learners and special education for existing teachers and pre-service teachers. They are supplying local schools that are on the watch list with tutors for their students. They are also offering many

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation – (Cont'd.)

continuing education opportunities for teachers working with the professional development program.

Dr. Bill Sparkman, Dean, College of Education, UNR, reported that the institutions had completed substantial work in response to the NCLB Act. They have moved forward in numerous ways to ensure that all program completers are highly qualified and prepared to improve student achievement and to close the achievement gap. Much of the work started before the enactment of NCLB, and has been driven by professional accreditation standards placing an emphasis on performance assessment to gauge student learning. It was also driven by the State Academic and Performance Standards adopted by the Legislature in 1998. The work continues a long history of positive, productive relationships with schools and school districts. Commonalities among the three 4-year institutions include:

➤ • The institutions have worked with professional accreditation agencies to develop a rigorous performance assessment process. Performance can be assessed upon entry into programs, midway through programs, and upon completion of the programs.

➤ • There has been a renewed and increased emphasis on assessment of student learning and helping teacher education students and perspective administrators and counselors diagnose, assess, and provide learning strategies so students can achieve the necessary gains.

➤ • There has been a renewed emphasis on academic content. In some cases, pedagogic courses have been reduced in favor of additional content courses. All programs are academically and clinically based programs to provide the kinds of experiences necessary for students.

➤ • A series of assessments have been developed, both standardized tests and programs to gauge competency in the areas of academic content, pedagogy, and professional knowledge. Student portfolios are used to receive a broader picture of student performance. Student learning samples are used so prospective teachers can develop lessons around student needs, assess what has occurred, and make decisions relative to changing the instruction to get the needed results.

➤ • The institutions rely heavily on follow-up studies of the graduates, employers, and other stakeholders to ensure graduates are performing adequately.

➤ • Work with local school districts and partnerships. Federal, state, and private grants have allowed the development of literacy cohorts. Faculty in all institutions have worked for the delivery of professional

development programs. Ongoing relationships with the schools exist for placement of student practicum and internship opportunities. The institutions use field based faculty from the school districts in the university classrooms. The institutions have participated in a range of other activities.

- • Students leave with no provisions on their certificates.
- • The institutions have worked in collaboration with the community colleges.
- • Preparing teachers for diverse populations has been an interest of the colleges for years. In most cases, there are required courses that students take regarding teaching exceptional children. There is more emphasis on courses dealing with English language instruction, multicultural and socio-cultural courses. Federal grants have allowed programs to help prepare endorsement areas in English

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation – (Cont'd.)

language learners. Colleges have adopted standing diversity committees to provide policy direction in a number of programmatic areas surrounding diversity and diverse need students. Colleges are involved with minority recruitment programs.

- • For alternative certification, all of the colleges have post-baccalaureate programs to allow individuals to receive teacher licensure. Efforts have been made to streamline those programs so students can finish more quickly. A number of pathways and options have been provided for teachers in Nevada.

Vice Chancellor Curry reported there has been more emphasis placed on students in teacher preparation programs being better prepared in the content areas. More profound means of assessing progress and readiness are being developed.

Regent Dondero asked what follow-up would be provided (*i.e., one-year review*) . Vice Chancellor Curry replied that this needs to become something that is done on a regular basis. A process of communication has been developed and a regular review would be healthy. He said it may not need to be so comprehensive, but regular review was necessary. He suggested that the issue of assessment of graduates was an area for potential review.

Regent Rosenberg commended the report. He said that the NCLB Act was a difficult one to which to react. He said the UCCSN tended to react rather than be proactive. He related that higher education was training the teachers and could change K-12 by changing the culture in the public schools. He felt that was not being done as well as it could be. He wanted to see an awareness of proliferation of paper. More and more, students are required to complete a great deal of paperwork that has absolutely nothing to do with what they do in the classroom. He felt that more classroom based experience was necessary. He suggested expanding student teaching and having a minimum of three or four different experiences with different master teachers.

Ms. Francine Mayfield, Director of Education-NSC, reported that when individuals are admitted to the teacher preparation program in their junior year, each education course has a field experience attached to it. They are in the classroom 10-20 hours per class and acquire the field experience prior to beginning their student teaching. She related that NSC was working in collaboration with CCSN and UNLV to offer 2+2 programs and GEARUP opportunities for juniors and seniors in high school. Regent Rosenberg observed that the public school culture has changed drastically. Much of a teacher's time is spent on classroom management. He felt that students needed to enter the classrooms well-trained, which would change the manner in which students are taught. The more experience they can have in the classroom with students the better.

Regent Bandera thanked everyone for the report. There has been some criticism about the report and whether or not it has adequately revealed what is being done to address NCLB. She said that first there was the Nevada Education Reform Act in 1997 that established some standards. It was shortly followed by the first version of NCLB, which was then followed by the revised version. Everyone at the teacher education institutions has worked hard to respond. She said she had no criticism of the report. She said that Dr. Curry had made it clear that he views it as an ongoing report and effort to determine

23. Information Only-Report on the Status of Teacher Preparation – (Cont'd.)

where they need to be. She supported the idea of more time in the classroom for the students before they graduate. She said there were things to work out and fix, but she saw a great deal of effort in collaboration and cooperation.

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests - The Board of Regents discussed a list of 2005-07 capital improvement projects, to be prioritized by the chancellor, which was requested by the UCCSN institutions to be forwarded to the State Public Works Board for its review and recommendation to the governor. Discussion included proposals for seeking alternate funding sources for UCCSN capital projects, including but not limited to an increased property tax and a public bonding initiative (*Ref. Q on file in the Board office*).

Chancellor Rogers noted significant inflation in the construction business. He said that he had spent a great deal of the last 15 years raising money for colleges and universities. In so doing, he has attempted to develop more public-private partnerships. The University of Nevada School of Medicine has a partnership with the Ruvo family. He has spoken with the Mirrens about their alliance with the medical school's Cancer Institute. The recent orthodontics partnership will produce \$70-\$100 million over the next several years. President Harter and Chancellor Rogers had dinner with Mr. Glenn Schaeffer, Chairman, Mandalay Bay, who has been a very big contributor to UNLV. It is hoped that a meaningful alliance can be developed. He recalled that he sent Board members a copy of a letter that President Harter received from Mr. Brian Greenspun. The fourth or fifth priority on the capital list is the Greenspun Building, which is contemplated to be constructed at a cost of \$30 million (*Greenspun-\$12 million; state-\$18 million*). A commitment has developed from the Greenspun family to increase their investment from \$12 million to \$16 million, based upon the new programs that are designed for the building and what is expected to be an expanded building. The project will cost in the neighborhood of \$40 million. He thought there was a high probability that an additional \$9 million from the Greenspun family would be provided for the development of programs.

