

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA

Foundation Building, Events Room
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, December 2-3, 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
Mr. Howard Rosenberg
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Douglas Seastrand
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Bret Whipple

Members Absent: Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick

Others Present: Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers

Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson

Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Buster Neel

Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Chris Chairsell

Interim Vice Chancellor, Technology, Becky Seibert

Chief Counsel Dan Klaich

Assistant Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen

President Richard Carpenter, CCSN

Special Assistant to the President, Dr. Rand Key, CCSN

President Stephen Wells, DRI

President Paul Killpatrick, GBC

Interim President Pat Miltenberger, 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 Dr. Terry Jones, CCSN; Dr. Vic Etyemezian, DRI; Ms. Kathy Schwandt, GBC; Dr. Edward Baldwin, NSC; Ms. Bridgett Boulton, TMCC; Dr. Jane McCarthy, UNLV; Dr. Leah Wilds, UNR; Mr. Richard Kloes, WNCC; and Ms. Sara Velez Mallea, System Administration. Student government leaders present included Ms. Michelle Hammond Urain, GBC; 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.

Vice Chair Jill Derby called the meeting to order at 7:40 a.m., on Thursday, December 2, 2004 with all members present except Regents Anthony, Hill, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak.

1. Information Only-Personnel Session, President Philip Ringle – The Board held a personnel session concerning President Philip Ringle.

1.1 Approved-Moving to Closed Session – The Board approved moving to a closed personnel session regarding President Philip Ringle, in compliance with and for the purposes set forth in NRS 241.030 (“*closed meeting to consider character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or physical or mental health*”).

Regent Bandera moved approval of moving to a closed personnel session. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony, Hill, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak were absent.

The meeting recessed at 7:42 a.m. (*for a closed session*) and reconvened at 8:44 a.m., on December 2, 2004, with all members present except Regents Alden, Anthony, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak.

1.2 Information Only-Return to Open Session – The Board returned to open session.

Regent Derby asked Board members to comment on President Ringle's evaluation.

Regent Bandera said that she was quite impressed with the self-study, accreditation visit, and final report that had been conducted at TMCC. She felt it was important that the person in charge of an institution is a clear thinker and a good observer in order to determine what is really going on within the institution. She congratulated President Ringle on his service, adding that she would miss seeing and hearing from him. She said he was taking the institution in the right direction to serve Washoe County in the proper manner.

Regent Howard said that she really appreciated the way that President Ringle had brought stability to TMCC. She said that she felt much better since he had been there and she commended him for doing a good job.

Regent Hill thanked President Ringle for his fine work.

Regent Derby expressed the Board's appreciation to President Ringle for his leadership and complimented him on his efforts.

Regent Schofield noted the positive attitude that had been expressed by the evaluation respondents. He noted that the morale on TMCC's campus appeared to be very positive.

Regents Alden and Sisolak entered the meeting.

Regent Schofield said that it was apparent that the employees on campus are happy and he expressed his appreciation for President Ringle's fine work.

1.2 Information Only-Return to Open Session – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Derby thanked the consultant, Dr. Robert Barringer, and the evaluation committee for the good work performed on President Ringle's evaluation. She also thanked President Ringle for his fine work.

The meeting recessed at 8:55 a.m. (*for committee meetings*) and reconvened at 1:00 p.m., on December 2, 2004, with all members present except Regent Kirkpatrick.

Father Albert Felice-Pace from UNLV's Interfaith Student Center offered the invocation.

2. Introductions – President Harter introduced UNLV's and System Administration's new General Counsel, Mr. Richard Linstrom. Mr. Linstrom served as chief deputy and assistant solicitor general with the Nevada Attorney General's office.

President Wells introduced Dr. Scott Hauger, Vice President for Government & Business Relations-DRI.

Regent Derby announced that Carson City had started a new magazine, *The Carson Magazine*, which featured an article highlighting WNCC and President Carol Lucey.

3. Chair's Report - Chair Stavros Anthony thanked President Harter and her staff for hosting the Board meeting. He then congratulated Regents Hill, Seastrand, and Sisolak on their re-elections. He welcomed Dr. Rand Key, Special Assistant to the President-CCSN, for filling in for the ailing President Carpenter. Chair Anthony announced that Regent Rosenberg would serve as the new chair of the ARSA Committee and Regent Dondero would serve as chair of the Health Education Task Force. Chair Anthony related that two new Regents would be joining the Board in January 2005: Mrs. Dorothy Gallagher (*Elko*) and Mr. James Dean Leavitt (*Las Vegas*). Regent Gallagher will serve on the Audit and Budget & Finance committees, as well as on the Health Education Task Force. Regent Leavitt will serve on the ARSA and Audit committees. Chair Anthony then honored outgoing Regents Ms. Marcia Bandera and Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick (*Resolutions 04-24 and 04-25 on file in the Board office*). Chair Anthony announced that Chief Executive Officer Suzanne Ernst's evaluation was somewhat overdue and that he and Vice Chair Derby would be contacting Board members for input.

4. Public Comment – Chair Anthony recalled that he and former Chancellor Nichols had previously discussed presenting a State of the System address and that Regent Hill had recently reminded him about this plan. Chair Anthony announced that Chancellor Rogers would be presenting a State of the System address at this time.

Chancellor Rogers announced that his executive secretary, Mrs. Jo Ann Prevetti, had recently adopted a baby boy.

Chancellor Rogers reported that Governor Guinn views education as Nevada's future, rather than gaming or tourism. Chancellor Rogers offered to provide his assessment of higher education in Nevada since assuming the chancellor's position seven months prior. He felt that these observations should be distributed throughout the state in order

4. Public Comment – (Cont'd.)

to inform as many people as possible prior to the start of the legislative session (*on file in the Board office*).

Chancellor Rogers said that he expects all Regents, presidents, and the institutions to work together in a unified effort to realize the promise that higher education holds for the dynamic state of Nevada. He observed that he came to this position with some misconceptions. He had no appreciation for the breadth of impact this System has on every aspect of the state's business and cultural life and how well the institutions have performed their tasks. He said that he believed he had underestimated the effectiveness of the System, especially when considering how under funded it is. He advocated the nobility of raising the achievement standards, goals and aspirations of education in Nevada.

Chancellor Rogers noted that Nevadans want to know that their tax and private dollars are being used to produce a world-class product and are being spent efficiently, effectively, and are managed by people of talent, vision, productivity, and integrity. He reported that many of the hardest working and most dedicated people that he has ever known are working in the UCCSN.

Chancellor Rogers recommended controlling and directing the System's enrollment more effectively to utilize the community colleges and state college where education can be provided more economically. He felt that three projects should be undertaken to make UCCSN more effective and cost efficient:

1. Ask the Legislature to adjust the Millennium Scholarship payout between universities and community colleges so that it is more economically advantageous for Millennium scholars to attend the community colleges.
2. Accelerate the phase-in of higher GPA and class standing requirements for admission to the universities in order to redirect more students to community colleges and the state college.
 - a. Institute a class standing criteria for admission. The universities should not accept students who are not in the top 25% of their high school graduation class.
3. Continue to support Nevada State College and recognize that the state college system must ultimately be expanded.

Chancellor Rogers said he was confident that Nevada State College will become a reality. He felt that a merger of Nevada State College with the Community College of Southern Nevada provided a shortsighted, short-term cost savings with expensive long-term consequences.

Chancellor Rogers noted that the System has repeatedly asked the Legislature to allow the universities to retain the 25% cost recovery on research grants. For Nevada to attain the goal of having first rate research universities, it must provide the incentive to those institutions to be entrepreneurial. He suggested that the Legislature could restrict the use of those funds to renovation and construction of research space.

4. Public Comment – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Rogers stated that the policy for unexpended state funds to be reverted to the state did not promote efficient use of taxpayer dollars. He proposed allowing the institutions to keep unexpended funds, but to require that they be placed in that institution's need-based scholarship fund in an effort to improve Nevada's low college going rate.

Chancellor Rogers observed that appointed boards also have their share of problems. He appreciates that Nevada's Board of Regents answers to the public at large and not to a governor. He felt the Board should set policy and delegate management of the System to the chancellor. He felt that changing the Board from an elected to an appointed one would usurp the power of the electorate to control its higher education destiny. He predicted that an appointed Board would be less effective than the present one. He felt that the proposed constitutional amendment was shortsighted and worthy of being defeated in the next legislative session. He also does not believe that the proposed 4-year terms for Regents creates the institutional memory necessary for good governance. He advocated a process of screening prospective Board appointments similar to that employed by the judicial selection commission.

In discussing the proposed reduction of the Board size, Chancellor Rogers noted that Nevada's Board of Regents is the governing body for all eight institutions of higher learning. He felt that a reduction in Board membership would spread the Regents too thin and would reduce the Regents' ability to respond to the electorate. He implored the Legislature not to create the turmoil in higher education that the proposed constitutional amendments would cause.

The Latino population is the fastest growing segment of the population and the most underrepresented group in the UCCSN. Chancellor Rogers felt the System must be made available to minorities and that they must actively recruit minorities.

Chancellor Rogers said that the entire System must begin a crusade to raise funds to help students who do not have the financial ability to go to college. Nevada's tuition is among the lowest in the nation. However, it makes no difference how low tuition is if the student lacks the source of funds to pay the tuition. Future tuition increases are anticipated. Without providing need-based loans, even more students will be prevented from obtaining a college education.

Word has come from several legislators that, "The System must learn to live within its means." Chancellor Rogers reported that the UCCSN does not squander money and uses its funds very efficiently, and is the greatest over achiever in American education. Only if the System receives adequate funding from the public and private sectors will it be able to grow into a world class higher education system. Productivity of the System is high in spite of some inefficiency. He promised the Legislature that those pockets of inefficiency will be eliminated during his tenure.

Higher education is not growing fast enough to meet the needs of Nevada. The Board, the Legislature, the business leaders, and the people of Nevada must understand and face the infrastructure needs presented by Nevada's tremendous growth. Capital

4. Public Comment – (Cont'd.)

funding availability is estimated to be between \$150 million and \$200 million for the next biennium. The capital budget needs for higher education in Nevada for the next biennium are somewhere between \$300 and \$500 million. The future of the State of Nevada is being placed in jeopardy by inadequate funding of higher education. Chancellor Rogers will propose to the Governor and legislative leaders a new method of obtaining funds for capital projects. He will work with the state's leadership to promote a capital funding and renovation proposal that will meet the needs of the System in the next session and beyond. A goodly portion of capital construction must also come from private funds.

CCSN is the third largest multi-campus community college in the United States with 35,000 students. Over 15,000 of these students are Latinos. Further funds are needed for construction. Chancellor Rogers said he would explore the feasibility of obtaining capital funds from Nevada's cities and counties. Community colleges are designed mostly to benefit the community in which the schools exist. He felt it would be in the best interests of Nevada's counties to supplement the financial needs of the community colleges in their respective counties to support the growth and development of these communities. Chancellor Rogers closed by saying that there is no investment that can be made that will have a more permanent impact on our culture than the investment in higher education.

Regent Alden agreed with every aspect of the chancellor's speech and felt it was incumbent upon the Board Chair to distribute it to as many people in Nevada as possible.

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #6 (*Handbook Revision, Salary Schedule*) and #11 (*Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14*), which were considered separately:

(1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the regular meeting held October 14-15, 2004.

(2) Approved-Chief Counsel Host Account – The Board approved Interim Chancellor Rogers' request for a \$5,000 host account for use of Chief Counsel (*Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office*).

(3) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's recommendation for the formal approval of tenure with hire for Ms. Patricia Iannuzzi, effective February 1, 2005. Ms. Iannuzzi accepted UNLV's offer as Dean of the University Libraries with tenure at the rank of full professor. Additionally, the Libraries' faculty overwhelmingly support Ms. Iannuzzi's tenure with hire. Of course, her offer letter stipulated that her hire with tenure was subject to approval by the Board of Regents (*Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office*).

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

(4) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Request, CCSN – The Board approved President Richard Carpenter's request for the expenditure of capital improvement fee funds for the following projects (*Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office*):

➤ • International Students Program (*Charleston Campus*) \$125,000

➤ • 2nd Floor Upgrade/Improvements in Phase I

(*Cheyenne Campus*) \$50,000

TOTAL: \$175,000

(5) Approved-Capital Improvement Fee Request, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for the expenditure of capital improvement fee funds for the sum of \$621,000 (*Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office*).

➤ • North Las Vegas Master Plan \$350,000

➤ • Student Services Complex

(*Final cost to replace 10-year old carpeting*) 86,000

➤ • Campus-wide asbestos survey 185,000

TOTAL: \$621,000

(7) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws (*Title V, Chapter 6, Chapter I, Section 4.3.4*) to clarify who may vote on tenure applications (Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office).

(8) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws (*Title V, Chapter 6, Chapter I, Section 4.3.6.2*) to establish standards and procedures for mid-tenure review for the campus (Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office).

(9) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws (*Title V, Chapter 6, Chapter I, multiple sections*), which are non-substantive in content (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office).

(10) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws (*Title V, Chapter 6, Chapter II, multiple sections*), which are non-substantive in content (Ref. C-10 on file in the Board office).

(12) Approved-Resolution 04-26, Refunding of 1998 State GO Bonds – The Board approved Director of Banking & Investments Kathleen Payne’s request for a Bond Resolution to refund the 1998 State General Obligation Bonds if and when the savings results in a minimum of 3% present value savings (Ref. C-12 on file in the Board office).

(13) Approved-Instructional Facility Agreement, Elko County School District & GBC – The Board approved President Paul T. Killpatrick’s request for the instructional facility agreement between Great Basin College and Elko County School District to allow GBC to move forward with efforts to provide a facility to show, inspect, and judge agriculture animals (Ref. C-13 on file in the Board office).

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

(14) Approved-Third Amendment to Lease, NSC – The Board approved Interim President Pat Miltenberger’s request for a third amendment to Nevada State College’s original lease agreement extending the lease for ten (10) years with an option to renew for another ten (10) years (Ref. C-14 on file in the Board office).

(15) Approved-Water Well Easement, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey’s request for a permanent easement and a temporary construction easement to Carson City for the construction of a water well to be located on a 2,100-sq. ft. section of the lower parking lot at 2201 West College Parkway, Carson City, Nevada 89703 (*APN 007-091-082*) (Ref. C-15 on file in the Board office).

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

Regent Sisolak requested that Consent Agenda items #6 (*Handbook Revision, Salary Schedule*) and #11 (*Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14*) be considered separately.

Motion amended to exclude Consent Agenda items #6 (*Handbook Revision, Salary Schedule*) and #11 (*Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14*).

Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

(6) Approved-Handbook Revision, Salary Schedule – The Board approved Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson’s request for a correction to the *Board of Regents Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 3, Section 21-1.b)* to reflect Board-approved policy as it relates to the use of salary data for the salary schedules (Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak asked why the 75th percentile was used. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that this was approved 2½ years ago. During the LCB audit, it was noticed that this particular section was not in compliance with the Board policy for using the 75th percentile as the salary schedule median. This change would bring the Handbook into compliance.

Regent Sisolak asked why the 75th percentile was chosen. Regent Derby recalled that it was a policy decision the Board made several years ago.

Mrs. Carla Henson, Director, Human Resources-System Administration, reported that the Board made the decision to adopt the 75th percentile as the midpoint in April 2000 based on data provided by a consultant review and presented by former Vice President, Administration & Finance-UNR, Dr. Ashok Dhingra. She related that it was an oversight that the Handbook was never changed.

(6) Approved-Handbook Revision, Salary Schedule – (Cont'd.)

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning the salary schedule. Regent Dondero seconded. Motion carried. Regent Sisolak voted no. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

(11) Approved-Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14 – The Board approved Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson's request for suggested organizational changes to the *Board of Regents' Handbook (Title IV, Chapters 8 through 14)* with the exception of the section addressing periodic/annual reporting of diversity data (*Title IV, Chapter 8, Page 4*). The proposed revisions remove certain provisions from the *Handbook* and place them into the new *Procedures and Guidelines Manual*. In addition, this revision edits each chapter making clarifying corrections and correcting obvious errors where necessary. During the October Board meeting, members approved the reorganization of Chapters 1 through 7. The reorganization of the final batch of chapters (*Chapters 15 through 20*) will be presented for approval at the February 2005 Board meeting (*Bound Report sent under separate mailing on file in the Board office*).

Relative to Title IV, Chapter 8, Page 4, Regent Sisolak asked whether the minority reporting would be conducted periodically. Senior Research Analyst-System Administration, Ms. Crystal McGee, replied that in revising this particular section of the *Handbook* they reflected current practices. She explained that they had not previously been meeting the mandate set forth in the *Handbook*. She related that periodic reports were the norm. Regent Sisolak asked why the reporting was done periodically as opposed to annually or semi-annually. Mr. Tyler Trevor, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs-System Administration, explained that part of the UCCSN's performance indicators for measuring the master plan incorporated diversity measures. Those measures are presented annually to the Board. Regent Sisolak asked why this report was not presented annually. Mr. Trevor replied that the diversity report is the raw numbers representing seven different categories (*i.e., faculty, staff, and administrators*). It is a very large set of data that was not traditionally presented in a manner that is conducive to reviewing on an annual basis. He said the information is captured in a database and that staff is very responsive to any requests for such information.

Regent Howard agreed that staff had been responsive to some of her requests, but she did not feel that the logic and justification being used to change the policy was very good. She felt it should continue to be reported annually and periodically upon request. Ms. McGee related that this type of review illuminated such issues. She said that the *Handbook* is voluminous, adding that many mandates were not being met. Part of this review is intended to bring such issues to the surface. She asked the Board whether they preferred an annual or a periodic review. Regent Howard said that the Board needs the report annually and periodically when requested. She related that many times when such information is requested it was due to federal guidelines or other issues.

Chair Anthony observed that it was currently indicated as a periodic review. He said the Board could decide that now and asked whether Regent Howard wanted to review the matter further and return with a separate agenda item. Regent Howard said she did not

(11) Approved-Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14 – (Cont'd.)

see a reason for the change. She felt it should continue to be done in the same manner that it had been.

Mr. Trevor related that this information had not been reported to the Board since 2001. A transition occurred in the style and manner in which this data is brought forward (*the performance indicators for the master plan*). He said he would be happy to bring forward the diversity data in any type of form the Board desires. In the past, the information was not displayed or conveyed in a concise manner where anyone was actually using it to make decisions. He offered to work with Regent Howard to do that. Regent Howard said she would like to work with him on that. She stated that the information had been used in her decision making. Mr. Trevor explained that there were many issues with the documents that he reviewed. He felt it was time to take a different approach to displaying that information.

Chair Anthony suggested withdrawing the item to allow Regent Howard to work with Mr. Trevor and bring forward a preferred method for the Board. Regent Howard said that she hoped that other Board members were also concerned. She expressed her appreciation to Regent Sisolak for raising this issue. Chair Anthony said they would withdraw the section addressing annual/periodic reporting or when it is requested.

Regent Sisolak then addressed Title IV, Chapter 10, Page 9-distributions from the endowment fund. He noted that an example was being used from 8 years ago and questioned why the example was not updated. Ms. McGee said she would substitute a more recent example to subsection 3a. Regent Sisolak asked whether the Investment Committee made such adjustments. Chair Anthony asked Ms. McGee to update the example. Regent Sisolak said he also had questions about the 4.5%. Ms. Kathleen Payne, Director, Banking & Investments-System Administration, reported that the Investment Committee had not discussed changing the payout rate. Regent Sisolak asked whether the Investment Committee could make such a change. Ms. Payne replied that it could. She related that this rate

had been in effect since the 1980's. She asked whether he was confusing this with the operating pool payout, which had been changed a number of times. Regent Sisolak acknowledged that he might be. He said that both had been changed once. Ms. Payne replied they had not. She reported that the operating pool payout started at 7.2% and was reduced to 6.2%. It was then reduced to 5.5% and 4.5%. They have maintained the current 3.5% payout rate for the past 1½ years. She explained that the endowment distribution policy had been in effect since late 1980's and had never been changed. She related that the 4.5% was correct, but could be changed.

Regent Sisolak then referred to Title IV, Chapter 10, Page 10-permitted ranges. He questioned the use of "permitted". He said they had deviated from these ranges since the portfolio changed on a daily basis. Ms. Payne replied that the policy mandated that the Investment Committee must keep the investments within these ranges. Regent Sisolak asked about domestic common stock. The strategic allocation is 35%, while the permitted range is 35%-60%. He said they had gone under 35%. Ms. Payne replied they had not. Regent Sisolak asked about considering it on a daily basis. Ms. Payne

(11) Approved-Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14 – (Cont'd.)

agreed that the policy stipulated that they must keep the investments within the permitted ranges, which had been done. She acknowledged that they had come very close. Regent Sisolak questioned whether the strategic allocation on domestic common stock had never gone under 35%. Ms. Payne replied it had not. He asked why the strategic setting would be at the bottom end of the established range. Ms. Payne agreed it was not logical. She said that she had a number of changes that she would like to recommend to the Investment Committee in February. One of them is changing the permitted range in that category. She explained that the Board's policy told the Investment Committee what the permitted ranges are and holds the Committee responsible for setting the strategic allocation within those ranges. She explained that her office reviewed this information regularly. Regent Sisolak said that he had a hard time believing that they never deviated below 35% in the bear market. Ms. Payne said that they had come very close. She agreed that the strategic allocation should be changed.

Assistant Chancellor Larson thanked Regent Sisolak for reading through the material so carefully.

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook reorganization of Title IV, Chapters 8-14 with the exception of the section addressing diversity reporting (*Title IV, Chapter 8, Page 4*). Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

President Ringle introduced TMCC's newly elected Student Body President, Ms. Alanna Stewart-Bell and thanked current Student Body President, Mr. Joel Gutierrez for his service.

Regents Alden and Howard left the meeting.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – The Board approved Presidents Philip M. Ringle's, Stephen G. Wells', and John M. Lilley's requests for the Facilities Master Plans for their respective institutions (Ref. A-TMCC; Ref. B-DRI; Ref. C-UNR and Bound Reports on file in the Board office).

TMCC President Phil Ringle introduced Vice President, Finance & Administration-TMCC, Delores Sanford; Dr. Robert Sabbatini, Sasaki Associates; and Mr. John Hester, Community Development Director, City of Reno, representing Mayor Bob Cashell.

Mr. Hester stated that the UNR, TMCC, and DRI campuses are all significant to the economy and quality of life in Reno. The campuses have been designated as "regional centers" in the City's master plan; areas of highest development priority for the City and County. Once the Board approves these plans, the City will begin incorporating them into the City's master plan. Mr. Hester was pleased that the City was invited to participate and partner with these institutions. He said the City would do what it could to help implement the plans and thanked the Board for the opportunity to offer the City's comments.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

President Ringle reported that the Facilities Master Plan is one part of TMCC's strategic planning effort. The College is engaged in five major planning initiatives (*academic master plan, enrollment management plan, the re-accreditation self study, marketing plan, and facilities master plan*). The master plan is the planning tool that will provide a framework for making sound decisions regarding the College's facilities that will promote the mission, while allowing accommodations for student growth and maintaining a sense of community. The master plan also proposes cooperative development of facilities with the neighboring Desert Research Institute. The plan focuses on the Dandini Campus, although college planning also calls for expansion at other sites. Costs prohibited TMCC from working on all of the areas, so the Dandini Campus was decided as the site upon which to focus. The TMCC community as a whole contributed to the process (*students, faculty, staff, and administrators*). TMCC architecture students are working on building a physical model of the plan. President Ringle highlighted the six TMCC locations and the programs offered at each:

- • Dandini Campus – main campus, academic & occupational programs, administrative functions.

- • Meadowood Center – full-service education center, student support services, Institute for Business & Industry, Institute for Community Services. Captures Hispanic population in Neil Road corridor. ESL student population has grown from 171 students to 2,071 students in ESL, GED, and literacy non-credit programs.
- • TMCC IGT Applied Technology Center – education and training in industrial technologies (*automotive, construction, diesel, electronic, environmental control technology, recreation vehicle, and welding*).
- • TMCC Nell J. Redfield Foundation Performing Arts Center – houses the college’s dance, music and theater programs.
- • The Redfield Center – the 40,000-sq. ft. facility is scheduled to open in 2005 and shares a campus with the University of Nevada, Reno.
- • The Spanish Springs Higher Education Center – the 60,000-sq. ft. facility will serve the fastest growing portion of Washoe County on a gift of four acres.

Planning horizons are traditionally based on ten-year projections. The consultants recommended that horizons be based on enrollment targets, a more realistic way of reviewing space requirements. TMCC will develop its space requirements based on user-determined need and demand rather than on an arbitrary year. The Fall 2003 headcount of 11,797 is projected to be 15,459 in Horizon 1.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

President Ringle reported that the Dandini Campus had 57-assignable square feet per student FTE in Fall 2004. UCCSN guidelines suggest 87-assignable square feet per FTE. The campus is already in need of increasing the amount of facilities given the college’s growth and enrollment, and existing space deficits. TMCC is less than 1,800 FTE and less than 2,300 student headcount away from Horizon 1.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont’d.)

Master Plan Principles:

- • Community – foster a cultural and physical environment for learning, teaching, and social interaction between students, faculty, staff, and the greater community.
- • Access – promote an open and accessible community college using TMCC’s image, physical locations, design, and technical resources to encourage learning and training by users of all ages, races, cultures, and academic levels.
- • Leadership – promote stewardship of the campus land incorporating sustainable techniques in design, building development and maintenance, campus life, and academic programs.
- • Sensitivity – Respect the character of the high desert landscape and maintain the integrated setting of the campus on the hill.

Guidelines and Implementation:

- • Campus on the hill.
- • Framed views.
- • Architectural character.
- • Climate sensitive design.
- • Pedestrian level treatment.
- • Landscape character.

Four new parking structures will be necessary to accommodate the increased enrollment. Parking will be increased to accommodate 3,000 spaces at Horizon 2. One of these parking structures will be shared with DRI.

Horizon 1 will add an additional 380,000-gross sq. ft. and a campus accommodating 12,322 student headcount. One of the first priorities will be to construct a parking structure (*1,095 spaces*). Facilities and Grounds will be relocated to a new site. Horizon 2 will add another 306,000-gsf, accommodating 16,058 student headcount. A new parking structure will be erected (*1,095 spaces*), changes to pedestrian pathways will be made, as well as changes to the entry and drop-off points on campus.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Chair Anthony left the meeting.

President Ringle reported that Citifare bus service will continue to have a drop-off location off of Dandini Blvd., located more centrally within the campus. Emergency vehicles will also be able to access all campus areas. President Ringle thanked Sasaki Associates for incorporating campus suggestions and Vice President Sanford and the committee members for their efforts. He also thanked President Wells and his DRI staff for being good neighbors. He said it had been a successful master planning process.

Regent Seastrand said that he liked what he saw and complimented the effort.

Regent Rosenberg observed that the plans made it look like a real campus.

Chair Anthony entered the meeting.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

DRI President Stephen Wells thanked the participants of the master planning committee; the City of Reno; Chip Maxfield, Clark County Board of Commissioners; Mayor Bob Cashell; Sasaki Associates; President Ringle and TMCC colleagues.

President Wells highlighted the Reno and Las Vegas campuses. He reported that the facilities master planning process analyzed existing and projected facilities needs to develop long-range plans for responsible and efficient growth at each campus.

Regent Sisolak left the meeting.

The process involved an extensive analysis of existing conditions, participation by faculty, staff, and students, and consensus on master plan principles. Past trends support long-term growth. New opportunities exist in interdisciplinary science. Potential directions include increasing the number of faculty, diversifying, and developing new and enhanced partnerships and collaborations.

New initiatives:

- • Homeland Security.
- • Nonproliferation.
- • Environmental Visualization.
- • Environmental Restoration.
- • Life in Extreme Environments.
- • Federal-Land Stewardship (*DoD*).
- • Renewable Energy.
- • Environmental Modeling.
- • Environmental Hazards.

Facilities Expansion:

- • Existing gross square footage of both campuses is approximately 203,000-sq. ft.
- • Current program need is approximately 260,000-gsf, excluding leased space.
- • Projected facilities need 780,000-gsf based on tripling current need.
- • Additional land required to realize the goal in Las Vegas.

Design Principles:

- • Foster connections.
- • Honor campus settings.
- • Create flexibility.
- • Embrace efficiency and stewardship.
- • Enhance access.
- • Create a campus heart.
- • Make memorable places.

Plan Summary:

Reno Campus Horizon 1 -

- • 299,000-gsf (*371 spaces*).
- • Facility for data visualization.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

- • DRI-TMCC multipurpose center.
- • NNSC phase II.
- • Field operations phase II.

Reno Campus Horizon 2 -

- • 406,400-gsf (*526 spaces*).
- • Structured parking.
- • North building.
- • East building.
- • South building.

Las Vegas Campus Horizon 1 -

- • 178,000-gsf (*359 spaces*).

