

SPECIAL MEETING

BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Conference Room, System Administration
5550 W. Flamingo Road, Suite C-1, Las Vegas
Wednesday, April 26, 2006

Members Present: Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher, Vice Chairman

Mrs. Thalia M. Dondero

Mrs. Linda C. Howard

Mr. James Dean Leavitt

Mr. Howard Rosenberg

Dr. Jack Lund Schofield

Mr. Steve Sisolak

Members Absent: Mr. Mark Alden

Dr. Stavros S. Anthony

Dr. Jill Derby

Mr. Douglas Roman Hill

Mr. Bret Whipple

Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Others Present: Mr. Bart Patterson, Deputy Chief Counsel

Ms. Suzanne Ernst, Special Assistant to the Chancellor

Mrs. Mary Ellen McMullen, UNR Foundation

Dr. Milton Glick

Vice Chairman Dorothy S. Gallagher called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., with all members present except Regents Alden, Anthony, Derby, Hill, Howard, Schofield, Whipple, and Wixom.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents - Dr. Milton Glick, a finalist for the position of President of the University of Nevada, Reno, met with members of the Board of Regents.

Vice Chairman Gallagher asked Dr. Glick to explain his interest in the job. Dr. Glick replied that elementary, secondary education and higher education would be critical to the prosperity of the country. He said he enjoyed helping people become better and improving an institution to realize its full potential. He stated he would like to look back in five or seven years and realize that, because he was there to help, it was a much better institution for serving the state and the nation.

Regent Sisolak asked Dr. Glick how long he intended to potentially stay in this position. Dr. Glick said he did not feel that a significant difference could be achieved in less than five years. He estimated staying five to seven years, and expected this would be his last administrative job.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked if Dr. Glick had an elected or appointed board, and how he felt about one versus the other. Dr. Glick said he had an appointed board. He dealt with both types and was less interested in how they were created and more interested in who the people were. He does not see this as a significant issue and felt there were more important matters than trying to change the political design of the board.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked if Dr. Glick was aware of the Fire Science Academy issue. Dr. Glick said he was not.

Regent Dondero asked how Dr. Glick was recruited. Dr. Glick stated he was contacted about three weeks prior to this meeting by executive search consultant, Mr. Alberto Pimentel, A.T. Kearney. Mr. Pimentel asked Dr. Glick if he would be willing to share his credentials and allow the search committee to examine them, to which Dr. Glick agreed. Dr. Glick then met with the search committee and things moved forward from there. Regent Dondero asked if Dr. Glick was related to Mr. Alan Glick from Las Vegas. Dr. Glick did not believe he had any relatives in Nevada.

Regent Howard asked if Dr. Glick knew anyone in the Higher Education System from Nevada. Dr. Glick stated he knew Mr. Dick Morgan, Dean of the Law School at UNLV. They worked together at Arizona State. He said that unknowingly, when he arrived in Reno, he discovered that Dr. John McDonald was the Dean of the School of Medicine. They worked together at the Mayo Clinic in Scottsdale. He also knew a faculty member in the Department of Economics, who was his faculty member at Iowa State and Missouri.

Regent Sisolak asked if there was any discussion about this job and Dr. Glick bringing anyone with him; spouse or children needing employment. Dr. Glick said he would be bringing his wife and there has been no commitment or discussion with anyone concerning employment for her. Dr. Glick stated that if he took this position there would be some people he would hire, but there was no discussion of bringing anyone or any other commitment for employment.

Regent Leavitt asked Dr. Glick his thoughts on fundraising. Dr. Glick said it was clear that everyone's expectation was that there would be greater private investment in the university than there has been. He stated as president, he would plan to play a major role in making that happen. As he engaged in shaping his future at UNR and got to know the university, he would then be in a better position to approach private contributors. Dr. Glick stated that at this point he does not want to quantify it because it is not how much time was spent, but rather how much money was raised. That has not been the major aspect of his portfolio as provost. He thought it had to be well integrated with everything else the president does. Dr. Glick stated people would invest in the university because they would see the results and their return on that investment. He would rather sell ideas than personality.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Dondero asked Dr. Glick how he felt about research programs and how they would be promoted. Dr. Glick said it was clear that UNR needed to take its strong research programs and enhance them. He observed that UNR was smaller than many of its competitors. Therefore, even if they are effective on a pro forma basis, the total does not meet the competition and that was a critical element in how far they could go. A significant question to be answered at UNR was how big they should be. He was not prepared to answer that. He felt it was the defining question for what UNR becomes. He said number one was having the facilities to conduct research. Next would be good faculty, high expectations of that faculty and accountability of that faculty. He pointed out that they require the tools of their trade and need to be sure their teaching and service expectations were constant with their type of research. He said recognizing that in the long run in many fields, certainly the sciences and engineering, the goal was to give these faculty the infrastructure and startup investment and then it was their responsibility to support the research, in large part, through federal and corporate funds. He stated that insisting that faculty raise funds was not just the dollars, it was to get the research done, and get the new ideas the faculty were capable of generating for the health of the nation.