He then reported that Nevada State College was a project where hope exceeded reality. The remaining \$9 million of the original \$10 million from the private sector has not materialized. He felt that such a vast amount of seed money could not be raised. There is a state commitment of \$13 million for the construction of the first building at a cost of \$23 million (*\$13 million-state and \$10 million-private funds*). The \$13 million will go away unless the funds are matched this year. The situation was complicated by the flak about whether the school should exist in the first place. Most donors want the first building to be built. Currently, NSC is in existence and is considered an integral part of the education system of the state. Numerous people feel that Nevada State College is an absolutely essential part of the System. Chancellor Rogers and President Romesburg met with the mayor of Henderson. He has asked the City to extend the present lease (*\$1/year*) for an additional 10 years. \$3.5 million has been proposed to purchase the Dawson Building. He said that request could be eliminated and delayed for 10 years. He said they need the \$9 million from the state. While he understood the Legislature's reluctance to fund such projects and bitter feelings that people were misled in originally building this college, but the money has not materialized. He suggested asking the Legislature to leave

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

the \$13 million in tact and provide the \$9 million to build the first building. It is his belief that once the initial building is constructed, they will be able to convince those with money that they now have a viable college that can succeed. He suggested that the \$3.5 million for NSC be increased to \$9 million.

Chancellor Rogers said that if the Board considered the Greenspun Building (*currently \$30 million*) and increase the request to what is believed to be necessary to fund the eventual construction the request will increase from \$30 million to \$40 million (*\$24 million-state; \$16 million-Greenspuns*). The System gains an addition \$4 million from the Greenspun family. He also believed there would be an additional \$9 million provided to develop the programs.

Chancellor Rogers recalled another letter sent to the Board outlining a proposal for CCSN's automotive technology program. This morning he received a new analysis from the State Public Works Board. All of the projects total approximately \$198 million. Due to construction cost increases, projects 1-7 will now likely total \$100 million. He asked whether the projects should be reprioritized based on the cost increases.

Mr. Dan O'Brien, Manager, State Public Works Board, explained that, in the past, the SPWB has taken the Board's recommendation, gone to their board, and made a recommendation to the governor. They have not had input into the early part of the process. This time, project managers were assigned early to the different campuses. They have been working with campus staff reviewing the budgets. If the scope and the budget are not

aligned, there will be a failure in the projects. Due to drastic increases in the cost of materials, the SPWB has either adjusted the scope of the project or adjusted the budget. Some projects experienced no change, while other experienced 16-65% change based upon the input from the different campuses. Recent estimates are close to actual costs, however, projects that were scoped 6-8 months ago do not reflect recent changes in the industry and had to be adjusted.

Mr. Gus Nunez, Deputy Manager, State Public Works Board, reported that steel prices have increased 65% through January 2004. Inflation has been increasing at approximately 1% per month. Some predictions indicate that it will continue to escalate until the end of this quarter and should stabilize by the 3rd and 4th quarters of this year. The SPWB is currently estimating 10%/year escalation through the next year. They hope it will return to the historical 3% of past years.

Chancellor Rogers noted that the increased costs of the first FF&E items was \$1.4 million, \$6.9 million, and \$5 million respectively. The Electrical and Industrial Tech building was increased from \$7.7 million to \$12.5 million.

Mr. Nunez explained that the SPWB had trimmed the UNLV Science & Engineering building project through a variety of value engineering. Later, the increased steel prices caused another \$6-\$8 million increase in the project. At this point, they did not feel that they could go any farther. Chancellor Rogers said that if the Board readjusted the budget based upon the SPWB's present figures, and the escalation continued at the same rate, that all of the buildings would be cut in half in 1½ years and they would be unable to finish them. Mr. Nunez agreed. Current estimates are through midpoint of construction.

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg thought that bids were received when building a building. He asked whether that was not a final bid. Mr. Nunez replied that it was a final bid. The contractor will normally estimate to midpoint of construction due to the number of items that will not be purchased or contracted until after that date. Regent Rosenberg asked whether that was the contractor's problem. Mr. Nunez said that it was, but costs are estimated and bid to midpoint of construction. Chancellor Rogers reminded Regent Rosenberg that a significant planning period (1-1½ years) was required. In that period of time a contractor cannot be tied to anything. The plans are created, bids are solicited, and by the time that period of time has run, the contractor will have to bid the project at a higher price.

Regent Sisolak observed that the estimate on Nevada State College was \$23 million 4½ years ago. In light of these steel increases, the \$23 million building will be \$30-\$35 million. Mr. Nunez said that the last estimate prepared for NSC was approaching the point where it would be difficult to meet the original scope. In an attempt to mitigate these increases, the SPWB is deferring some of the escalation on the approved project into the FF&E. Regent Sisolak asked to which project Mr. Nunez was referring. Mr. Nunez said that he was talking about NSC. Regent Sisolak asked to which building Mr. Nunez was referring. Mr. Nunez replied that he was referring to the first building that was currently under design. Regent Sisolak asked whether that was the \$23 million building or the Dawson Building. Mr. Nunez replied that it was the existing building that was under design. Regent Sisolak established that the building was not on the list under consideration. Mr. Nunez replied that the FF&E was included. A 57% increase was noted, which included deferral of some of the inflation from that project in order to make things work.

Regent Sisolak asked what the eventual cost would be. Mr. O'Brien replied that they were approaching the point where the budget was starting to get stretched. If they can't meet the budget, then the scope (*size of the building*) must be changed. He mentioned the discussion regarding a request for the additional funds to finish the building. He suggested that they discuss what inflation is doing to the project. Regent Sisolak requested a projection of what the Board would need to request in addition to the \$13 million in order to complete the building. Mr. Nunez replied that the best projection would be to increase the FF&E by 57% and deferring some of the last minute items that would be purchased toward the end of construction. The problem is that the project is supposed to go to bid within the next six months and the \$10 million is not available. Assuming that the project could be bid now, as soon as the design is completed, the SPWB suggests increasing the FF&E by 57%

would most likely work. Delaying the project for another year because the matching funds are not available will only increase the project cost further. The project may be even further delayed if all of the money is supposed to come from the state. An estimated 5% inflation rate could increase the cost by another \$2 million. Regent Sisolak questioned how with the steel increases a \$23 million building (*bid four years ago*) could be built for \$25 million in one year. President Romesburg replied that when this project was approved in 2001 it was a \$23 million project for 100,000-sq. ft. By the time the design was completed, the building was scaled down to 85,000-sq. ft. Inflation has reduced the size of the building by about 20%, which will require a scope change from the Legislature.