- • Phase III building.
- Las Vegas Campus Horizon 2 -
- • 230,000-gsf (472 spaces).
 - • Structured parking.
 - • Phase IVa.
 - • Phase IVb.
 - • Phase V.
 - • Museum addition.

Chair Anthony left the meeting.

Next steps include following the facilities master plan:

- • Construct Maxey Science Center addition.
- • Secure funding for visualization laboratory (*CAVE*).
- • Populate the Research Park.
- • Complete critical planning.
- • Identify and acquire second Las Vegas campus.

Regent Dondero asked about developing open spaces. President Wells replied that they wanted to honor and preserve some of the natural features. He suggested a botanical garden, a natural open space, or demonstration space for irrigation and xeri-scaping.

Regent Bandera asked about the potential for finding additional property in close proximity to the existing Las Vegas Campus. President Wells replied that they were exploring opportunities. He said they had discussed the north campus with UNLV. There may be other opportunities with other campuses. Immediate proximity is zero. DRI has committed to not building on every square foot of the property in order to maintain some of its natural beauty.

UNR President John M. Lilley thanked Mayor Bob Cashell, the master planning committee, faculty, staff, students, and friends who contributed to the plan. He then introduced UNR Provost John Frederick.

Regents Howard and Sisolak entered the meeting.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

Provost Frederick reported that UNR's comprehensive master plan sets a bold and creative vision for the university. He thanked Dr. Robert Sabbatini, Sasaki Associates for leading the process. The master plan addresses the 860-acre area bounded by North Sierra Street on the west, Interstate 80 on the south, Sutro Street on the east, and North McCarran Boulevard on the north. It is encompassed in a city planning district designated for higher density, transit-oriented development. The plan boundary outlines a region of cooperative planning and partnership between the University and the City of Reno.

Provost Frederick stated that the planning process had encompassed a 2½ year period, involving students, faculty, staff, neighbors, the City of Reno, and the University planning council. He said they were very thankful for the role that the City played in the planning process. Three stages of projected growth in the near future have been identified as Horizons 1, 2, and 3. As with TMCC, the horizons will be determined by when the institution achieves certain enrollment sizes. Projections indicate enrollment will grow by 45% over the next 8-10 years. Horizon 1 will accommodate 16,000 FTE and is expected to be reached between 2012 and 2016. Horizons 2 and 3 correlate to an unspecified time in the future when the University reaches a 24,000 and 30,000 FTE student count respectively. Within the next few years, almost one-third of UNR's space will be 45-years old or older, the age at which the State Public Works Board recommends razing or remodeling. Most science labs are 20-years old or older, predating most current regulations for the Environmental Protection Agency and OSHA.

Program Demand:

- • Academic.
- • Research.
- • Athletic, Recreation, and Physical Education Facilities.
- • Residential – plans anticipate a goal for 50% of students living within the campus boundary, in addition to 25% of the faculty.
- • Auxiliary.

Campus Comparisons – Horizon 2 (860 acres):

- • University of Colorado, Boulder – 24,700 FTE.
- • University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill – 24,300 FTE
- • University of Utah – 23,420 FTE.
- • University of Virginia – 20,320 FTE.

Planning Principles:

- • Compact campus - 10-minute walking distance between classes.
- • Formal academic quadrangles and streets.
- • Integrated open space network.
- • Pedestrian orientation.
- • Places for interaction.
- • Campus gateways.
- • Responsiveness to the environment – sustainable development, alternative energy sources.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

Provost Frederick reported that traffic, pedestrian, and shuttle patterns would allow for efficient occupation of existing space. The University is also mindful of the front it presents to the City.

- • Evans Road and East Campus Mall – a new open space mall connects the mid-campus with the east campus, creating an important north-south spine on campus and convenient access to rapid transit and campus shuttle systems.
- • Extend Enterprise Road to North Virginia Street – create access point for all health science programs.
- • Irrigation Channel and Evans Creek – incorporate as featured elements on campus near the Knowledge Center and student union.

Provost Frederick reviewed UNR's land use by buildings (*academic and research, affiliated research, common facilities, athletics, residential, physical plant, parking structure, non-UNR, and retail*). The eastward expansion accommodates existing railroad lines and how to make use of existing terrain.

Residential Uses :

- • A variety of housing types is required to meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff. It relies on housing provided by both the University and the private sector. The master plan targets 40% of the student FTE and 25% of faculty and staff to reside within the university regional center. The master plan provides for residence halls, suites, apartments, and single-family housing, locating residential suites and residence halls for lower division students, many with dining facilities, near academic quadrangles.

Vehicular Circulation:

- • Shuttle access only on campus.
- • Vehicular traffic funneled to Sierra Street, Virginia Street, Evans Avenue, Valley Road, Sutro Street, and Wells Avenue. This circulation pattern will allow parking structures to be placed so as not to intrude with the academic center of the campus, providing easy access off of main thoroughfares.
- • The City of Reno and RTC are installing a bus rapid transit line that will service Virginia Street. Several terminals will be located around the campus and as far south as the Redfield campus.

Campus Districts – include south campus, mid-campus, east campus, agricultural sciences campus, health sciences campus, and athletic and recreation campus. The building design will integrate new construction with existing terrain and environment. It will maximize the reuse of existing buildings and infrastructure and employ passive heating and cooling systems and user operable windows to provide thermal comfort. It will incorporate solar panels into the building design and employ day-lighting and use automatic timers for lights. The plan will ensure adequate natural ventilation; prohibit indoor smoking, and smoking near building entrances.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

Horizon 1 (16,000 student FTE):

- • Widen Evans Avenue to a four-lane boulevard and relocate it eastward from its current location in the southern portion of the campus, requiring the acquisition and removal of existing houses in the area.
- • Create a new gateway open space between 8th and 9th Streets in the southern part of the campus, requiring the acquisition and removal of existing housing and commercial entities in the area.
- • Create a new gateway entrance at 15th Street, consisting of improved landscape, signage, and a small visitor information building.
- • Complete the mid-campus, including the Student Center, Knowledge Center, and new campus quadrangle.
- • Relocate Enterprise Road and configure as a four-lane boulevard to organize expanding medical needs.
- • Construct at-grade railroad crossing when allowed by railroad policy.

Horizon 2 (24,000 student FTE):

- • Create the western half of the new east campus, including new buildings and new mall.
- • Construct new buildings at the agricultural sciences campus.
- • Expand private research affiliates.
- • Construct new university and/or private sector residential development.
- • Improve North Wells Avenue to a four-lane boulevard, including bike lanes.
- • Widen selected sections of Highland Avenue to a four-lane boulevard.
- • Improve selected sections of Valley Road, including bike lanes.

Horizon 3 (30,000 student FTE):

- • Complete the east campus, including new buildings and new mall.
- • Complete the agricultural sciences campus.
- • Construct a new 20,000-seat arena with center parking lot available for outdoor events.
- • Renovate and expand existing residential area as affordable housing for faculty and staff.
- • Complete Highland Avenue as a four-lane boulevard.
- • Construct pedestrian bridge crossing Interstate 80 (*City of Reno initiative*).

Regent Alden observed that the plans included garages. He said he had never approved any plan with a garage because he does not believe in them. He noted that other institutions locate their parking on the campus perimeter and shuttle the students into campus. He said he would be voting no symbolically because he believed that parking must be on the perimeter except for emergencies.

Chair Anthony entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak said he was a little concerned or troubled about the property acquisition maps, feeling that they could fuel price increases. He felt that they were driving up some of the prices with notification of perspective land acquisitions. Provost Frederick acknowledged that it was a good point, adding that UNR was already experiencing that.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak felt that more conversation only encouraged sellers to increase their prices.

Regent Dondero moved approval of the facilities master plans for TMCC, DRI, and UNR as presented. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

The meeting recessed at 3:25 p.m. and reconvened at 3:45 p.m., on Thursday, December 2, 2004, with all members present except Regent Kirkpatrick.

7. Approved-10-Year/No-Cost Elko Clinic Property Lease, GBC – The Board approved President Paul T. Killpatrick's request for a ten-year, no-cost lease of the Elko Clinic property located at 762 14th Street in Elko, Nevada (Ref. D on file in the Board office).

President Killpatrick reported that this effort had taken slightly over a year to bring to fruition. It has been a collaborative effort between GBC, the Northern Nevada Regional Hospital, Elko County, and the Elko community. He introduced Mr. Carl Diekhans, Vice President, Finance & Administrative Services-GBC, and Mr. Cash Minor, Chief Financial Officer, Elko County.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Mr. Diekhans reported that a bill was introduced in the previous legislative session providing \$250,000 for Great Basin College to establish an oral clinic. This project brought the Miles for Smiles program to rural Nevada. The program provides pediatric dental care for children who cannot obtain it or who would otherwise not be able to afford dental care. A second bus will soon be provided. The \$250,000 appropriation was used to establish a five-chair dental clinic that was to be located on the GBC campus. Simultaneously, GBC was asked to double its nursing program, which required more lab space in existing classrooms. This resulted in a shortage of classroom space. The college needed to find space to accommodate the expanded nursing programs, as well as for the oral clinic. Following conversations with AHEC and the UNLV dental school, twenty-four dentists will begin performing their rural rotation in the clinic this Spring. Northern Nevada Regional Hospital agreed to provide space for the clinic at no cost to GBC. Mr. Diekhans noted a correction to the documentation. Originally, GBC thought they would be getting the main floor and the basement (34,000-sq. ft.). However, the lease covers only the main floor (17,000-sq. ft.) because the hospital did not realize that GBC would use the basement. The fiscal impact statement must be modified to \$73,000/year to provide janitorial services, janitorial equipment, and utilities. Each agency working with GBC will provide their own equipment, staff salaries, and operating funds. GBC will return at a future date with a request for the basement space, which will provide laboratory space for the nursing program.

Mr. Cash Minor, Chief Financial Officer, Elko County, reported that the potential lease of this building had generated a community-based partnership with the goal of serving

7. Approved-10-Year/No-Cost Elko Clinic Property Lease, GBC – (Cont'd.)

northeastern Nevada with potential health care, a training center, a primary care medical clinic, Miles for Smiles, and a Veteran's Administration community-based outpatient clinic. The partnership is a collaborative effort between GBC, Northeastern Nevada Regional Medical Hospital, the University of Nevada School of Medicine, Miles for Smiles, Nevada Health Centers, the State of Nevada Department of Veteran Affairs, various veteran's associations, and Elko County. During strategic planning sessions, GBC identified the need for expanding the BSN program, as well as future goals related to training programs for radiology technology, medical students, a rural training track for family medicine, a rural training site for nursing and dental students and resident physicians. Conversations have been held with AHEC regarding expanding the rotation of residencies for the medical school. Elko County recognized the severe need in the community for a primary care clinic to serve the regional population of underserved, uninsured, and the Medicare/Medicaid eligible population. Currently, the local medical community is only accepting limited appointments due to delays with reimbursements from the Medicare/Medicaid programs. The County partnered with Nevada Medical Centers to open a primary care facility in Elko. Elko County promised a three-year funding commitment of \$362,000. The intention is to house the facility in the Elko Clinic property, should the Board approve the lease. Elko County also has responsibility for indigent care costs as well as a private hospital facility. The Miles for Smiles program is currently operating via a mobile unit. They plan to expand their services by adding a permanent facility. The community-based partnership also approached the Veteran's Administration in Salt Lake City about potentially placing a community-based outpatient clinic for veterans in the area. Mr. Minor said that Elko County feels that this is an excellent opportunity to serve rural health care needs in rural Nevada. Nevada's congressional delegation has also indicated positive support for the project. The community-based partnership also approached the mining industry in Elko County to provide funding for the initial construction/remodel. An appropriation will also be requested from the congressional level to provide a complete facelift to the building. On behalf of Elko County, Mr. Minor respectfully requested that the Board approve the request for the lease of the Elko Clinic property with the goal of establishing a unique and possible future model for health care center operations in rural areas.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the 10-year, no-cost lease of the Elko Clinic property for GBC. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the property had been inspected, noting that the Board would be responsible for all maintenance items listed in the lease under subsection 6. Mr. Diekhans replied that it had been inspected. GBC brought in a Public Works inspector and a local architect. There is no noticeable asbestos. All of the pipe wrap was fiberglass and not asbestos. The floor tiles are not of the type that use to contain asbestos. The preliminary inspection indicated there was not an asbestos problem. GBC's mechanical people have also checked the mechanical systems. The facility was formerly fully operational. When Providence Hospital built a new hospital, several doctors at the Elko Clinic joined the new clinic, thus vacating the building. Providence

7. Approved-10-Year/No-Cost Elko Clinic Property Lease, GBC – (Cont'd.)

would not allow anyone to open the building as another clinic to compete against them. They view this effort as a partnership with them to address some of the problems that they are unable to handle.

Regent Sisolak asked about the age of the air conditioning system. Mr. Diekhans replied that it varies, adding that some of it had been refurbished. He estimated there was nothing over 20 years old, adding that it was functioning. Regent Sisolak said he thought it was a great program. His concern related to assuming the lease and encountering a \$200,000 bill to replace old equipment. Regent Sisolak asked whether qualified inspectors had verified there are currently no problems. Mr. Diekhans replied that they had. He related that some modifications were necessary to the sprinkler system (*estimated \$50,000*), which will be prorated amongst the partners. Miles for Smiles already has the money to take care of their portion. The college's share will be approximately \$28,000, which can be covered by capital improvement funds. The county will also share a portion. If the veteran's clinic is added, they will also share a portion of the costs, further reducing the state's responsibility. Regent Sisolak established that the collaborating entities would share in the cost of maintenance, utilities, and major expenditures. Mr. Diekhans agreed that they would.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

8. Approved-Naming of Atomic Testing Museum Gallery, DRI – The Board approved, on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Nevada Test Site Historical Foundation (*NTSHF*), President Stephen G. Wells' request to name a gallery of the new Atomic Testing Museum, located in the Frank H. Rogers Science & Technology Building, the "Harry Reid Exhibit Hall." This request is made pursuant to the *Board of Regents Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 23 (3) (a)-(d) (Ref. E on file in the Board office)*.

Regent Seastrand moved approval of naming a gallery in the new Atomic Testing Museum, located in the Frank H. Rogers Science & technology Building, the "Harry Reid Exhibit Hall." Regent Hill seconded.

Regent Sisolak said that he has the utmost respect and admiration for Senator Reid. He noted that the Board had established a policy for not naming buildings after sitting politicians. President Wells replied that DRI was requesting an exception, adding that it was a little complicated because it is actually leased property in DRI's building. The request is based on the NTS Historical Society's need to honor Senator Reid. Regent Sisolak observed that each institution was granted one exception and that those exceptions had been exhausted. He was concerned that granting this exception would cause other presidents to request another exception.