Regent Dondero asked if Dr. Glick could work with federal agencies. Dr. Glick stated he could and he has, but basically the thrust of the federal funding was going to come from the individual researcher making the best case for those federal funds with the agency. By collecting researchers across the university with common interests and putting them together, an environment would be created where they could generate considerably more dollars because the great thrust in Washington with research was interdisciplinary, not because it was inherently better, but because that was where the problems were now, at the intersections of the disciplines. Arizona State

University has created a new school of Earth & Space Exploration, which brought the astronomers, astrobiologists, astrochemists, and geologists together to look at very large problems.

Regent Rosenberg asked about art, music, theater, English, and history. He said the federal government looked at these items and felt there was nothing there. Dr. Glick said some areas should be bringing in their own funds. In other areas, the university would have to help more. It does not really cost more, but the university needed to make those things happen. Dr. Glick said scholars could help themselves in those areas also, from the Guggenheim's to the Fulbright's; there were a variety of ways. There were two thrusts in the arts, one of which was honoring the traditional arts and the performance, reflecting on the creative activity. The other, which was growing in importance, was recognizing how the arts were changing and must change so they are as important to the 21st Century people as they were in the 19th Century. Dr. Glick stated that was at the edge as opposed to the core of the traditional arts.

Regent Rosenberg said the art department at UNR, and at UNLV to a certain extent, was doing an entire program in new media in context, keying off of what Dr. Glick was talking about. The biggest problem was that laboratory space for science was understood, but studio space for the creative arts was more difficult.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg asked if Dr. Glick had any experience with trying to balance the two startup costs. Dr. Glick said modest startup costs were provided for the arts, and very big startup costs for the sciences. Arizona State University did not build anything for 10 years. There were now nine buildings underway, which were almost all in the sciences. The president made a decision that investment in the sciences had to be made to meet certain institutional objectives, and while it was understood there were needs in other areas, they were trying to make investments there. It was a very tactical and strategic decision. There are superb facilities in music, but very poor facilities in the art department. It was a combination of a very old building and what the artists could do with it. Historically the humanists have not prospered much.

Regent Schofield said he was passionate about athletics and asked Dr. Glick for his philosophy about sports in academics. Dr. Glick state he liked athletics too. He felt it was an excellent way of bringing the community to the university, an excellent way of building community within the university, and an excellent way to train leaders. He wants to win at everything, but that was secondary to having a clean program and having students that graduate. If he had to choose between winning and graduating his students, he would graduate his students and be proud of them. Dr. Glick said that having said that, he does not like to loose, and does not think there was an incompatibility between having a winning team, building leaders and graduating athletes. There have to be coaches and athletic directors who believed that, and if they did not, they were the wrong people for the job. Dr. Glick worries about the escalating costs in this area. When so much incentive money was put on a coach to win, it puts huge pressures on that coach. He wants coaches who want to win, but want to win right. That meant students work hard, were good people, and they graduate. One thing he wanted was for student athletes to put the same kind of intensity into learning that they put into practicing and winning, because it was just as hard to learn as it was to run a nine-second hundred. He stated there was evidence that athletes do better in their courses during the semesters while in the sport than off semester, because the discipline learned as an athlete translated to discipline as a student.

Regent Leavitt asked Dr. Glick what interested him specifically about living in a city with snow, and about the opportunities that this position held versus the presidency at the University of Arizona at Tucson, if that was open. Dr. Glick said he lived with snow most of his life. He stated that he lives in his job and the question was whether UNR was ready to make decisions about its future, and could he affect its future. He has never been very interested in a management job where he would simply keep things running. The question was whether UNR was a place where a difference could be made. Dr. Glick stated that, for him, it was less the city of Reno and more of whether he can make a difference which would have an impact on the state and the nation.

Regent Leavitt asked what impressed Dr. Glick the most during the past two days of his visit. Dr. Glick said he felt it was a healthy university that has managed to keep its student-faculty ratio surprisingly low, which was

good. Salaries seem to be competitive,

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

the faculty does not seem to be looking to leave their jobs, and the university seems to hire good, young faculty.

Regent Sisolak stated the problem he had with good athletes being good students was he does not feel that they need to be mutually exclusive. It seemed to be an excuse he heard constantly from athletic directors or coaches that do not perform very well. They point out that the athletes were doing better on the graduation side than the athletes that were winning.

Regent Sisolak asked Dr. Glick what experience he had with part-time faculty and was there a problem with language communication. Dr. Glick stated that all public universities were becoming more dependent on non-track faculty. ASU has temporary or non-track faculty who were full-time and part-time. It was clearly a very cost effective way to get courses taught. Recognizing ASU does not have a choice, they try to be less exploitive. Salaries have been raised slowly, and some have been moved from part-time to full-time, not to track positions, and they teach more than track because they do not have research responsibilities. By moving them to full-time they make a better salary and receive benefits. There were also development opportunities, they teach better and were accessible because they were more stationary. ASU would like to do all of its teaching with tenured faculty, but recognize the value of the non-track people and treat them better.