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Alden said that NSC was needed for a number of reasons, including capped enrollments, funding full-time equivalents, and the need for nurses and teachers. He felt that the first building on the list should be NSC. He felt that the second building should be the Greenspun building due to their private commitment and their willingness to increase that commitment.

Regent Howard recalled that the GBC Electrical Industrial Tech building had been on the list for quite some time. She did not understand why it was constantly pushed farther back on the list of priorities. She noted that some of the projects listed ahead of GBC actually came after the GBC project. Regent Bandera agreed.

Chair Anthony observed that the GBC project was within the group that would likely be funded. Regent Howard said that they had been on the list for 8 years and should now be the first priority.

Regent Whipple acknowledged the sobering news, noting that the Board had some difficult decisions to make. He recognized that it was important to capitalize on the private money for some of these projects. He suggested creating two lists; one itemizing those projects with no private money and a second with those projects that have private money set aside or available. He said that considering the loss of private funds for those undeveloped projects could be an additional incentive. He asked whether the chancellor felt it was applicable or worthy of review. Chancellor Rogers replied that when considering a total budget of \$100 million and there is \$20-\$25 million in private money, it is pretty difficult to ignore a \$20-\$25 million private contribution (*20-25% of the total budget*) in order to provide 100% of the funding for areas where there is no private money. He acknowledged that the community colleges did not have access to private funds. He felt it should be balanced. One given is that they cannot let NSC go away. He said they had to acknowledge that mistakes were made and move forward. They need to be sure they have the \$13 million from the state and that UCCSN requests the additional \$9 million, and receive it soon enough to salvage the size of the project. He said the Board could not escape the fact that NSC needs to be funded. He said they required that integral part of the System. They must also consider that the Greenspun family's indication that timing of the project is very important. He said the Board also did not want to abandon the community college projects. He acknowledged that it was difficult. He related that UNR had indicated that they are \$1 billion behind in capital projects. Every year the institution falls farther behind. He said that was the importance for getting as much as possible from the state and to promote the public/private partnerships. He said there was not enough money.

Regent Kirkpatrick said it was obvious that the Board would need to develop a new stream of financing for capital construction. He reviewed the necessity of many of the projects listed, noting that FF&E alone totaled \$36 million. He regretted that the UNLV Student Services Building had been on the list for many sessions. He said that CCSN had the greatest shortage of classroom space. He noted the importance of WNCC's request (*#10 - \$5.97 million*). President Lucey reported that the college has had health and safety issues for the past two sessions. The costs are larger than can be accommodated by HECC and SHECC resources. The college is really struggling with issues that she does

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

not know how to solve. She said that the college had a good record of fundraising. She said it was very difficult to interest an philanthropist in code violations.

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of giving the chancellor authority to develop a priority list extending to the

10th project listed. Regent Hill second.

Regents Sisolak and Derby requested clarification. Chair Anthony explained that the motion would give the chancellor the authority to develop the priority list for the capital projects and approach the Legislature. Regent Howard asked whether it would be subject to Board approval. Chair Anthony replied that the list would not return to the Board for approval. The chancellor would run with the list at this point. Regent Kirkpatrick agreed.

Chancellor Rogers said that he did not have a problem doing that, but felt that some Board members might. He said he would take the responsibility of making the list, but felt that he needed to meet with the SPWB to get a realistic view of what the costs really are because they are so different this morning from anything that was anticipated. He said that the Board should really approve the priority list. He felt it could be accomplished in a short amount of time, adding that he would talk with everyone about what they felt the priorities are.

Regent Hill suggested the motion be amended in view of the chancellor's comments. He suggested that it might be best for the chancellor to redo the list and return to the Board at a special meeting. He felt that making a hasty decision would be a mistake. He asked Regent Kirkpatrick to amend the motion to have the chancellor return at a special meeting. Regent Kirkpatrick said that he would be glad to do so. Chair Anthony said that the Board did not require a motion for that. Regent Kirkpatrick asked when the list needed to be submitted. Mr. O'Brien replied that submittals were normally due by June 15th. Since they have already performed their due diligence, the SPWB could accept the list by the end of July and still be fine to start their hearings in August. Chancellor Rogers said that he would provide the preliminary list in the next three weeks. From there the Board could discuss it and refine it. He said that he would then have the SPWB figures on the projected costs.

Regent Kirkpatrick withdrew his motion.

Chair Anthony said that he and the chancellor would work to see that it gets done.

Regent Derby said there are a number of critical factors. An extensive space study was conducted, which provided the Board critical information regarding where the most compelling need is. She felt that should be closely consulted. Chancellor Rogers said that Board members were not shy about calling him and providing information and advice. He said that he was open to anything the Board wanted to do (*e-mail, writing*) and he would discuss each of those issues with Board members. He said that he would rely upon the Board to provide the information.

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Derby said it was important to look at where private money is available for matching because it made a difference. She also felt that Nevada State College is a major priority.

Chair Anthony clarified that the chancellor would develop a final list based on the best estimates for cost. He will receive input from all of the Regents and presidents. He will send a final list to everyone and the Board will have a special meeting to finalize it as a Board.

Regent Sisolak said that the Henderson money was not promised at a cocktail party, but rather at a Board meeting, where elected officials guaranteed they would raise a minimum of \$50 million. He felt that people should be held accountable, adding that he was very supportive of the state college in Henderson. He said that they promised that they would raise the money. He felt that they owed it to the students of the state college and the citizens of Nevada to follow through on commitments made. He observed that the Academic Medical Center had been on the list and needed \$1 million, but would raise the remaining \$70 million. He said they were willing to privately fundraise most of that project. He said that money has to follow growth, noting there were institutions bulging at the seams. He suggested that the auto tech center involved a new group of donors, who were willing to contribute substantial money now and in the future. He noted that, in the last year, the Board approved \$100 million in recreation centers on various campuses. He said that they might have to consider assessing students for some of this, as much as he was reluctant to do so. He said the money could be spread further that way. He thought that students would be willing to pay for a library or a classroom building. At one

point, the Board discussed a lease/buy back on a classroom building for CCSN. He asked why the \$30 million project could not be addressed with a lease/buy back. He said that enhanced enrollment would drive the tuition, which was student oriented. He said that with increased enrollment they could identify a revenue stream and could bond the lease/buy back building for the \$30 million classroom project. Chancellor Rogers said that he had already had discussions with major developers in Las Vegas who would be willing to do that, adding that he felt it was a good idea. Regent Sisolak asked how the \$100 million was derived. With assessed valuations skyrocketing on property in southern Nevada, the assessed valuation pool must be significantly higher. He suggested that there may be more than \$115 million available. Chancellor Rogers said that he had a meeting scheduled on Monday with the legislative people to discuss the sources of funds and what actual predictions are. He said that by the time he provided the list to the Board he would have what he believed to be the revenue and what can be done with that money. Regent Sisolak suggested considering a \$5/credit assessment that could be used for some capital projects. Since students lobbied for a gym, maybe the Board can supplement the state money.