Mr. Troy Wade, President, NTSHF, reported they had planned to honor people who made significant donations or contributions to the museum. He noted that \$1.5 million came from senate appropriations made by Senator Reid. Without Senator Reid's

8. Approved-Naming of Atomic Testing Museum Gallery, DRI – (Cont'd.)

financial and moral support the museum would never have been created. While he understood the Board's policy, he noted there is a provision in the state regulation for a waiver. He observed that these are unusual circumstances. The proposed gallery is located in a UCCSN building. The space is leased and paid for by the federal government for the next 20 years. He respectfully requested the Board consider a waiver to name the gallery after Senator Reid.

Regent Rosenberg said that he understood Regent Sisolak's concerns. He observed that this is leased space. The lessee is asking to name the gallery after Senator Reid. Regent Rosenberg felt that he could support such a request.

Regent Sisolak asked why the Board would need to approve a lessee naming their space, adding that they could call it anything they desired. Assistant Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen replied that this is a UCCSN building, which is paid for through rental receipts received from the lessee over a 20-year period. Ultimately it is a DRI/Board of Regents building, so it entailed the naming of space within one of UCCSN's buildings. She observed that the policy for naming buildings allowed for Board waivers of those limitations.

Interim Chancellor Rogers stated that he had been involved with this building from the beginning. The building itself is named for his father due to a \$3 million commitment from the family. He felt there should be an exception to the rule in this case because Senator Reid is an exceptional senator and his strength and power are phenomenal. Chancellor Rogers felt that Senator Reid had really come through for the state. While he understood Regent Sisolak's concerns, he favored the request.

Regent Schofield said he did not recall voting for anything like the limitation discussed, adding that he would vote against it if they were voting for it now. He observed that Senator Reid had gone out of his way to help UCCSN and many others and indicated his support for the motion.

Regent Howard stated that she could appreciate the chancellor's remarks and that she felt the same way. When this policy was put in place, she supported it. As the chancellor has indicated, if there is any time for the Board to waive the policy this would be the opportunity because Senator Reid is more than just a sitting politician. Regent Howard said that she knew how passionately Mr. Wade and the NTSHF felt about Senator Reid's assistance. Regent Howard indicated her support for the motion in spite of the fact that she did not favor naming things after sitting politicians. She felt that Senator Reid is deserving of this honor and that it would be in the System's best interest to name the gallery in his honor.

Regent Dondero said that it would be an honor for her to approve the request. She felt that it was the right thing to do, noting that Senator Reid has done a lot for the state.

Regent Sisolak clarified that none of his comments were intended to denigrate what Senator Reid has done. He suggested providing another exception to each of the presidents.

8. Approved-Naming of Atomic Testing Museum Gallery, DRI – (Cont'd.)

Motion carried. Regent Sisolak abstained. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

9. Approved-Sale of Real Property in Stead, Nevada, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request to sell real property parcel #86-154-09 for \$9,538,000 and parcel #86-143-06 for \$1,733,252 located in Stead, Nevada. The sale is consistent with the Stead land disposition plan approved by the Board at the September 1999 meeting (Ref. F on file in the Board office).

President Lilley reported that the sale would provide working capital to acquire property listed elsewhere in the agenda.

Regent Hill moved approval of the sale of real property in Stead, Nevada for UNR. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak recalled that concern had been expressed about married student housing when the property was originally sold. He asked what had been done for married student housing. Mr. Ron Zurek, Vice President Finance and Administration-UNR, replied that there were a certain number of apartments that were included with the Stead Apartments that were designated married student housing and were affected. A transition plan was developed to vacate the residents. He reported that UNR has not eliminated married student housing on the campus (*University Village*).

Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, GSA Student Body President-UNR, reported that the graduate association was currently in the assessment stage regarding married student housing. An online survey is being conducted to assess the need and to consider alternatives for meeting those needs. Regent Sisolak asked how many units were lost when the property was sold. Mr. Zurek replied there were 10

married student apartments in the Stead complex. Regent Sisolak thought that a commitment had been made to replace those units. Mr. Zurek said he could not say that they had been specifically replaced. UNR meets on a regular basis with developers for both undergraduate and graduate student housing. The problem remains that they require a cost basis and will need to charge a rate that will amortize the project. To date, they have not been able to make the numbers. Regent Sisolak suggested that a portion of the sale of this property could be put towards that effort. He said that he wanted more married student housing.

Regent Bandera clarified that Ms. Muehlberg had just stated that they are in the process of reviewing options and planning for adult and married student housing on university facilities/campus. She related that UNR had not given up the notion for adding, renovating, expanding, increasing, or putting more married and adult housing within the university facilities and property. Mr. Zurek agreed they had not. He observed that the Board had been approving the acquisition of single-family residences around the campus. UNR's graduate and married students have first bid on those properties. The master plan also includes several precincts for future housing, which also includes graduate and married student housing. Regent Bandera asked how many units had been made available to married or adult students on a first-come, first-served basis. Mr. Zurek replied that

9. Approved-Sale of Real Property in Stead, Nevada, UNR – (Cont'd.)

they had not been able to replace all ten of the units lost at Stead. He estimated between five and seven units had been made available. Regent Bandera observed that progress had been made on replacing the lost units and that planning was underway for a larger scale of facilities.

Regent Rosenberg noted that a number of the students found places at Wolf Run and at the new complex recently built on the hill. It costs less to live there (*no commute*) and it is a better neighborhood. He said that all of the students that had been displaced that he was aware of had found new residences. He was more concerned with the new married student housing on campus because the space is required for other projects. He asked whether there were plans to eliminate that space. Mr. Zurek replied there was not.

Regent Howard asked about academic housing mentioned in the master plan for faculty to live on campus. President Lilley replied that the campus master plan included more housing for undergraduates and graduates, as well as space for faculty housing due to soaring housing costs. Regent Howard felt this was a great idea. She said she had not heard anything about married housing, which was also needed. President Lilley agreed. Vice President Zurek related that it included affordable housing for students and faculty.

Regent Sisolak observed that the issue first arose over five years ago when the graduate students approached the Board. While they have chipped away at the housing deficit, he did not want to lose sight of the Board's commitment. He said that he wanted all ten units replaced as soon as possible. President Lilley replied that with the working capital provided by this sale they would be able to buy many more houses and have many more opportunities to more than chip away at the housing deficit.

Regent Seastrand observed that they were selling some of the Stead property, which was where the Fire Science Academy used to be located. President Lilley clarified that it was near this location. Regent Seastrand suggested using some of the sale proceeds to pay off some of the money owed on the Fire Science Academy, which would lower the student burden. President Lilley replied that they anticipate having to spend \$175 million long-term to acquire all of the property. They must have working capital to get started. The campus is currently literally out of space. If they are unable to acquire property nearby, they will never be able to implement the planning. Regent Seastrand asked whether it made sense to try to reduce the liability and someday pay it off completely. He observed that student fees could be raised again to help pay for property acquisition. He felt that students would be even more excited about buying property on campus. He asked President Lilley to consider it.

Mr. Zurek stated that UNR had received offers and acceptances that have been signed off. They have the 5% cash deposit. Both buyers are in a period of due diligence. The north valleys continue to have issues with water service. Part of the due diligence includes working with the county and Truckee Meadows Water Authority to discuss these issues.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

10. Approved-Acquisition of Real Property, 920 Evans Avenue, Reno, Nevada, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request to purchase real property (*single-family residence*) located at 920 Evans Avenue, Reno, Nevada for the purchase price of \$260,000 (Ref. G on file in the Board office).

Regent Hill moved approval of the acquisition of real property located at 920 Evans Avenue in Reno, Nevada for UNR. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether Anthony Wren was always used for the appraisals. Mr. Zurek replied that he conducted the appraisals for the three properties on this agenda, but he is not used on all properties. They use a list of certified appraisers. Quite often it is the appraiser's availability that determines who conducts the appraisal.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the offer was made prior to conducting an appraisal or vice versa. Mr. Zurek replied that they retain the appraisal first. Regent Sisolak asked whether the appraisal came first on the Stead property. Mr. Zurek replied that it did. They had the appraised values for all ten parcels. Regent Sisolak questioned that the buyer's offer was significantly over the appraisal. Mr. Zurek agreed that it was. Once the appraisals are retained a sealed public bid process is initiated. Regent Sisolak asked how the acquisition of the two houses was initiated. Mr. Zurek replied that the owners approached UNR. A property appraisal was conducted and an offer was tendered. Regent Sisolak asked whether they always offered appraised value. Mr. Zurek replied that they had on the last several properties. It is very difficult in this market to get these properties at a discount.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

11. Approved-Acquisition of Real Property, 829 Lake Street, Reno, Nevada, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request to purchase real property (*multi-occupancy rooming house*) located at 829 Lake Street, Reno, Nevada for the purchase price of \$450,000 (Ref. H on file in the Board office).

Regent Hill moved approval of the acquisition of real property located at 829 Lake Street in Reno, Nevada for UNR. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

12. Approved-Design, Fundraising, & Construction for Carson Campus Athletic Fields, WNCC – The Board approved President Carol A. Lucey's request to begin the design, fundraising, and construction of athletic fields at the Carson City campus of Western Nevada Community College (Ref. L on file in the Board office).

President Lucey reported the college would offer baseball and women's soccer.

12. Approved-Design, Fundraising, & Construction for Carson Campus Athletic Fields, WNCC – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the design, fundraising, and construction for Carson Campus athletic fields for WNCC. Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Hill asked whether President Lucey would be committing funds prior to having the birds in hand. President Lucey replied she would not.

Regent Sisolak said that he had spoken with CCSN's athletic director, who expressed the extreme difficulty with raising sufficient funds to support the program. Regent Sisolak observed that CCSN's baseball program had one donor and that it was virtually impossible to raise the necessary funds. Should that donor go away, so too would the program. He said it sounded good in theory. He was concerned what would happen if events were to occur at WNCC similar to that at CCSN (*i.e., basketball*). President Lucey clarified that they were not discussing an operating budget, but rather the facilities. She related that WNCC has use agreements with the City and the school district to use facilities. She observed that one discovers many things they did not previously know after hiring a coach. The baseball field in town will need some renovation in order to qualify for college games. She said they would address the matter if necessary, but she would rather spend the money on the campus and build their own facility using Foundation funds. The City is helping with the soccer field. The Board previously approved a transfer of property for flood mitigation on the Carson campus. The City is scooping out the sandpit to create a natural soccer field. Most of the expensive work will be done when this project is completed. The baseball field will need to be acquired with private funds. They have an idea for a funding source. She requested permission to perform the design, fundraising and construct work.

Regent Sisolak said he was concerned and supportive of these programs. He surmised that other presidents will come forward with requests to start other sporting programs. He thought the Board should have a policy that deals with this. Chancellor Rogers said they had been working on that at CCSN. He said it was very troubling when public funds would be lost and buildings could not be built. He hoped they would decide upon an absolute rule that if a donor wants to come in and have their own basketball or baseball program that it is fine with the Board. He said it was difficult when talking about subsidizing those programs with tuition and fees. He said he would really like to respond, possibly at the next meeting, and see if the Board can adopt a comprehensive and consistent policy.

Regent Derby said she would not want to delay WNCC's intention for moving forward with this. The intent with the rodeo program was to encourage more traditional students to remain in the area and become full-time students at the college. It has been found that it does serve that purpose. She said these types of programs help recruit students, particularly full-time students, in an important way. She supported and applauded WNCC's efforts in this direction. She noted that this had been in their plans for some time.

12. Approved-Design, Fundraising, & Construction for Carson Campus Athletic Fields, WNCC – (Cont'd.)

Regent Howard said she had a problem with approving something before the dollars are committed to it. She asked what would

happen if the Board approved the program and the funds were not raised. She asked who would foot the bill. President Lucey said she had no intention to build anything until she had the funds. She said she would like to be able to design and consult with potential donors. Regent Howard asked why the request was not for the design and fundraising and return later with a request for permission to construct. President Lucey clarified her understanding of Regent Howard's concerns. She observed that Regent Howard was concerned that WNCC would end up having part of the project unfunded with construction already started. Regent Howard said that the Board has approved things in the past that it did not have money with which to follow up. She said she was concerned about the Board approving things before the funds have been identified.

Regent Rosenberg related that it was almost impossible to raise money unless you can assure the donor that the project will be built. He asked President Lucey for her personal assurance that nothing will be built until all of the money is in hand. President Lucey agreed to do so. She reminded the Board that they built the observatory under these terms.

Regent Seastrand asked whether the Board would have an opportunity to approve the design. President Lucey replied that she would like to have a team playing on the field by next August. She was concerned about bringing the request forward in multiple sections. She related that the baseball and soccer fields are fairly simple projects, which are described in the college master plan that the Board approved a few years ago. Regent Seastrand asked whether there would be any buildings included. President Lucey replied that they would eventually build buildings because the fields are near footprints for future buildings, which the Board would need to approve. Regent Seastrand established that the request did not include any buildings and comprised just the fields. He said he could live with that.

Regent Howard asked whether WNCC had any commitments for this project already. President Lucey replied that they believed that they would have some donors who would be receptive to this project. Regent Howard asked how WNCC expected to pay the coaches and others required to maintain a sports team and the source of such funding. President Lucey replied that the money would be provided by the Foundation. She said they would need to raise an operating budget every year just as they do for the rodeo team. Regent Howard asked whether the Foundation had already committed to that and had earmarked the funds for that particular project. President Lucey replied that they had.

Regent Sisolak asked how much operating funds would be required. President Lucey replied it was approximately \$75,000 for each sport. Regent Sisolak asked what they would do if they could not raise the money. He again mentioned CCSN's one donor. President Lucey replied that in such a case they would need to do the same thing that CCSN did, which was to discontinue the program. She related that the college had done this successfully for the past three years with the rodeo program. If in a given year they

12. Approved-Design, Fundraising, & Construction for Carson Campus Athletic Fields, WNCC – (Cont'd.)

are unable to raise the funds, they will not have a team. She said that was the problem with running community college athletics with operating budgets which are funded by philanthropy and that it was the only way to accomplish this. Regent Sisolak questioned the theory that such programs increase student participation and enrollment. President Lucey replied that it was amazing how much interest there is on the part of students and the community. Regent Sisolak felt the same way about CCSN's baseball program, though the games were not well attended. He did not want to be in a position where they have to discontinue a program once it has been started. President Lucey said she did not know any other way to do it. Regent Sisolak suggested raising the funds and endowing the operating budget. President Lucey replied that would be wonderful if they could find someone to endow the two teams.