President Harter said that the presidents had discussed whether the Board would want to consider a major bond issue for higher education that would be special and above anything done before. She related that several states have taken on these bond issues to further higher education, adding that it may be the only way to build facilities to accommodate the enormous growth.

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg said that he agreed with everything that had been said. The last building built for students at UNR was 10 years ago, yet garages are built. He said that the amount of space that is dedicated to cars and the amount of money put into garages was incredible. He observed that the buildings stand empty at night. He said that there were some items on the list that did not require much money when compared to the entire budget, but were more important than others (*i.e., safety issues*). He suggested that the Board determine what is most important and what they can afford to do. He suggested providing a visual display for how much each project would reduce the anticipated \$115 million to help the Board make better decisions.

Regent Hill felt that every item on the list was sorely needed. He felt that Chancellor Rogers was knowledgeable, and had the best idea about fundraising and capital projects, and where the Board needed to go. He said there were many considerations for prioritizing projects. Some health and safety concerns are more important than others. They must also consider state funds vs. non-state funds. There is a difference in the fundraising abilities of each of the institutions. Everyone has different criteria. He suggested the chancellor provide some criteria. He said it would be foolish to ignore the Greenspun donation unless it was for a project that was not needed. He said they should consider prior requests, acknowledging that the request for UNLV's Student Services Building had been through several sessions. President Harter clarified that this was the fifth session. Another consideration is opportunities. He felt they should consider campus age and the age of the facilities. He said the Board absolutely had to support NSC.

Regent Alden asked how long it would take to complete the building at NSC once the \$23 million was in place. He asked when they could break ground. Chancellor Rogers said they would provide an answer later. He said it depended upon what the Legislature would do with the remaining \$9 million. He said he would provide a plan for the Board. Developers and bankers have contacted the chancellor regarding creative financing measures. Chancellor Rogers said that he also wanted input from the presidents.

Regent Dondero wondered if the chancellor might want to have a select committee to help develop the priorities. She suggested selecting 2-3 Regents with a financial background and/or some members of the public who the chancellor mentioned had financing suggestions. Chancellor Rogers suggested that she call him to volunteer. Regent Bandera volunteered.

Regent Howard mentioned the automotive center, which she felt was a win-win situation. Students would have a program that would allow them to earn good money. The workforce currently has a high need and demand. Chancellor Rogers promised that the automotive center would make the list.

Regent Howard said that she had opposed the recreation centers because she did not believe the students supported them. She felt that half of the students supported them, yet \$100 million was spent on them. She did not feel that they were a priority and that most of the students she spoke with had indicated it was not a priority. Those funds could have been used to build a Student Services Building. She was also interested in discussing support of the bond issue that President Harter mentioned.

24. Information Only-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (Cont'd.)

Regent Kirkpatrick asked the chancellor to please consider the space utilization study when developing the priorities.

Regent Derby asked about the revenue stream that would support the bond proposal. President Harter clarified that she was talking about a state commitment to the System of higher education over an extended period of time that the state would let and fund. She felt that research was necessary regarding how it has been done in other states and how to lobby for it. She felt that a strategy needed to be developed. Regent Derby supported further consideration of this measure.

The meeting recessed at 10:20 a.m. and reconvened at 10:30 a.m. with all members present except Regents Hill and Seastrand

25. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations - Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met June 3, 2004 and heard the following reports:

- • Core Curriculum for Millennium Scholars – Associate Vice Chancellor Chris Chairsell summarized statewide discussion that has taken place in an effort to gather input on the development of a high school core curriculum for Millennium Scholars as mandated by the Nevada Legislature.
- • Developmental and Remedial Task Force – Associate Vice Chancellor Chris Chairsell reported on the activities of the UCCSN Developmental and Remedial Task Force and areas for potential policy development.

Regent Hill entered the meeting.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Derby requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- • New Program Proposals – The Committee recommended approval of the following new program proposals:
 - ✓ • Ph.D., Public Affairs, UNLV (*Ref. ARSA-2 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ • Ph.D., Mathematical Sciences, UNLV (*Ref. ARSA-3 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ • M.S., Materials & Nuclear Engineering, UNLV (*Ref. ARSA-4 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ • M.Ed. and M.A., Literacy Studies, UNR (*Ref. ARSA-5 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ • B.A., Integrative and Professional Studies: Arts and Humanities Administration, GBC (*Ref. ARSA-7 on file in the Board office*).
- • New Unit Proposal, Academy for the Environment, UNR (*Ref. ARSA-6 on file in the Board office*) – The Committee approved a proposal for a new unit, the Academy for the Environment at UNR.
- • Handbook Revision, UCCSN Policy on Instructional Materials – The Committee recommended approval of an addition to the *Board of Regents Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 14, Section 25)* requiring each UCCSN institution to develop an approved statement of professional and ethical guidelines relative to the selection of textbooks or other instructional materials (*Ref. ARSA-10 on file in the Board office*)

25. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

Regent Derby moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Schofield seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Seastrand were absent.

26. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the Audit Committee met June 3, 2004 and received follow-up responses for five internal audit reports presented at the December 2003 meeting. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit, reported on the current status of the Legislative

Counsel Bureau audit. The LDB auditors have concluded their work on the Statewide Programs portion of the audit and expect to report their findings to the Legislative Commission in June 2004. He said that Board members would receive a copy of their reports. The auditors have also completed their work on the Investments and Enrollment portions of the audit. The auditors continue their review of Intercollegiate Athletics, Capital Construction, Host and Administrative Costs. The process is expected to be completed in December 2004. Regent Hill said that one of the concerns about LCB audits is that there are no standards to which the administration can be held. Mr. Tom Judy, Associate Vice President for Business & Finance-UNR, reported on the status of the University of Nevada School of Medicine Practice Plan. The net profit of the Plan is \$1.46 million as of April 30, 2004. The Committee discussed proposed changes to the UCCSN and Member Institution Foundations Administrative and Accounting Guidelines, *Board of Regents Handbook (Title IV, chapter 10, Section 10)*. The UCCSN business officers' council will revise the proposed guidelines in consultation with the chancellor and report to the Committee in August. The PricewaterhouseCoopers report on the Quality Assurance Review of the UCCSN Internal Audit Department for the three years ended December 31, 2004 was deferred to the August meeting because the PricewaterhouseCoopers' representative missed his connecting flight to Elko and could not attend the meeting.

Regent Hill requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Internal Audit Reports – The Committee reviewed the following Internal Audit Reports (*Ref. U on file in the Board office*):
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, UNR (*Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, UNLV (*Ref. A-4 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, DRI (*Ref. A-5 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, TMCC (*Ref. A-6 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, CCSN (*Ref. A-7 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, WNCC (*Ref. A-8 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Travel-Operational Review, GBC (*Ref. A-9 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Review of Lobbyist Expenditures, UNR (*Ref. A-10 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Review of Lobbyist Expenditures, UNLV (*Ref. A-11 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Review of Lobbyist Expenditures, UCCSN (*Ref. A-12 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Review of Lobbyist Expenditures, DRI (*Ref. A-13 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Review of Lobbyist Expenditures, NSC (*Ref. A-14 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Review of Lobbyist Expenditures, WNCC (*Ref. A-15 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ Nevada Terawatt Facility, UNR (*Ref. A-16 on file in the Board office*).
 - ✓ University Libraries, UNLV (*Ref. A-17 on file in the Board office*).

26. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations – (Cont'd.)

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

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

27. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations - Chair Mark Alden reported the Budget & Finance Committee met May 3, 2004 and received a brief description of what an auxiliary enterprise is and was also provided examples of auxiliary enterprises for each UCCSN institution. The Committee also heard reports regarding the self-supporting budget revisions for the third quarter of fiscal year 2003-2004 and state supported operating budget transfers for the third quarter of fiscal year 2003-2004. Campuses and UCCSN units presented and discussed their state operating budget initiatives for the 2005-2007 biennium with the Committee. There were no action items.

Regent Alden moved acceptance of the May 3, 2004 report. Regent Bandera seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Regent Alden reported that the Committee also met on June 3, 2004 and heard reports regarding the fiscal year 2004-2005 UCCSN state supported operating budget, All Funds revenues and expenses for the third quarter of

fiscal year 2003-2004, fiscal exceptions of self-supporting budgets and the status of state appropriations for the third quarter of fiscal year 2003-2004, and state-supported budget initiatives for System computing Services and the Management Assistance Partnership (*MAP*) for the 2005-2007 biennium.

Regent Alden requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

➤ • Fiscal Year 2004-05 UCCSN State Supported Operating Budget – The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2004-05 UCCSN operating budget (*Bound Report on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the June 3, 2004 report. Regent Whipple seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

28. Accepted-Investment Committee Report - Chair Bret Whipple reported the Investment Committee met April 1, 2004 and approved sending out an RFP for the investment consultant. Subsequently, the Committee met May 11, 2004 and the current endowment and operating pool policies were reviewed and revised. The revisions will be presented to the full Board at the August meeting and consist of mainly housekeeping items. 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, 2004. Endowment investments returned 3.7% for the quarter (*compared to the 3.5% benchmark*) and 16.9% for the fiscal year (*compared to the 15.9% benchmark*). The total return for the pooled operating funds was 2.0% for the quarter (*compared to the 2.0% benchmark*) and

28. Accepted-Investment Committee Report – (*Cont'd.*)

7.0% for the calendar year (*compared to the 8.0% benchmark*). The Committee was updated on the status of the Investment Consultant Request for Proposal. The Committee will hold a special meeting on July 9, 2004 to hear presentations for the top candidates. The Committee reviewed the asset allocation of the operating pool. The allocation to short-term bonds and cash at March 31, 2004 was 40% compared to the target allocation of 30%. The Committee decided to move 10% from short-term bonds and cash to U.S. Equities and International Equities.

Regent Whipple moved acceptance of the report. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

29. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations - Chair Thalia Dondero reported the Board Development Committee met April 1, 2004 and requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- • Retreat/Workshop Presentations – The Committee approved holding a one-day workshop, giving Ms. Ernst the authority to put together the workshop schedule. Authority was also delegated to Committee Chair Dondero to approve and sign contracts for the workshop facilitators and speakers.
- • Future Meetings - The Committee approved holding another meeting in August to plan the fall workshop, which will be devoted to the subject of ethics.

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

Chair Anthony reported that the Faculty Workload Task Force report would be postponed until the next meeting since they had a few items to wrap up.

30. Approved-Health Education Task Force Report - Chair Marcia Bandera thanked Ms. Crystal McGee for all of the great work she performed. An additional meeting will be held June 21st to continue discussion regarding the School of Public Health. The health care workforce agency proposal was submitted to the legislative subcommittee and another meeting has been scheduled in July. A recommendation from a consultant regarding the School of Pharmacy is expected at the June 21st meeting. A consultant has also been scheduled for the health sciences university issue.

Regent Bandera reported the ad hoc Health Education Task Force met April 16, and May 5, 2004 and requested

approval of the following Task Force recommendations.

➤ • Health and Allied Health Programs – The Task Force recommended requiring the campuses to conduct a special review of their respective health and allied health programs (*separate from the regularly scheduled program reviews*) to determine the need for such programs, eliminating those where demand is lacking, and increasing recruiting efforts for programs where market demand is growing but student demand is lagging with a report to the ARSA Committee.

30. Approved-Health Education Task Force Report – (Cont'd.)

➤ • Student Exchange Positions – The Task Force recommended that the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (*WICHE*) increase for Nevada its number of student exchange positions for students of veterinary medicine.

➤ • Continued Work of Health Education Task Force – The Task Force requested approval to continue its work and revise the Task Force's charge to include: (1) the coordination of a semi-annual forum through which representatives from the USSCN health profession programs may meet to discuss demand data for health care professions, efforts to expand programs to meet market demand, strategic planning, collaborative efforts among the campuses, etc.; and (2) organize and co-sponsor with other health care organizations a "21st Century Health Professions Summit" in Fall 2005. This summit would provide the opportunity to collect information from Nevada's health care industry and discuss health profession market needs, trends, and training and educational opportunities with Nevada's educational leaders. Ms. Caroline Ford, Director of the State Office of Rural Health, volunteered the help of her office in organizing the summit and will provide funding for the event.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Task Force recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Bandera seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

31. Tabled-Price of Athletic Event Tickets – The Board tabled action indefinitely on Regents Mark Alden's, Howard Rosenberg's, and Steve Sisolak's request to discuss the possibility of increasing the cost of tickets to athletic events by \$1.00, which would be dedicated to the institution's academic programs.