Regent Schofield observed that athletics is a great way to build morale. He felt the Board should allow President Lucey to do what she has proposed and that they should support her.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

13. Information Only-Personnel Session, President Paul Killpatrick – The Board held a personnel session concerning President Paul Killpatrick.

13.1 Approved-Moving to Closed Session – The Board approved moving to a closed personnel session regarding President Paul Killpatrick, in compliance with and for the purposes set forth in NRS 241.030 (*"closed meeting to consider character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or physical or mental health"*).

Regent Derby moved approval of moving to a closed personnel session. Regent Hill seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

The meeting recessed at 4:42 p.m. on Thursday, December 2, 2004, (*for a closed session*) and reconvened at 5:53 p.m. on Thursday, December 2, 2004, with all members present except Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick.

13.2 Information Only-Return to Open Session – The Board returned to open session.

The meeting then recessed for the evening at 5:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:04 a.m., on Friday, December 3, 2004 with all members present except Regents Kirkpatrick, Schofield, Sisolak, and Whipple.

Chair Anthony reminded those present that the Board would begin conducting one-day meetings on Friday in February 2005. He explained that the standing committees must meet prior to the Board meeting date and that the committee chairs were responsible for scheduling those meetings. An agenda item will be included on February's agenda to allow the Board to reconsider the meeting schedule. If one-day meetings are not feasible, the Board will return to a two-day meeting cycle.

Regent Alden asked the Board Chair and Vice Chair, the chancellor, and legal counsel to carefully review the agenda items to determine which items can be included on the Consent agenda. Chair Anthony agreed to do so.

Chair Anthony explained that the Board would accept the Board Development Committee report and entertain its first discussion about the relationship between the chancellor, the Board, and the presidents. Specifically, the Board would discuss the chancellor's role in the contract regarding discipline and contract termination. Since this could entail a Bylaw change, this would constitute the first reading of the request. Following this discussion, a Bylaw change will be drafted and brought forward to the Board for action (*likely at the February meeting*).

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Thalia Dondero reported the Board Development Committee met November 3, 2004 and recommended that the Regent orientation be held on December 16th at 1:00 p.m. with all Regents requested to attend. The Committee continued to review the proposed addendum to presidential contracts, which includes a mechanism for disciplining short of termination. The Committee asked to review it again at their December 1, 2004 meeting. The Committee then continued its discussion on Chancellor/Board relationships. Regent Derby submitted substitute language for consideration. Regent Rosenberg suggested substituting the word "discipline" for "terminate." The Committee agreed to recommend bringing the issue to the full Board in December with the reference material.

The Committee also met on December 1, 2004, with all Committee members present in addition to Regent Alden. The Committee set dates for new Regent orientation on December 16, 2004 and for a Board workshop on March 10, 2005. The Committee reviewed proposals for changes to the Regents' Bylaws dealing with the role of the chancellor and the discipline of presidents, and also reviewed a proposed standard addendum to presidential contracts dealing with discipline. The Committee noted that there was overlap between the two documents and directed counsel to prepare a proposed Bylaw change, which incorporated the provisions of the contract addendum into the Bylaws thereby delegating the power to discipline presidents to the chancellor. The Committee directed counsel in preparing the Bylaw change that the decision of the chancellor to terminate a president under the serious circumstances set forth should be final. With this change, the Committee approved sending the proposed Bylaw change to the full Board. The Chair noted that this referral to the Board would constitute notice of intent to change the Regents' Bylaws, which could be discussed at the next meeting, but which could not be voted upon until the next succeeding meeting. Copies of the Committee's proposed Bylaw change were provided to each Board member. Regent Dondero noted that the provisions of the Bylaw change are the identical provisions of the contract addendum, which all Board members received as Reference I in the agenda packet, with the changes she mentioned.

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Dondero moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report, understanding that the Bylaw change is forwarded to the Board not for acceptance at this time but for review, discussion, and to give notice of a proposed change to the Bylaws which can be acted upon at the next Board meeting. Regent Alden seconded.

Chair Anthony referred to a handout regarding the Bylaws of the Board of Regents (*on file in the Board office*).

Regent Alden referred to a 2003 LCB position paper that discussed higher education governance in the state.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Regent Alden reported that the position paper referred to a 1917 report on higher education governance. At that time there was only one institution of higher learning in Nevada. The issue addressed in that paper warned about the meaning of higher education governance, and constituted the same issue under discussion that day. He read two paragraphs from Background Paper 03-05, background information education governance that was published by the LCB research division:

"Functions of the Board of Regents: In describing the Board of Regents as the governing board of the university, we have in mind a legislative rather than an executive function. As the Regents seek broad measure of autonomy in relation to state government, so should they grant as much freedom and discretion as possible to the president and the faculty of the university in the internal management of affairs. It is a sound rule of administration that leaves the greatest possible discretion to those at the base of any

administrative period...and minimizes the decisions that can be made at the top. Nowhere is this a more statutory rule than for governance of a university.”

Regent Alden observed that the 1917 report warned against a meticulous attention to detail of administration by the Board of Regents. The report cited three main activities: 1) Determination of general policies of the institution in consultation with executive officers; 2) The appropriation of monies and the approval of distribution of the appropriations made by the proper appropriating bodies; 3) The appointment of institutional employees on the recommendation of the institution executives. He related that if the Board attempted to obscure executive functions they would have a lot of problems. He stated that the chief executive officer was the chancellor. The Board sets policy, but the chancellor runs the System.

Chair Anthony asked Chief Counsel Klaich or Regent Dondero to walk the Board through the handout document pointing out the important issues.

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont’d.)

Regent Seastrand noted a point of order. He observed that the motion was to make a recommendation that the Board would not be voting upon at this time. He suggested the Board accept the report and then address the item that covers this material. Chair Anthony replied that if the Board voted they would be done with that particular agenda item, which would preclude discussion. Regent Seastrand asked whether other items on the agenda would allow such discussion.

Chief Counsel Klaich reported that Board members had all received Reference I, which was a recommendation for a standard addendum to presidential contracts for discipline for cause to be included in presidential contracts. The Board discussed this item at its last Board meeting, prior to the Board Development Committee meeting. Simultaneously, the Committee was considering a proposed Bylaw change, which set forth a new and different role for the chancellor under the Code (Article VII, Section 3, new item (14)), which discussed delegating the right to discipline presidents to the chancellor and to terminate presidents in extraordinary circumstances. The Bylaw change also defined extraordinary circumstances with reference to provisions in the University Code for extraordinary circumstances for removing a faculty member from their position. The Committee realized there is overlap between these two. They seem to define different things “for cause”. The Committee determined the more appropriate method of proceeding would be to refer the matter to the full Board for discussion to review the substance of the addenda for dealing with discipline of presidents. The Committee recommended that the chancellor be given the authority to discipline and directed counsel to make the necessary changes to the Bylaws. The Committee also raised the question of whether or not the chancellor’s decision should be final. Reference I, Section 4.d. indicates that the chancellor’s decision could be reviewed by the Board. The Committee recommended in the Bylaw change that the decision be final. Those are the two changes referred to in Regent Dondero’s Committee report.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Chief Counsel Klaich said that he was sensitive to the Board’s desire not to have material presented just prior to voting. The Board has had the presidential addenda language before it for a long time. There are two changes: 1) To actually delegate the responsibility to the chancellor and 2) To make the chancellor’s decision final. Chief Counsel Klaich acknowledged that questions had been raised about due process and appealing the chancellor’s decision to the full Board. He related that this is a Board decision. He noted that the decision to terminate a president at this time is not subject to appeal. The Board makes the decision to terminate a president and that decision is final. The Committee recommends that, under the extraordinary circumstances listed in the Bylaw amendment, that the chancellor make that decision and that the decision be final.

Regent Rosenberg noted there would be no right to an evidentiary hearing with regard to any proposed discipline, which meant the presidents have no appeal to the Board. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that was not the intent of that sentence. The appeal rights that were in the draft standard addenda were actually in other language that was deleted. The intent of this sentence was to describe the limited nature of the hearing between the

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont’d.)

chancellor and the president. The paragraph requires that prior to taking any action, the chancellor must provide notification to the president and provide all documentation which would support that decision. It allows the president the right to respond. This sentence was meant to indicate that there would not be a full-blown evidentiary hearing, but rather a limited due process hearing where the chancellor tells the president of his/her intended action and provides the president subject to the discipline with the documentation or other evidence which would support the intended discipline. Regent Rosenberg said he did not understand the wording. He asked who had no right to an evidentiary hearing. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that the president would have no right to such a hearing. Regent Rosenberg observed that, in effect, there was no appeal. Chief Counsel Klaich agreed. Regent Rosenberg asked whether that was the same thing as “due process”. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that due process is not a fixed subject, but rather a matter that can be anything from administrative hearings on campus to appeals, to courts of law, to rights, to all sorts of things. He said this was “due process”, albeit a short and abbreviated due process. Regent Rosenberg observed that all UCCSN members had access to a far more lengthy due process, yet they were denying the presidents that same right. He said he could not

support that. He said that he was told that the reason that the Board was contemplating this kind of language and action was to give the chancellor “teeth”. The Board currently gives the chancellor authority but no teeth. He felt that a good chancellor leads by respect and trust, and not by fangs and a baseball bat. He said he was growing exceedingly nervous the more he saw of this kind of thing. He recalled that Interim Chancellor Rogers had said that, “I trust the Board more than I trust the Governor.” He said that as long as it was Governor Guinn, he had no problem, but one never knows what one is apt to get. He observed that the Board was in the same situation. The Board seeks a good, strong chancellor, but you never know. He said that he had experience with former chancellors that he would not trust with this kind of power. He was concerned the Board was putting the presidents in terrible peril. He surmised that they feel the same and cannot say anything. He felt that was poisonous when running a system. He observed that they were not running one institution, but rather eight institutions, which was vastly different. He suggested to the Board that leaving the presidents without appeal to the Board would be one of the worst things they could do. It takes away a right to which he felt they were entitled. He asked the Board to reconsider that particular portion of the recommendation. He did not object to delegating authority to discipline to the chancellor. When it comes to something as serious and far reaching as termination, he felt it was the Board’s responsibility. He said the Board is responsible to and for their main constituency (*i.e., students*), and they deserve more consideration than this would provide. He said that students suffer when you lose a president. He wanted to ensure that if they do lose a president that it is for the right reasons.

Regent Alden said he understood what Regent Rosenberg was saying. He said that he believes in due process. He observed that the world has changed. We are not state supported, but state assisted. We are not 2,000 students, but 100,000 students. If Board members were managers, they should apply for the job. At General Motors, the CEO reports to the board of directors, which has no authority over whom the CEO hires and fires. The Board selects the CEO and entrusts the CEO. The Board needs to act as a

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont’d.)

board. He said he would not allow himself to become involved in the daily affairs. He suggested Board members read the book about academic freedom and the history of the presidency of the University of Nevada, Reno by Mindred Stout to understand that. He observed the Board was facing huge issues in higher education. The Board is here to set Board policy, the budget, and to be the watchdog for Nevada’s citizens for how the money is spent and how the missions are carried out. He felt the Board needed to concentrate on larger issues (*how to fund capital projects, how to fund the institutions, increasing the research levels at the universities, adjusting the academic entrance requirements*).

Regent Rosenberg observed that the Board was not running a business and that this was not General Motors. He said he has lived in this System for 38 years. He related that they were not stamping out light bulbs. This is the Board’s responsibility. No policy is more important to this Board than presidents, the care of presidents, and what they need for their institutions. He asked whether agenda items #13 (*Standard Addendum to Presidents’ Contracts*) and #16 (*Final Form of Addendum to President’s Contract, UNLV*) were related to this particular item. He asked whether one decision would affect all. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that it would not apply to item #16 (*Final Form of Addendum to President’s Contract, UNLV*). This Board has a contract with Dr. Harter and the provisions of that contract are set. Since there were minor wording changes to that contract subsequent to the last Board meeting, the final form of the contract has been brought back to the Board for ratification. He said there was no contract to approve or disapprove at this point. He said that the provisions of that contract were not totally consistent with what was currently under discussion. To the extent that the Board is trying to enact a policy that will have standard application to all presidents, Dr. Harter’s contract is and will remain an abhorration because there was a disconnect between the negotiation of that contract and the discussion of this policy. With respect to items #14 (*President’s Contract, TMCC*) and #15 (*President’s Contract, GBC*), he believed there was the possibility of similar differences that could relate to Dr. Ringle’s and Dr. Killpatrick’s contract with respect to a final decision by the Board. He also believed that when the Board addresses those items that it would be the recommendation of the Chair and chancellor that those contracts be put before the Board in a manner so that the final decision of the Board on this subject will be respected and incorporated into those contracts. It is not the intent in addressing the contracts to “end run” the Board’s ability to fully discuss and implement a critical policy decision. Regent Rosenberg clarified that those two contracts will not be final until this is decided. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that he was trying to reply carefully because of the issue raised by Regent Hill regarding consideration. The Board cannot have unilateral changes to a contract without consideration. He stated that the contracts would remain in line.

Regent Derby stated that the Board Development Committee had been struggling with this issue for the last three meetings. The majority sense of the Committee has been an interest in strengthening the hand of the chancellor. She related there was more work to be done. She said that the issue for strengthening the hand of the chancellor as the head of the System had been primary and that it was a delicate balance. She clarified that they were not discussing centralization. She felt it was important for the institutions to remain semi-autonomous, entrepreneurial, and creative. Nevada’s glory and challenge is that it is one system. Other trustees in the country are jealous. Most states have many

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont’d.)

boards that compete with one another. She said that Nevada has many advantages by having one system and one system head. Unless the system head has adequate authority, the concept of a system and the benefits it brings cannot be delivered. Presidents of large institutions become very powerful with very large constituencies. The chancellor has one constituency – the Board of Regents. In order for a chancellor to have adequate authority in a system, to have the system work, to enforce Board policies and to ensure they are followed, the chancellor must have adequate authority. She was well aware that if a system was highly centralized and all the

authority were delegated at the head, it would not work well and could discourage institutions from being entrepreneurial and creative. That is the balance with which the Committee has been struggling. The Board is trying to determine just the right balance so that the chancellor's hand is strengthened and has adequate authority to make the system work. She agreed it was not an easy conversation.

Regent Whipple entered the meeting.

Regent Derby observed that, currently, the presidents serve at the pleasure of the Board and there is no appeal process. She felt it was important for the Board to retain the authority in case something goes awry and the health and vitality of an institution is at stake. The Board has to retain the authority to make a quick decision and to remove a president. The issue of the Board having the authority and choosing to delegate it to the chancellor is the primary issue. Normally, the relationship between a board and a chancellor is very close. It would be very unusual for a chancellor to take action that was inconsistent with the will of a board. She noted that the wording specified "extraordinary circumstances" when action needs to be taken quickly. Under normal circumstances, the chancellor would approach the Board. She felt the recommendation appropriately strengthens the chancellor's hand in managing a system.