Regent Alden proposed raising the price of athletic tickets only at the two universities and only for football and basketball by a small portion (*\$1.00 or less*). The money would be used to support academic programs. He felt that the Board did not have enough information, tickets have already been distributed for sale, and it would have a negative impact on the two major institutions. He recommended including a provision that it apply only to the two major institutions, for an amount of one-dollar or less, and it would only be used for academic programs. He felt the Board needed to know how much money would be raised and what the negative impact would be for raising the ticket prices. He felt the Board should discuss this as a policy issue, but did not feel that the Board had enough information to do so.

Regent Rosenberg stated that one-dollar did not seem to be an onerous amount. It would raise more money than what is available now. If it did nothing more than help defray some expense so that the part-time instructor salaries could be increased it would be worthwhile. Since the Board did not know the impact, he suggested the issue be tabled.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of tabling the item indefinitely. Regent Whipple seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Regent Alden thanked Regent Rosenberg for bringing the matter to the Board's attention.

32. Accepted-Legislative Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs Report - Regent Jill Derby reported the Legislative Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs met March 24, and April 29, 2004. At the March meeting, the Committee briefly examined the UCCSN's response to four questions that had been forwarded after the Committee's meeting in February. The Committee also clarified data from the external consultants that had been provided at the last meeting about the impact of the Millennium Scholarship as well as the statewide need for dentists in Nevada. The majority of the March meeting was devoted to the presentation of data by the Committee's external consultants on comparative funding levels for higher education in Nevada.

Two of the charges to the Committee in AB 203 are to determine if it is feasible to reallocate existing resources within institutions to meet the critical needs of the state and whether state appropriations and student fee revenues are being efficiently distributed internally at each UCCSN institution. The presentation on funding levels represented the second report by the consultants to analyze various data and trends that will ultimately inform the Committee's final report. The consultants reviewed the adequacy of funding, the utilization of existing resources, and cost effectiveness within the UCCSN as compared to a group of peer institutions. The consultants concluded that postsecondary education in Nevada is funded at about the same level as its peers. The consultants also reported that UCCSN institutions rely heavily on state appropriations and tuition and fees, with less funding than their peers from private gifts and from government grants and contracts. In terms of the utilization of resources, the consultants observed that expenditure patterns within UCCSN institutional budgets are very similar to those of comparable institutions. Nevada institutions are comparatively well staffed, especially with regard to administrative/professional staff and clerical staff. Faculty salaries are very competitive, particularly at the two universities. The consultants concluded that faculty are not tenured at abnormally high levels and that UCCSN institutions teach relatively few course elections with low enrollments. Finally, the consultants found that UCCSN institutions award degrees in a wide variety of fields relative to size of their student bodies. A great deal of time was spent discussing the peer institutions used by the consultants, because Chairman Hardy wants to be confident that the Committee's findings are not disputed based on any disagreements with peer data. The institutions have been given an opportunity to suggest other peers to the consultants.

The Committee's next meeting was held on April 29th. The UCCSN was asked to provide information about articulation and core credit requirements, remedial education, and the effect of the millennium Scholarship on average Pell grant disbursements in the System. Following these presentations, the Committee heard from a panel comprised of representatives from regional economic development agencies throughout Nevada. The discussion centered on the relationship between economic development authorities, strength of the economy, and higher education in Nevada. The strong influence education and research has upon the economy was a theme that prevailed throughout the discussion. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to reviewing an outline of the final report and recommendations to be provided by the external consultants. The consultants began their review by first providing preliminary findings from a System-wide policy audit. In general, the audit found that at the System level the focus is predominantly on institutional level issues and that attention should be redirected to long-term strategies for linking higher education to the future economy and quality of life in the state. The

32. Accepted-Legislative Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs Report – (Cont'd.)

consultants continued with a review of a draft version of their final report. The findings in the report will provide an analysis of state needs, observations about funding adequacy and use of resources, as well as an overview of the feasibility to reallocate funds within institutions. Recommendations from the findings will be provided to the Board and Legislature addressing means for increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education in Nevada. Detailed findings and recommendations are scheduled to be presented at the next meeting on June 17th.

Regent Derby moved acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Whipple thanked Regent Derby for devoting her time. He asked that Board members be provided with a copy of the minutes from those meetings.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

33. Approved-Public Safety Initiative, CCSN – The Board approved Interim President Paul C. Gianini's request to move forward to implement the plan to establish a professionally trained, in-house College Police Department, consisting of Peace Officers (*sworn*) and Security Officers (*non-sworn*) who are employees of the College (Ref. X on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of establishing a professionally trained, in-house College Police Department for CCSN. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the officers would be POST certified and would carry weapons. President Gianini replied that they would be POST certified and would eventually all carry weapons. He said it was a transitional plan. CCSN is integrating the rented police officers with the real police officers. Chair Anthony clarified that it would be a certified police department. Regent Sisolak asked about the fiscal impact as compared with hiring the service out. Ms. Patty Charlton, Vice President, Finance & Administration-CCSN, replied that CCSN reviewed what the current contract provides. All security services are outsourced at this time. CCSN is not seeking 100% security force/officers. Instead they plan to implement a hybrid structure, which will be cost efficient and basically a reallocation of what is currently paid for the contract service. Regent Sisolak asked how much was currently spent on private security. Ms. Charlton replied that CCSN would spend \$1.8 million next year. Regent Sisolak asked about the cost of in-house security. Ms. Charlton replied that next year's contract was \$1.8 million. An automatic 3% increase was provided for each year thereafter until the contract expires December 31, 2007. In anticipating the campus growth and new facilities, it will be approximately \$2.3 million when the program is fully implemented, which matches what the contract would be. Regent Sisolak asked whether the chancellor had reviewed the matter. Chancellor Rogers replied that he had not.

Mr. Sandy Seda, Chief, Public Safety-CCSN, reported that the proposal was developed over two years. CCSN has undergone a comprehensive self examination. CCSN would

33. Approved-Public Safety Initiative, CCSN – (Cont'd.)

like to implement the proposal as the result of consultation with faculty, staff, and students. Following his appointment in 2002, he reviewed how the campus provides security services. He examined crime statistics and reviewed historical trends. He met with students, staff, and faculty and held meetings with the contract security officers. He also met with the Chiefs at UNR, UNLV, and TMCC. It became clear after 5 months that CCSN has not taken a proactive approach to pre-positioning the critical thinkers necessary to respond to a significant incident. There is no professional first responder corps of professionals in place. In the last 8 months, there have been four incidences on CCSN campuses involving weapons (*3 with firearms and 1 with a butcher knife*). Currently, he is the POST certified peace officer on staff. He responds to all of these incidences, which is a problem given the scope and complexity of CCNS's setup. CCSN is a multi-campus site. He cannot be everywhere at once and cannot do it all on his own. The proposal creates a hybrid police department that is a service-oriented public safety department based on a community policing model. It will consist of both sworn and non-sworn officers (*POST certified and security officers*). He considers it the most cost effective way of providing services for the campuses. The security officers would provide customer service functions (*i.e., opening/closing doors, monitoring the closed circuit T.V. and fire alarm systems*). Police officers would be used for enforcement, patrol, and investigation. Currently security services are provided by a contract security company. He said they had the best guards you could get for \$8/hour. They have limited experience, training, and education. Over the past two years, numerous operational, administrative, and personnel issues have arisen and will continue to do so. He said that CCSN needs the Board's help. He said that CCSN would be very different in four years, adding that they need to do the planning now.