Regent Rosenberg said that he understood that presently there is no appeal. He observed that was the Board's decision and not an individual's. He noted that the Board has had chancellors in the past that they would not trust with this kind of power.

Regent Bandera observed that there was a slight difference between the presidents currently not having an appeal to the Board and a situation that would allow the president to approach the Board and make their case in a full-blown manner. She stated that the Board would be taking away the opportunity in some instances to present a full-case to the Board. She was slightly confused about the purpose for this change. In her opinion, it is not a delegation of authority, but rather a deletion and a change of authority. The Bylaw change gives the authority away to the chancellor. She asked whether the Board was doing this because it is more effective or efficient. She asked whether there was a closer relationship providing a better observation and comprehension of the circumstances by the chancellor. She asked whether the Board was doing it to strengthen the authority of the chancellor to prevent presidents from forming a coalition over the chancellor by approaching the Board. She asked whether the Board was doing it because making difficult decisions in public is painful and messy and not a pleasant experience. She stated that if it was due to the latter, it would be

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

unfortunate. She observed that the people elect the Regents to make those kinds of decisions. If making this change causes the Board to think that they will not have possible messy presidential terminations they are fooling themselves. She noted there are many procedural methods allowing Regents to put items on the agenda that could facilitate bringing any sort of difficult discussion about presidents to the Board. She asked whether the Board was looking at it as micromanagement for the Board to deal with presidents who may be in danger of termination rather than leaving it to the chancellor. She did not believe so. If the Board finds it important enough to engage a very rigorous process to hire the president of an institution to lead that institution and all of its members, she questioned why it would be considered micromanagement to address the painful and possible difficult situation of dismissing a president. She felt the Board needed to be very careful about what they are saying, why they are saying it, and what they are doing. If it is appropriate to have the CEO conduct the terminations in such instances, then allow it. She urged the Board not to couch the decision in other sorts of verbage to make it appear more palatable. She said she was not trying to offend anyone.

Regent Hill observed the Board was addressing three different agenda items that were becoming confused. His understanding was that this comprised the first reading of a proposed Bylaw change and the Board would not take action until the next meeting. Chair Anthony agreed. Regent Hill felt it was appropriate to have this discussion about the Bylaw change. He agreed with just about everything that Regent Derby said and large sections of what Regent Bandera stated. He said the Board must decide where is policy and where is management. They need to arrive at a balance. He acknowledged that the Board needs to set policy, but also needs to give the chancellor the authority to manage the presidents. He said that he did not have a problem making difficult decisions. The real issue is whether the chancellor has the authority to manage the presidents. He felt it was good for Board members to carefully consider the Bylaw amendment and discuss it at the next meeting. He said he had a small problem with two contracts before the Board. While he liked the idea for having every presidential contract the same, he objected to the presidents signing the contract with a provision for adding this later amendment to the contract should the Board adopt it. He did not feel that it was completely fair and the way the Board should act. He also did not want to delay action on the two contracts because he felt that it sent a bad message to the campuses. He felt that, when it came time to address those contracts, the Board should act on the language presented with the understanding that it could be amended in the future and there would be three contracts that would be slightly out of sync with the Board's policy.

Regent Seastrand said that the issue of the Bylaw change was very clear. He felt that the decision to manage in such a manner made a lot of sense. He felt they needed a clear line of authority and a clear sense of who is in charge and who would be terminated. He was curious about presidential powers in terms of hiring and firing. The presidents have the ability to hire and fire their vice presidents and the decision is final. He felt that it works and that it is an important management decision. He acknowledged they would be changing the structure of the Board somewhat for the better. He said he would support the measure.

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked whether the chancellor could come to the Board and notify them that he/she has an issue with a president, which could be accomplished with 2-3 day's notice. If the chancellor does it in his/her office, he asked about the public's right to know. He said that part of the Open Meeting Law was that the public has a right to know the reasons, justifications, and cause. He questioned how the real truth would ever get out if the chancellor merely called the individual into his/her office. He said it would create a lot of rumors and innuendo. He questioned how this would serve the System. He asked how this change would affect recruiting new presidents. He did not object to giving this chancellor this authority, but he agreed with Regent Rosenberg that he might not feel that way about another chancellor. He said that at one point in the future, one chancellor would fire one president and it would ruin and cripple the institution. He felt that the person who does the hiring should also do the firing. He observed that the Board would do the hiring, yet give someone else the responsibility for the firing because it seemed like the Board did not want to get its hands dirty. He felt that if they made this change that they should also allow the chancellor to hire the presidents. He asked for the presidents' thoughts.

President Harter felt that this conversation had nothing to do with Chancellor Rogers or her if the Board approved the final form of addendum to her contract. Presidents can non-renew a vice president, which is not subject to appeal. If a president fires a vice president for cause under Chapter 6 it can be appealed to the Board. Regent Seastrand asked for an explanation of Chapter 6. President Harter replied that it was part of the Code that allows for termination for cause of any of the staff or the presidential level. Regent Seastrand clarified that if a vice president was non-renewed they did not have a chance for appeal. President Harter agreed, adding that it would provide one year beyond the year in which the decision is made. However, if they are terminated for cause they have the right of appeal to the Board. Regent Seastrand asked whether that applied to faculty. President Harter replied that it applied to vice presidents. Regent Seastrand requested a ruling. Assistant Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen replied that the president appoints the vice presidents under the Code and they serve at the pleasure of the president. They can be issued a notice of non-reappointment and there is no appeal. If they are fired for cause, a disciplinary process is started that is the same process that applies to any other faculty member or professional member of the staff and can be appealed. That is only if a disciplinary committee is convened and Chapter 6 process is followed. There is an ultimate appeal right to the Board of Regents. Regent Seastrand asked whether there was a Chapter 6 process for presidents. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen replied there was not.

President Harter felt that the business analogy that was used was a flawed analogy when applied to higher education and university presidents. They are not the same as vice presidents in a corporate structure, nor are they that way in 90% of the universities in the country. They are treated as CEO's because they are the CEO of the campus. They are singular leaders. Great universities in this country are led by great presidents. Most of those presidents report directly to a board. They are not subordinated to chancellors, but rather work with chancellors as colleagues. She felt that was a very important distinction. There are very few systems in which chancellors have the authority to fire

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

presidents. The California State System may be one of the few. Their chancellor was recently granted that right. The California State University System is a fine system, but it is not the University of California. It is a secondary system to the University of California, which has extraordinary presidents who report directly to their board. President Harter felt that the analogies being used and the history of higher education, great presidents, and great universities ought to be the context within which the question is examined. She urged the Board that if they change many of the other provisions (*i.e., presidential tenure*) they retain at least the right of appeal to the Board, which is comprised of thirteen people who could provide the necessary checks and balances and ensure that the judgment is fairly heard.

President Killpatrick said the discussion was very telling. He thought there would be an issue and he would object if the presidential contracts were different – if there was due process or an appeal process for one person and not others. He felt that would send a very chilling message to the community and future presidents who might be interested in coming to Nevada.

President Lucey said she felt some concern about talking about a subject which clearly had personal and professional interests for her. She noted that Nevada's System is different from others in the country in that the Board has responsibility for two different kinds of entities. She observed that as the Board of a system it is very important to keep the concerns, safety, and integrity of that system at the forefront. The Board is also her board and the board for Western Nevada Community College. She observed there is that little bit of tension in Nevada that the Board controls the System as well as the distinct institutions. She felt that if the Board relinquished the authority to totally supervise its presidents it would seem that she is no longer a president but rather a campus provost, which is a very different role. Currently, the only individual the Board has who is totally and solely responsible for thinking about her college is the campus president. If her role is diminished and she is no longer reporting to the Board, they will lose that role in her. She said that she was struggling with this change. She said she could see the concerns the Board has about assuring that they function as a system and not just as eight individual institutions. She observed that they are also individual institutions.

President Lilley observed that something major will have been lost if the presidents lose the opportunity to have direct contact with the Board. If the Board is going to give the authority to the chancellor to terminate and make it impossible for presidents to speak to the Board about this matter it would be a major loss. His major concern was the impact it could have on future pools of presidential candidates.

Regent Alden thanked Regent Hill for his thoughtful comments. He acknowledged that this was not easy. He has always felt that the Board should not hire or fire presidents, but rather it should be advice and consent. He said that someone needed to be in charge. He said he had full confidence that this Board would reverse the decision and fire the chancellor if they felt that the chancellor had overstepped his bounds. He stated that the Board was not managers, but rather policy makers. The Board sets the budget. They do not make decisions about hiring or firing a coach. They should not meddle in the hiring

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

and firing of vice presidents. The Board sets policy. There always has to be a balancing act. This will be further discussed in February. He did not want to get the Board in a situation of the “do’s” and “don’ts”. He urged the Board to talk about the big picture, to consider the matter carefully, and to move on.

Regent Rosenberg said that the devil is in the detail and the big picture is comprised of many small details that need to be attended to. He said that his personal admiration for the presidents was boundless. He requested clarification. Vice presidents and deans serve at the behest of the president. The presidents authorize their hire and their termination. Presidents serve at the behest of the Board. Chair Anthony verified that was correct. Regent Rosenberg noted a major difference, which he felt should be maintained.

Chancellor Rogers felt the Board needed to decide whether or not they want a chancellor. If the Board gives the chancellor no authority, they do not have one. In such a case they should eliminate the position. He understood President Harter’s feeling that each president is a CEO of a particular campus. This is a system. In the past, there has been no one who could coordinate the efforts of the eight different institutions. As long as there is no central authority or ability to gather information and disseminate to the Board, there are eight people reporting to thirteen part-timers. He said they have eight presidents who can, if they want, do what they please on their own campus. He did not object to the presidents running their own campuses. For too long there has been a failure of cooperation among the eight institutions. For too long, there have been confrontations between the institutions that is unpardonable. This Board has no way to resolve those problems. It cannot resolve those problems by meeting six times per year. Past chancellors have been given no authority and have been unable to do anything. If the Board is going to recruit a chancellor, he suggested they must decide whether they merely want someone who talks to everyone, passes messages back and forth, and allows the eight presidents to manipulate the Board as they do. He said he felt very strongly about this. A system requires some central authority to carry that out. The Governor is in a different position. The Governor appoints people for a period of time and there is no way to get rid of the Governor in the short run. The next chancellor will not make arbitrary decisions that are totally inconsistent with the policy of this Board. He said he would not as a chancellor fire any of the presidents without talking to members of the Board. He said that he confers with Board members each and every day. He said they would not be shocked by what he does, though they might not agree with him. If the Board should get an arbitrary chancellor, the Board could remedy that problem very quickly if they were arbitrary in firing a president by simply terminating the chancellor. It is frustrating for him to try to deal with the presidents when he has no authority to make them cooperate and develop a system and joint ventures that benefit everyone. He said the Board needs someone with central authority to determine what is done on a daily basis. He felt the Board was fooling itself if they thought that a drop-in board, which sets policy, could also handle the management. If the Board does something that the presidents do not like, they will politic Board members in groups. That is what prevents the Board from making a final decision. That is the way they bring the System to a halt, resulting in years and years of controversy, litigation, and ongoing problems. He said there was no perfect

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

answer. He said they could not do everything based upon the lowest common denominator. They cannot say that because of a potential problem (*i.e., possibly having a chancellor who could be arbitrary*) who would make an arbitrary decision one time that they will set the level of what that person can do based upon that very remote possibility. He said they would never get anyplace. He related that this is a business. Anytime that money is involved, it is a business. The Legislature views this as a business. They want to know that the System produces efficiently with their dollars. The private sector wants to know that the System is spending their money efficiently. If the Board can get along without the taxpayers’ money and without the private money, they can run it any way they choose. But the Board has accountability and an obligation to the state to do certain things. He addressed the question of whether he would fire a president. He has 700 employees and no one under contract. For some reason, System people think they are only safe unless they have a contract. He has not fired more than 15 people in 40 years. He does not act arbitrarily; it is not in his best interest or that of his company. Having that authority is one of the reasons why he does not have to fire anyone. If this were a full-time board, it could function and operate the System. It is not a full-time board and is not trained to be one. He said the Board needs to decide whether or not they want a chancellor. If the Board takes away the power of the chancellor to fire a president, they ought to eliminate the position. He related that the eight institutions are like subsidiaries of the holding company, with no one who coordinates those subsidiaries.

Regent Rosenberg acknowledged that Chancellor Rogers was correct where he is concerned. He did not view the eight presidents as conniving people who were out to get what they want at the expense of everyone else. The Board had a chancellor who was very successful for four years. He did not accomplish that success with any more strength than what is currently provided. He did not feel it was necessary to hand anyone a baseball bat to hold over the presidents’ heads. He said the Board needs them to do what they do. There are times when mutual interests do not coincide and they do not get along as well as we would like. He did not like the idea of

anyone being denied the right to appeal. All he was asking is that the presidents have the right to appeal.

Chair Anthony said that Board members had a couple of months to consider the matter and that it would be included on the next meeting agenda.

Motion to approve the Board Development Committee recommendations carried. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

The meeting recessed at 9:27 a.m. on Friday, December 3, 2004, and the Board convened as Members of the Corporation for the UCCSN institution Foundations' reports with all members present except Regents Bandera, and Kirkpatrick.

15. Information Only-Foundation Reports - The Board reviewed presentations from the institution foundations. *Order of Presentation: UNLV, DRI, NSC, CCSN, UNR, GBC, TMCC, WNCC*

The meeting reconvened at 10:58 a.m. on Friday, December 3, 2004, with all members present except Regents Derby, Kirkpatrick, Schofield, and Seastrand.

Chair Anthony noted that the item regarding "Standard Addendum to Presidents' Contracts" had been withdrawn.

Regents Derby and Schofield entered the meeting.

16. Approved-President's Contract, TMCC – The Board approved the employment terms and conditions for TMCC President Philip Ringle.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the presidential contract for TMCC President Philip Ringle. Regent Hill seconded.

Chair Anthony reported that the terms of the contract had been distributed to the Regents (*on file in the Board office*):

- • Commencing January 1, 2005, President Ringle's base salary will be \$180,000.
- • President Ringle shall be granted tenure at Truckee Meadows Community College upon approval of this Second Addendum by the UCCSN Board of Regents.
- • The term of the Employment Agreement is extended for a period which shall commence on January 1, 2005 and run through June 30, 2009.
- • Fringe benefits (*housing, vehicle, and host allowances*) shall be the same as provided to other professional UCCSN employees.