Ms. Ann Johnson, Faculty Senate Chair-CCSN, reported that the faculty senate supported the proposal wholeheartedly.

Mr. David Rosier, Student Body President-CCSN, reported that the students supported the proposal and that no one was opposed to it.

Regent Kirkpatrick established that the program would be phased in over time. Police officers would be hired while CCSN gradually reduces the contract services. He established that current contract services cost \$1.8 million and would increase to \$2.3 million over the four years. Regent Kirkpatrick asked about a provision in the contract for such reductions. He asked how the program would be phased in and how many officers would be hired each year. Mr. Seda replied that six police sergeants would be hired in the first year. They would be divided amongst the three main campuses and would serve as the supervisory team. They would help with the interlocal agreements and with screening subsequent hires. They would also assist with developing the field training program. Eight additional police officers would be hired in the second year. At that time, security personnel would be reduced by eight. In the third year of the plan, eight additional police officers will be hired,

reducing the security staff by eight. In the fourth year, eight additional police officers would be hired subject to review. A component has been included to reexamine minimum manning numbers to determine the appropriate complement of sworn and non-sworn personnel. Regent Kirkpatrick asked about the cost of the officers including salary and fringe benefits. Mr. Seda replied it

33. Approved-Public Safety Initiative, CCSN – (Cont'd.)

would cost approximately \$50,000 each for sergeants. Regent Kirkpatrick established there would be \$300,000 for salaries in the first year. He asked about equipment and initial costs. Mr. Seda replied that facilities and equipment would be phased in over the four-year period. Regent Kirkpatrick acknowledged that CCSN needed a police department if UNR and UNLV did since CCSN was spread out more than they were. He said there ought to be some way of knowing how much this would cost, noting that it was not provided. He established that as officers were added each year that security personnel would be reduced. Mr. Seda stated that each year during the second, third, and fourth year of the plan, CCSN would try to take out eight officers. In the fourth year, they will examine the total number of officers on staff and determine the appropriate complement of police and security officers. CCSN is also trying to reassign some of the customer service related functions (*i.e., opening/closing doors provided by Operations & Maintenance*). Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the officers would have the same powers as those of a Clark County School District police officer (*i.e., arrests*). Mr. Seda replied that they would, adding that they would be POST certified. Regent Kirkpatrick established that they would be fully trained in firearms. Mr. Seda said that the spirit and intent of the proposal was to provide officers who bring a greater level training, education, and experience. It would be a true, professional corps of officers they could depend upon.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether Chair Anthony recommended the proposal. Chair Anthony said that he was. He said that CCSN was the largest institution, spread out over a lot of buildings. He asked whether they wanted security guards or trained, professional police officers. He felt it was a good, solid plan with good fiscal responsibility. He related that Vice President Charlton had been involved in the development. He said it would ensure the safety of the faculty and students. Regent Rosenberg said that it was very definitely needed. Mr. Seda said that police officers would solely patrol the campuses and would not go out to the outlying municipalities. He said that the plan had been developed in consultation with the Chiefs at UNR, UNLV, and TMCC who had also voiced their support. Chair Anthony said that the specific mission would be public safety on the campuses.

Regent Hill noted that there had been personnel issues with the safety people. He assured Mr. Seda that there would also be personnel issues with the sworn officers. He noted that the sworn officers would have a gun. He wants people that have the training, education, and experience. He hoped that they would also hire people who do not have testosterone problems. He noted that Presidents Harter and Lilley have both had problems with their police forces. He felt the problem was in the quality of the personnel. Most people work for Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department due to the salaries that the System pays. He said he was frightened about having armed people without the emotional maturity. He emphasized the need to be careful.

Regent Schofield said that he took classes at CCSN before becoming a Regent and had observed some of the problems mentioned. He felt the plan was well considered and that the costs would equalize. He said that it would provide qualified people and that he would feel more comfortable about having trained people present with additional lighting. He felt the program had been outlined so the officers would not overstep their bounds and indicated his support.

33. Approved-Public Safety Initiative, CCSN – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked whether the officers would issue speeding tickets. Mr. Seda said that they might.

Regent Howard agreed it was long overdue, adding her support.

Regent Rosenberg said they need to ensure the officers recognize the boundaries and not to go out of their way to alienate the people who live around them.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

President Gianini thanked the Board, adding that they had not only improved security but had also improved the teaching and learning environment at the college.

34. Approved-Additional Intercollegiate Athletics, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey’s request to add two more intercollegiate sports for WNCC – baseball and women’s soccer to begin competition in 2005 (*Ref. Y on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of adding two more intercollegiate sports for WNCC – baseball and women’s soccer to begin competition in 2005 with the understanding that none of the funding came from state money and was all self-supporting. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Howard asked about the source of funds. President Lucey replied there was a commitment of cash in kind and pledges of \$150,000, which was required for the first year’s budget. The coaches will need to be fundraisers. The college rodeo program has been operating for two years, which has been very successful.

Regent Sisolak asked whether statute prevented the use of state funds for athletics. WNCC Foundation Chair, Mr. Steve Lewis, replied that he believed that to be the case. President Lucey agreed. At some point in the future that question should be asked. Regent Sisolak asked which statute it was. Ms. Helaine Jesse, Vice President, Institutional Advancement-WNCC, replied that WNCC was not precluded by statute from using state funds for athletics. It has been a long-standing agreement when the community colleges were formed in the early 1970’s not to use state funds for athletics. Regent Sisolak asked with whom the agreement was. Regent Bandera replied that it was an agreement between the System office for community colleges, Governor O’Callaghan, and the Legislature when they were discussing the expansion of community colleges and their needs. While there is no prohibition for having athletics at the community colleges, it was not the expectation that they would have state money. She felt it would require discussion with the legislature.

Chancellor Rogers did not believe they could make a change in that at the moment with all of the other financial problems. Regent Sisolak asked what the baseball commitment was at CCSN. President Gianini replied that it cost approximately \$250,000/year to fund the baseball team. He said it all came from private sources. Chair Anthony suggested including the item as a future agenda item. Chancellor Rogers observed that when the

34. Approved-Additional Intercollegiate Athletics, WNCC – (*Cont’d.*)

private sector helped fund such ventures it freed up other money. Mr. Lewis said that Ms. Jesse’s staff had called different states to identify the source of funding for their athletics programs. A majority of university athletics programs comes from student fees and private donations. He noted that the rodeo program had been very well supported by the Fallon community.

Regent Schofield said that they would need to address the issue seriously if they were ever to get the athletics programs to the desired caliber. He did not recall a stipulation to not fund athletics. He noted the positive effect of having a national baseball championship team at CCSN. He felt the Board should focus attention to the areas they were passionate about.

Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

35. Approved-2005-2007 Student Fee Distribution – The Board approved Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration, Mr. Buster Neel’s request for approval of the distribution of student fee increases approved by the Board during its March 2004 meeting (*Ref. Z on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden moved approval of the distribution of student fees for 2005-2007. Regent Bandera seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

36. Approved-Board Meeting Calendar 2005 – The Board approved proposed dates for the Board of Regents’ meetings in 2005. All proposed dates are Friday meeting days with the understanding that the standing committees will not meet on these same dates.

- • February 4, 2005
- • April 15, 2005
- • June 24, 2005
- • September 23, 2005
- • December 2, 2005

Regent Alden moved approval of the Board meeting calendar dates for 2005. Regent Whipple seconded.

Regent Alden felt that traveling was easier on a Thursday than on a Friday. He asked why Friday dates were chosen. Chair Anthony replied that it appeared to work better with everyone's schedules. Regent Alden indicated his support for the motion. Chair Anthony said that the success of this schedule would depend on the Committee chairs. The Committee work will need to be done prior to the Board meeting.

Regent Dondero asked whether there was a cost savings associated with the proposed method. Chair Anthony replied that it had not been calculated. Regent Alden said that a cost savings analysis had been previously prepared, adding that it cost approximately \$90,000/meeting day.

36. Approved-Board Meeting Calendar 2005 – (Cont'd.)

Regent Howard asked whether meetings would still rotate from campus to campus. Chair Anthony replied that three meetings would likely be held in the south and two in the north. Regent Howard asked about the east. Chair Anthony replied that meetings would be held every other year in Elko.

Regent Derby recalled that the Board had previously tried separating the committee meetings from the meeting date. She suggested trying it to see how it works for staff. She felt the cost should be reviewed, given that people would need to attend the committee meetings. She suggested that having some of the committee meetings the afternoon before the Board meeting would be helpful.

Regent Kirkpatrick said he supported anything that would reduce time spent in meetings. He also wanted to ensure that the Board's business was completed. He felt that while video meetings saved money on travel, that it also detracted from camaraderie that developed among the individuals. He felt that if it were not done properly it could cost more than it does now. He felt that a study should be conducted. Chair Anthony said that if it did not work out it would be changed back to the former method. Regent Kirkpatrick said that it could still result in 3-day travel sessions.

Regent Whipple said he was excited about this, feeling that it was a strong improvement. He observed that the workshop was not included. He hoped the annual workshop would continue to be held to develop Board relationships.

Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg voted no. Regent Bandera abstained. Regent Seastrand was absent.

37. Approved-Election of Officers – The Board approved new officers to serve from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. In accordance with Regents' Bylaws (*Article IV, Section 2*), there will be an election of officers for FY 2004-2005.

- • Chair –

Regent Alden nominated Regent Stavros Anthony as Board Chair. Regent Schofield seconded. Motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Chair Anthony thanked the Board for their support.

- • Vice Chair -

Regent Alden nominated Regent Jill Derby as Board Vice Chair. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Schofield nominated Regent Doug Hill as Board Vice Chair.

Chair Anthony said that the Board needed to first vote on the previous motion.

Regent Sisolak requested a roll call vote.

37. Approved-Election of Officers – (Cont'd.)

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether the Vice Chair would most likely become the Board's next Chair. Chair Anthony said that it was his feeling that the Board decides who will be Chair. They can select from one of thirteen people.

Regent Schofield said that he had a great deal of respect for Regent Derby. He also believed that the responsibilities should be divided amongst the thirteen elected members of the Board. He wanted the Board to consider sharing the responsibility since two good people had been suggested. If Regent Derby did not win, he would nominate Regent Hill. He felt that Regent Hill also had leadership qualities, brought a lot of strength to the Board, and would do a good job.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regent Seastrand was absent.

Regent Derby thanked the Board for their vote of confidence, adding that she looked forward to serving.

Chair Anthony honored outgoing Vice Chair Marcia Bandera with a resolution (*Resolution 04-16 on file in the Board office*) citing her accomplishments since being appointed by Governor Guinn to complete a Regents' term. He said he was honored to have her serve as vice chair. Vice Chair Bandera thanked the Board for the honor.

38. New Business – Chair Anthony requested a progress report from UNR at the next meeting regarding the consolidation of the Mackay School of Mines within the College of Science, including how the process is working and how the working group feels about the process. Provost Frederick agreed to do so.

Regent Sisolak requested an item for the next meeting regarding the naming of institutions. He said there was some confusion that there might not be a policy regarding what the institutions are called. He said the ARSA Committee was asked for direction from the Board regarding what the name of a school would be (*i.e., University of Nevada; University of Nevada, Reno; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; etc.*). He said the matter was causing some concern. He thought the matter had been addressed in the 1968-70 timeframe. He felt the matter should be clarified for everyone. Regent Rosenberg agreed. Regent Derby acknowledged that the matter arose during the ARSA Committee meeting. She said the names had been designated, but the matter had to do with usage in official capacities. Chair Anthony suggested including an informational item at the next meeting. Regent Sisolak felt that an action item would be required, adding that UNR had requested direction. Chair Anthony agreed to include an action/information item at the next meeting.

Regent Howard wondered whether the Board required a policy regarding logos, noting that one institution has approximately ten logos. She said she had addressed the matter some time before with the understanding that the Board would consider it at a future date.

Regent Rosenberg said he was concerned that President Romesburg was leaving and that the Board needed to take action on an interim appointment for Nevada State College and

38. New Business – (Cont'd.)

also needed to form a presidential search committee. Chair Anthony said he would move on that matter immediately in concert with the Vice Chair and chancellor.

Regent Howard asked about the decision on the logos. Chair Anthony asked whether she wanted an agenda item. Regent Howard replied that she did. She said it could also be included with the naming issue. Chair Anthony agreed to provide something at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board