Chair Anthony asked General Counsel Klaich to explain the attached addendum.

General Counsel Klaich noted that the actions of the Board in bringing forth a Bylaw change were out of sync with the renegotiation of these contracts. He noted that Board members had expressed concern for sending any negative message to the campuses with respect to the outstanding performance of these two presidents by withdrawing their contracts from this agenda. He suggested to the chancellor, and discussed with Presidents Ringle and Killpatrick, that the more appropriate avenue to follow would be to attach the standard language with no changes. Regarding the item that provides for presidential discipline, in this addendum there is no delegation of discipline from the Board to the chancellor. It includes the language, "or to the chancellor if delegated." There are appeal rights in the standard addendum exactly as the Board has previously seen. With the review and approval of both President Ringle and President Killpatrick, the contract provides that if the Board should not adopt a Bylaw change with respect to presidential discipline that this addendum will drop from their contracts in its entirety. The contract further provides that if the Bylaw change is adopted (*without appeal rights*) that the appeal rights in the contract would be deleted. The intent is not to usurp the Board's power to discuss this item fully and to bring these two contracts into line, as much as possible, with the other presidential contracts. The two critical items in this standard addenda language are: 1) the delegation and 2) the appeal. There is no delegation in this contract and there are appeal rights. If the Board subsequently determines that either of those should be changed, it has been discussed with the two

16. Approved-President's Contract, TMCC – (*Cont'd.*)

presidents in advance and they are prepared to live by the subsequent decision of the Board.

Regent Alden thanked Chief Counsel Klaich and Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen for providing clarity and urged the Board to approve the agenda item as presented.

Regent Rosenberg clarified that they were essentially signing a blind contract because it could go either way. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that he would not characterize it in that fashion. At the last Board meeting, the question was raised whether the Board could bifurcate its decision on compensation and presidential discipline. Counsel advised that it could not be done because once the decision is made there is no consideration for changing the contract. Hence, staff is recommending this technical legal avenue. He did

not feel they were signing a blank check. There are two possible ultimate outcomes. The presidents have agreed that there will be a provision in their contract for discipline for cause. Should the Board determine that no such provision will be included in their Bylaws, it will be deleted in its entirety from their contracts. With respect to the appeal rights, the proposed addenda to the contract stipulates that any decision of the chancellor is appealable to the Board if the authority to discipline presidents is delegated to the chancellor. Presidents Ringle and Killpatrick have graciously indicated that should the Board determine otherwise that they are prepared to bring their contracts into conformity with the other presidential contracts.

Regent Sisolak observed that the first contract from June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2005. This contract begins January 1st. He asked if that had been done before. Chancellor Rogers replied that the contracts had been extended for one year with no evaluation. President Ringle indicated that he had not received a raise in the past few years because his evaluation had not been performed. He requested a four-year contract commencing on January 1, 2005. The Bylaws require that the contracts expire on a fiscal year. So a four-year contract commencing in January and ending in December could not be accomplished. The choice was then between a 3½ year or 4½ year contract. It seemed to Chancellor Rogers that the contracts be extended to ensure the presidents would remain since they are both superstars. That is how it was decided to start the new contract in January 2005 and run through June 2009. He related that his discussion with President Killpatrick had progressed similarly.

Motion carried. Regents Kirkpatrick and Seastrand were absent.

President Ringle thanked the Board for the opportunity to continue to work at TMCC with a very dedicated and hard-working faculty, staff, and administration who are all committed to providing high quality programs and services for the students.

17. Approved-President's Contract, GBC – The Board approved the employment terms and conditions for GBC President Paul Killpatrick.

17. Approved-President's Contract, GBC – (Cont'd.)

Regent Bandera moved approval of the presidential contract for GBC President Paul Killpatrick. Regent Howard seconded.

Chair Anthony presented the terms of the contract:

- • Commencing January 1, 2005, President Killpatrick's base salary will be \$165,000.
- • The term of the Employment Agreement is extended for a period which shall commence on January 1, 2005 and run through June 30, 2009.
- • President Killpatrick's shall be granted tenure at Great Basin College upon approval of this Second Addendum by the UCCSN Board of Regents. The provisions of this paragraph supersede the provisions of paragraph 1 of the Original Employment Agreement in their entirety.
- • Fringe benefits shall be the same as provided to other professional UCCSN employees.

Chief Counsel Klaich noted one difference in the contract. There was a specific provision in the original contract that President Killpatrick signed that he was a non-academic, non-tenure track. This contract includes a repeal of that.

Regent Howard related that she served on President Killpatrick's evaluation committee. She related that the warm hospitality made her trip to this very cold location all worthwhile. Her impression of President Killpatrick is very good. She noticed that the institution is very student-centered. The president supports and advocates for students. He has created great public/private partnerships. He is very strong on economic development and has enhanced economic development not only in Elko, but also for underrepresented rural groups. He is highly regarded in the areas of Elko, Ely, Winnemucca, Battle Mountain, Carlin, and Eureka. The outreach has been very good in those areas. He is also highly regarded amongst the Western Shoshone tribe. Native Americans have a lot of trust in him and appreciate his making them feel like they are a part of GBC. She related that President Killpatrick has helped create a lot of opportunities for youth in the area. He is well liked by students and community leaders. Regent Howard said that she noticed that both Presidents Killpatrick and Ringle had met the challenges with which they were faced in the aftermath of 9/11. She found that President Killpatrick is very passionate about education and is very generous with his time. She hoped that he would remain with the UCCSN. She felt that the Board was lucky to have him.

Regent Bandera related that northeastern Nevada is extremely fortunate to have Dr. Killpatrick as the president. She found him to be straightforward, honest, candid, energetic, listens, and gets in one's face. He also accepts it when one gets in his face. She found that he is willing to engage the problems brought before him. In the 2½ years that Dr. Killpatrick has been at GBC he has accomplished much. He has charmed and become part of the Elko community. His family is part of the community. She said she had never seen anyone come into an institution, take on the responsibilities, learn the

17. Approved-President's Contract, GBC – (Cont'd.)

job, maintain the level of enthusiasm and energy that he has and still look for more challenges. She expected that President Killpatrick will engage future challenges, resolve and solve them. She said that it had been a pleasure working with him.

Motion carried. Regents Kirkpatrick and Seastrand were absent.

President Killpatrick thanked Regents Bandera and Howard for taking time out of their busy schedules to participate in his evaluation. He also thanked the Board for their support and for supporting the terms of his contract. He said it was still his pleasure to continue to serve as the president of Great Basin College.

18. Approved-Final Form of Addendum to President's Contract, UNLV – The Board approved Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers' request for the final form of the Addendum to President Harter's employment contract. At the October 2004 Board meeting, the Board approved a draft Addendum to President Harter's employment contract that provided for supplemental compensation paid by the UNLV Foundation and also contained provisions for taking action based upon cause. The Addendum was amended by motion of the Board, and the final form of the Addendum contained other minor clarifications of language as was presented to the Board for ratification (Ref. J on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved approval of the final form of Addendum to the presidential contract for UNLV President Carol Harter so long as they met all of the codicils of Board policy. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the changes were resolved satisfactorily for everyone. President Harter replied that she believed that they were.

Motion carried. Regents Kirkpatrick and Seastrand were absent.

19. Information Only-Defining Chancellor and Board of Regents Roles/Relationships – The Board Development Committee brought forward a discussion to the full Board on the role of the chancellor and of the Board. The Board reviewed a 1993 description of the roles, and Committee members updated the Board on their discussion and recommendations. The Board considered the recommendations and defined the role of the chancellor and the Board. This served as notice of a proposed amendment to the Regent Bylaws, Article VII (Ref. K on file in the Board office).

Regent Derby reported that the Board Development Committee would discuss this topic at its next meeting. In reviewing the role of the Board and the chancellor, the Committee referred to a 1993 organizational review, which was requested to review the Board's governance system, the authority of the chancellor, and the role of the Board in relation to the chancellor. Three consultants were hired. One represented the community college sector and the other two represented higher education in general.

19. Information Only-Defining Chancellor and Board of Regents Roles/Relationships-(*Cont'd.*)

The consultants spent time reviewing what was not working well and made recommendations. The Board Development Committee reviewed this material. The Committee felt the role of the chancellor was of highest priority. She related that the Committee was planning to provide a recommendation for the full Board. The discussion is anchored in these earlier documents. Much of what was recommended at that time is still applicable today. She related the Board would have another opportunity to discuss the matter when the Board Development comes forth with recommendations.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Dondero reported that the next Committee meeting was scheduled for December 16, 2004.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

20. Information Only-SNEA Presentation on UNR Parking - The State of Nevada Employees Association made a presentation regarding parking for employees at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Regent Alden asked whether the note from General Counsel Klaich regarding parking regulations could be addressed under this agenda item. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen asked whether it related to the parking regulations. Regent Alden stated that it was a memorandum from Chief Counsel Klaich to the Board of Regents, copying Chancellor Rogers, regarding parking regulations and an article in the *Sparks Tribune*. Chair Anthony clarified that the two matters were related.

Mr. Scott McKenzie, Executive Director, SNEA, thanked the Board for taking the time to listen. He acknowledged that it was a point of contention, but an important issue for their membership. Mr. McKenzie related that a parking attendant had shown him where he could park for no charge and not receive a ticket. He said that if he had been an employee, he would receive a ticket for not paying for parking, which he found interesting. He related that they had been looking at the vision for what UCCSN envisions for growth and how the institutions will change statewide. They noticed there is a grand vision. A lot of people are giving a lot of consideration and thought for how the System will grow and change. Their concern is where the classified employees fit into that vision. He questioned whether the grand vision would negatively or positively impact the employees. He said that a majority were feeling negatively

impacted. As the university invests in new buildings, new technologies, and new parking garages are built, will their incomes and lifestyles be diminished as the grand plan unfolds. Thus far, this appears to be what is happening. He said that their people were not very happy. In speaking with classified employees, they have discovered that students also feel somewhat impacted by this and are also unhappy. Mr. McKenzie suggested that it would be smart public policy to try to deal with this in a manner where classified employees are part of the vision and the grand scheme, so there is no negative impact when a new building displaces their parking for which they now must pay more. He said that this type

20. Information Only-SNEA Presentation on UNR Parking – (Cont'd.)

of growth policy was not helping to bring the classified employees to share the grand vision. Mr. McKenzie stated that SNEA's door is open for discussion. They have research resources for determining a better way to do this. They do not want to just complain, they would like to be part of the solution. Thus far, the meetings have not been meaningful discussions, and have been somewhat discouraging. Mr. McKenzie related that they had asked two of the workers representing classified employees to come forward to relate their stories. He said they were speaking from the perspective of their co-workers and had been asked by their co-workers to approach the Board. He introduced Mr. Dennis Meredith from UNR and Mr. Samuel Phillips from UNLV.

Mr. Dennis Meredith, Principal Development, Physics Dept-UNR, said that he was speaking on behalf of the UNR Parking Committee and the members of UNR's classified staff, faculty, and students who have expressed similar concerns. He said they have a legitimate grievance. He said they are the only state employees who have to pay the state to park on state property while working for the state. DMV workers are puzzled by this. Within that payment system there is a disparity of costs. The prices, policies, and practices of the parking department are capricious and arbitrary. As an example, at UNR employees pay \$320/year to park. The space in which he parks originally cost \$7.50/year in 1983 when his employment began. It is now \$320. Contrary to the statement that all faculty, staff, and students pay to park, he observed that not all UNR employees pay to park. People who park on campus pay \$320/year, whereas people who work on Valley Road pay nothing. People who work at the meat lab pay nothing. People who work in Stead pay nothing. He said there was a disparity. People who work in the evenings pay less than those who work days. He related that employees are being forced to de facto subsidize capital improvements. The employees view the parking garages as capital improvements/infrastructure. As employees, they do not feel that it is fair to have to subsidize increased parking. As employees, they have no incentive to do a good job. If you do a good job you should be rewarded. University employees do a great job, donations are made to the university, it grows, but employees are suddenly being forced to pay for the growth, which they feel is unfair. Employees would like to be part of the great story. He said it was difficult to justify encouraging donations to the university when every time the university grows they have to pay more. He said the employees feel they have legitimate complaints and they invite a conversation with the union representatives.

Regent Sisolak asked whether there was any place one could park for no charge. Mr. Meredith replied there was no place to park for free at UNR. He said they could also not park in the adjoining neighborhoods. Regent Sisolak asked whether there was only the \$320 option. Mr. Meredith replied there were cheaper options. One can pay approximately \$150 if they park at the north end of campus and take a bus. Slowly the zoning of the parking areas is being changed. Gradually the inexpensive parking is being eliminated.

Chair Anthony suggested having Chancellor Rogers sit down with the group to get all of the information and return with a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Meredith said they would welcome that. Chancellor Rogers asked them to call his office, adding that he would meet with them any time.

20. Information Only-SNEA Presentation on UNR Parking – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Samuel Phillips Sr., Combination Welder I, Facilities Maintenance-UNLV, related that he had been an employee for nearly 20 years. When they brought in the apartment thing there was consensus that it would ensure a parking structure for employees to secure their cars as well as to help with the growth of the university. He said that everyone was concerned and confused about why they are being charged. He said that it made them angry when they hear about future increases. Many employees have not received a raise and question why they are charged more for parking when they are not guaranteed a parking spot.

Chair Anthony related that the chancellor would work with them. He said that the chancellor would return with a full report so the Board has a full understanding.

Regent Alden noted that the Board Bylaws stipulated that parking is the purview of the campus president. He felt that no one should pay for parking. He questioned who should then pay for it. He said he had never voted for a parking garage and never would. He felt that the model was Notre Dame where parking is on the perimeter and they shuttle in. He said he would not criticize the university presidents. He felt the planning was not done at some time. The campuses became smaller with the addition of more buildings and the pressure on parking. He said it all returned to planning. He said they could not ask the Legislature for parking. He said he had absolute confidence in the chancellor and staff that they would arrive at something. He did not believe it would be free. He said the problem would not be solved overnight.

Mr. Henry Schuck, Student Body President-UNLV, asked that the students be included in the process.

Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, GSA Student Body President-UNR, reported that the least expensive parking on the UNR campus is \$65/year and is open to everyone. She said that no one is forced to pay for parking. As a community, students, faculty, and staff are all paying for growth on the campus. The employees are not singled out. She wondered why classified staff did not attend meetings where community issues are discussed. She suggested that this could be one of the reasons why classified staff are not feeling a part of the community and why parking has become such an issue. She said that growth is occurring on the campuses. The state cannot pay for it all, neither can the students. It needs to be shared as a community.

Mr. Erin Lankowsky, Student Body President-UNR, suggested a way for providing free parking. Currently, there is a Sierra Spirit shuttle that runs through downtown Reno. It is a free shuttle offered in partnership with UNR, the RTC, and some of the casinos. If employees would utilize free parking on the casino lots they could ride the free shuttle to the university. He said there is also parking available in the communities near his home – a five-minute walk to the campus. He observed that if the Board allowed classified staff to be exempt from paying for parking it would raise the price for the students. He strongly suggested that everyone should share the burden.

20. Information Only-SNEA Presentation on UNR Parking – (Cont'd.)

President Lilley clarified that the university's staff employees council represents classified employees. They are elected and meet regularly with the president. He added that the campus parking council is comprised of staff employees, students, and faculty. He continued to be dismayed by the misrepresentations made by the SNEA group.

Regent Hill said that he had big problems with the misrepresentations made by SNEA regarding financial matters and parking. He objected to the material presented about violation of law that Chief Counsel Klaich addressed. He also objected to the Board addressing this matter. He felt that this should be addressed by the presidents or their employees and then go to the chancellor. If there is a need for a policy issue, the Board would then become involved. He said the Board should not be dealing with this matter as it had been delegated.

Regent Rosenberg stated that when SNEA was in the room the chancellor agreed to speak with them. They had every reason to believe that would be the end of the discussion. They did not hear what has ensued since. He respectfully requested that if the chancellor was willing to meet with them that discussion should cease.

21. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations and Report – Regent Jill Derby reported the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met December 2, 2004 and heard information concerning emphases and concentrations in relation to the Bachelor of Applied Science degree. In addition, staff provided a brief update on advising and scheduling and the challenges faced by students. Staff provided information on the issues and costs associated with changing the residency requirement from 12 months residency in the state to 6 months for the purposes of reclassification. Committee members agreed that due to the importance of this issue it will be brought before the full Board for consideration at the February 2005 meeting.

Regent Derby requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- · New Program Proposals – The Committee recommended approval of the following new program proposals:
 - ✓ · Bachelor of Science, Nursing, GBC – A Bachelor of Science in nursing degree for licensed registered nurses who have graduated from an accredited associate degree program (Ref. ARSA-2 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ · Master of Science, Aerospace Engineering, UNLV (Ref. ARSA-3 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ · Associate Degree, Computer Networking Technology, WNCC (Ref. ARSA-6 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ · Associate Degree, Office Technology, WNCC (Ref. ARSA-7 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ · Associate Degree, Web Technology, WNCC (Ref. ARSA-8 on file in the Board office).
- · New Unit Proposals – The Committee recommended approval of the following new unit proposals:

21. Approved-ARSA Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

- ✓ · Center for the Advanced Study of Algorithms, UNLV – The Center will focus on information technology for theoretical and applied research (Ref. ARSA-4 on file in the Board office).
- ✓ · Center for Outreach in School Leadership Development, UNLV – The Center's mission is to strengthen school reform through leadership excellence (Ref. ARSA-5 on file in the Board office).
- · Green Building Policies – The Committee recommends establishing a Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards Steering Committee that will determine the feasibility of green building at the UCCSN and will present an appropriate policy for the Board's consideration by December 2005 (Ref. ARSA-9 on file in the Board office).

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

Regents Bandera and Howard left the meeting.

Regent Hill was concerned that anything moving forward from the Steering Committee be reviewed by the institutional financial officers in order to provide an idea of costs in these matters. He said they could not afford to be penny wise and pound foolish. He said that he was concerned about the financial implications, adding that some of the green concepts did not make financial sense. Regent Derby assured him that the Steering Committee will consider all of the issues and will include financial people and wide consultation throughout the System.

Motion carried. Regents Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Seastrand were absent.

22. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the Audit Committee met December 2, 2004 and received follow-up responses for thirteen internal audit reports that were presented at the Committee's June 2004 meeting. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Assistant Vice Chancellor-System Administration, reported on the current status of the Legislative Counsel Bureau audit. The LCB auditors have reported on their work on the Statewide Programs, Enrollment Data, and Investment Income portions of the audit. The auditors will report on their review of Hosting Activity, Intercollegiate Athletics, Faculty Workload, Administrative Costs, and Construction in January 2005. This will conclude the audit.

Ms. Denise Baclawski, Executive Director, Fire Science Academy-UNR, reported on the status of the University of Nevada Fire Science Academy. The FSA is on target with projected revenues and expenses for this fiscal year as reported in the Business Plan. Enrollment has doubled from a year ago. The FSA has received a \$2.5 million grant for sponsored training.

22. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

The System and institution financial statements were deferred to the February 2005 Audit Committee meeting.

Regent Hill requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- • Internal Audit Reports – The Committee reviewed the following Internal Audit Reports (Ref. M on file in the Board office):
 - ✓ • Special Review, UNLV (Ref. A-13 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ • Full-Time Equivalent, UCCSN (Ref. A-14 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ • Library, TMCC (Ref. A-15 on file in the Board office).
 - ✓ • Athletics, WNCC (Ref. A-16 on file in the Board office).

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

23. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Mark Alden reported the Budget & Finance Committee met December 2, 2004 and heard the following reports:

- • Self-Supporting Budget-to-Actual Comparison for fiscal year 2003-04 and Summer School Budget-to-Actual report for calendar year 2003 (Bound Report on file in the Board office).
- • All Funds revenues and expenses for the first quarter of fiscal year 2004-05.
- • UCCSN Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets for the first quarter of fiscal year 2004-05.
- • Student Association Reports of revenues and expenditures for fiscal year 2003-04 (BF-7 on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- • IFC Approval for Additional Student Fee Revenues – The Committee recommended approval for UCCSN to seek Interim Finance Committee authorization to expend additional student fee and federal income revenues within the state operating budgets for fiscal year 2004-05 (BF-8 on file in the Board office).

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

24. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Bret Whipple reported the Investment Committee met November 8, 2004. Mr. William Atlas, Cambridge Associates, reviewed the asset allocation and performance for the pooled endowment and pooled operating funds of the UCCSN for the quarter ended September 30, 2004. Endowment investments returned 0.7% for the quarter (*compared to the 1.0% benchmark*) and 4.5% for the calendar year (*compared to the 4.1% benchmark*). The total return for the pooled operating funds was 0.9% for the quarter (*compared to the 0.9% benchmark*) and 2.9% for the calendar year (*compared to the 3.1% benchmark*).

The Committee also discussed that the actual allocation to inflation hedging assets was underweighted by 2% in the endowment pool. The Committee voted to allocate \$5 million dollars to Wellingtons Diversified Inflation Hedge fund. This fund has exposure to energy, metals, agriculture, livestock, forest products, real estate, commodities, and inflation-protected bonds. The \$5 million will be

taken from bonds and cash.

The Committee reviewed the current status of the operating fund reserve. As of October 15, 2004, the reserve was \$5.2 million. Of this \$5.2 million, the estate tax fund has a negative balance of \$600,000 due to receiving more income than it has earned. The Committee voted to have the estate tax fund repay this amount to the operating pool.

Regent Whipple moved acceptance of the report. Regent Sisolak seconded. Motion carried. Regents Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Seastrand were absent.

25. Approved-NSC Presidential Search Committees Recommendations and Report - Chair Mark Alden reported the NSC Presidential Search Committees met October 27, and November 16, 2004. On October 27th, the Committees voted to direct the search firm to bring the names of the semi-finalist candidates to the next meeting on November 16th.

On November 16th, the Committees met and ten semi-finalists' vitas were presented for consideration. The information was discussed and the Committees chose five finalists to be interviewed on December 8, 2004.

Regent Alden said he had invited all Regents and Regents-elect Gallagher and Leavitt to attend the interviews scheduled for December 8, 2004.

Regent Alden moved acceptance of the report. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regents Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Seastrand were absent.

26. Approved-Chancellor Search Committees Recommendations and Report - Chair Bret Whipple reported the Chancellor Search Committees met November 5, 2004. Assistant Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen reviewed the guidelines and process for a chancellor search and the impact of the Open Meeting Law. The responsibilities of the Regents' Committee and the Institutional Advisory Committee were discussed. Chair Whipple appointed President Lucey to serve as chair of the Advisory Committee. The members discussed the advantages of hiring a consulting firm to search for a chancellor. After a thoughtful discussion, the Committees approved a motion to send an RFP for a search firm to assist in the selection of the chancellor. Firms selected will present their proposals on December 9, 2004.

26. Approved-Chancellor Search Committees Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)

Regent Whipple moved acceptance of the report. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Seastrand were absent.

27. Approved-Technology Task Force Recommendations and Report – Regent Howard Rosenberg reported the Technology Task Force met November 18, 2004. The Task Force adopted the following mission statement:

“Our mission is to empower the University and Community College System of Nevada through the selection and implementation of a System-wide integrated information system, which provides access to distributed, secure, timely, and accurate data across departments, institutions, and the System.”

The Task Force agreed upon ten goals, one of which is to function as the Executive Steering Committee for the integrated information system project. Included in the goals are the selection and implementation of a flexible, scalable, upgradeable, stable, and cost effective system that provides secure and convenient access for all users. Other goals include the identification of funding mechanisms, the maintenance of current service levels with minimal disruption, the adoption of best business practices embedded in the new software, and the cultivation of effective communication, education, and a collaborative environment throughout the process. Next steps include a review of the field of potential information system vendors, presentations by the vendors, a discussion of alternative strategies for providing integration, and a discussion of financial strategies. The Task Force recommended that the next meeting be scheduled as soon as possible.

Regent Rosenberg moved acceptance of the report. Regent Whipple seconded. Motion carried. Regents Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, and Seastrand were absent.

28. New Business – Dr. Fred Conquest, Instructor-CCSN, said he had four items to discuss:

1. Selection of the candidates for Nevada State College. In discussions at the CCSN Henderson campus it was noted that no one was selected from the State of Nevada nor from the UCCSN to be interviewed for this position. He said that he personally applied. No one from the consulting firm contacted him. From his research he discovered that 54 people applied. Ten were selected and five will be brought forward. People working in the System are not too happy that if they apply to improve their career status that they receive no consideration at all.
2. Academics. We are all supposed to be connected to the library system, yet any CCSN professor who wishes to have a video sent

from UNLV must drive to the campus to pick it up. He related that daily deliveries are made from the library exchange. Dr. Conquest complained about this to UNLV and the chancellor's office and was told they would look into it. The letter he received indicated that UNLV would do it the way they wanted to because they are UNLV. He related that people want to use these videos in their classes. They can get books delivered, but not videos. In some cases, they can get them from the public library. UNLV has some of the older videos and are the sole source. He asked

28. New Business – (Cont'd.)

the Board to review the matter so that all of the campuses can take advantage of the material that has been purchased.

3. When Dr. Carpenter arrived, he requested information and help about raising money, promoting the school, and helping the community get more involved in the school. One of the options that Dr. Conquest suggested was for CCSN to have an online mall in which the Foundation would receive referral fees from community businesses. President Carpenter told Dr. Conquest to move forward on the project. He spent three months aligning over 200 businesses (*i.e., Google, E-Bay, National Geographic, Target, Overstock*). It was designed to take advantage of the Christmas season. He then received an email from Mr. Eric Garner with the CCSN Foundation stating that they could not do this. Dr. Conquest observed it would be totally free for the school and would raise between \$20,000-\$50,000 per month. He said that he has previous experience with fundraising. He felt that his ideas were ignored. The problem is that CCSN needs cash and nobody wants to do anything to raise any money. His problem is that it is all lip service. The faculty and those who want to help receive no respect for trying to help.

4. Hiring practices presently being debated at CCSN. Over the last semester, a consultant was hired to recommend hiring practices. The recommendations look like they came from a Soviet, bureaucratic organization. Faculty's main objection is that the president and his assistant can override the hiring practices at any time, a problem which occurred with a different administration. Another problem is that the consultant recommended that people from different disciplines (*i.e., English, anthropology*) participate on the selection committee for different departments (*i.e., dental hygiene, veterinary technology*), things about which they know nothing. There is no guarantee that people from the affected departments will participate on the committee. According to the consultant, it will take 97 working days to interview candidates for a position, which does not include the advertising period. They are facing an entire semester in time to hire new employees. Candidates are turning down CCSN's offers because it is taking too long to complete a recruitment. He said there was no way to retain qualified candidates in a recruiting process that takes so long. He said they complained about this at a recent meeting, and were told that administration would be doing it their own way.

Dr. Conquest wanted to alert the Board that there appears to be no communication flowing to the general faculty. Faculty only hears what will be done and it is causing a degree of friction. The present hiring freeze is causing considerable stress amongst classified employees. He said it was beginning to become a problem.

Regent Alden responded to the complaint about why there were no local candidates for the Nevada State College search. He observed that the Board must comply with the Open Meeting Law. It was the decision of the Committees to use an outside search firm. The Committees do not have access to the number of applicants received by the firm. If the Committees had such access, the names would need to be disclosed. The Committees put their confidence in the search firm. The firm brought forward ten candidates.

28. New Business – (Cont'd.)

Regent Derby stated that the search committees charge the consultant to bring forward candidates who fit the leadership profile, which is prepared to provide a description of what fits and what the committees are looking for in a president. The consultant is charged with the task of culling the applicant list. The committees carefully choose a consultant because they place a great deal of confidence in them. They ask specifically that they use the profile developed by the search committees.

Regent Sisolak related that he had received some student inquiries from UNR and UNLV. He asked about the hours of operation for the libraries. Mr. Henry Schuck, Student Body President-UNLV, replied that UNLV's operated between 7:30 a.m. and 12:00 midnight. During finals the library remains open until 2:00 a.m. Regent Sisolak asked whether the students were happy with that. Mr. Schuck replied there was also a section of the library that remained opened 24 hours for studying. Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, GSA Student Body President-UNR, replied that UNR's library cannot be sectioned off to accommodate an area to remain open later. The Student Union is open 24 hours during finals. The library opens between 7:30 and 8:00 a.m.

Dr. Terry Jones, Faculty Senate Chair-CCSN, said that he was familiar with a number of the issues mentioned by Dr. Conquest. Dr. Jones said that the faculty senate receives communications from a number of faculty who feel there are too many forms of communication and too many minutes on the internet. They feel they cannot digest all of the information. CCSN is in a state of change. Many feel that it is much needed change. He has found President Carpenter to be quite open to discussion and other ideas. As Faculty Senate Chair, he said he was willing to listen to everyone. He said that things were changing for the better. Generally with change, things can get upset, but they are getting better.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board