Dr. Glick went on to say that the issue raised about language relates more toward graduate students, and more specifically, disciplines where there were not enough Americans going to graduate school. International graduate students were not purposely chosen for civil engineering, and ASU would like more domestic students because it was in the nation's best interest. Dr. Glick stated they try to make sure the student in the classroom speaks good English, but sometimes mistakes were made and then they were fixed.

Regent Howard asked Regent Sisolak if he was referring to part-time math teachers. Regent Sisolak stated yes, particularly math was the area with the most complaints. The students felt they did not understand the material and could not understand the instructor due to the language barrier.

Regent Schofield left the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked what the funding mechanism was in Arizona for the community colleges. Dr. Glick said a small amount comes from the state but most comes from the county district and from tuition. Regent Sisolak said that was very different from Nevada because it was all state funded, none comes from the communities.

Regent Sisolak said the analogy was the president must be an advocate for UNR and its students while thinking about the other seven presidents, knowing they all need money. There was a different funding mechanism to deal with in Nevada. Regent Sisolak asked

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

Dr. Glick how he felt about the medical school in Reno and residencies in Las Vegas. Dr. Glick felt that it was important for the medical school to stay in Reno to prosper and expand. He does not see that inconsistent with having a campus in Las Vegas. If one were starting from scratch, the medical school would be built where the population is. Dr. Glick said a lot more doctors were needed to graduate in this state. He said he does not see why they cannot be graduated from programs that live in both places. He thought one of the complexities, and he has not talked with Dean McDonald about this, as he understands the present structure, was it tended to be the first two years in Reno and the second two years in Las Vegas. He stated that actually works in the sense that what UNR really wants in Reno was the basics and, what was needed in Las Vegas was the clinical. Dr. Glick went on to say that one of the complexities would be that the modern medical curriculum would be very distinct. He does not have an answer for how to make this work as it was presumably expanded in both sites, reflecting the fact that the new curriculum would not be so easily sub-divided. He felt that was a question that had to be at the top of the dean's agenda.

Regent Howard asked Dr. Glick how he felt about admission standards. Dr. Glick said it was clearly an issue of

some conversation on campus. He said he believed that all students should be allowed to enter if they were capable of doing the work. Quality of the class should be improved by adding the top students. He would look at the data and if it was believed that a group of students could not succeed, then it would be a cruel joke to bring them in. The goal is not to close the doors. He would like to graduate the best students in the country and also have an open door to all students who can do the work. They would all do better by being together. He was aware this was an issue that has been raised to him by a number of faculty, which was worthy of debate, and the debate should be based on data. He has not had a chance to look at the UNR data, so he does not know if the admission standards were right or wrong. He felt the way to increase the likelihood of students' success was to have them take four years of English and math, which should be the core of admission requirements.

Regent Howard asked about a freshman college focusing on freshman to help them improve retention and asked Dr. Glick his opinion. Dr. Glick said University College has just been created in his area. He explained it was not a freshman college, but rather a college for students in transition; students changing majors, students entering who do not know what their major is. Dr. Glick asked why students should know what their major is when they have never been exposed to the different majors. Dr. Glick said the issue of starting in a freshman college or a declared major both work, and he does not have strong feelings about it. He stated it was important to ask what the student needed, but pointed out that the student also has a responsibility for helping himself/herself succeed. He expressed the key was to even the playing field. The fact was the best predictor of college success was the student's zip code, and that was an unacceptable fate of the world.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

Regent Dondero said having the medical residents in Las Vegas was to help the hospitals and the amount of patients coming in to the emergency room, which was very good because they get a certain amount of money from the county to supplement that part of the program. It was a great arrangement for medical students. Dr. Glick said it seemed reasonable and it allowed them to handle real cases.

Regent Leavitt stated that at the March, 2006 Board meeting, a Regents' Committee was created, and also a Health Sciences Center Committee. One thing that was being studied for the very near future was the organizational design of the Health Sciences Center and there were discussions on whether or not to have a president or a vice chancellor for health sciences who reported directly to the Chancellor. Regent Leavitt asked Dr. Glick to discuss the pros and cons of a possible university president who would traditionally be in charge of the medical school, where there would be a different line of reporting. Dr. Glick stated the pros of separating it out that way was that, essentially, the UNR/UNLV conflict was taken out of the picture. Dr. Glick continued that a new conflict was created; medical center versus UNR, medical center versus UNLV. Secondly, Dr. Glick stated he believed that one of the opportunities for a university was to have people from across the university interacting with the medical school; that was where the money was and that was where the intersection of physics, chemistry, bio-engineering with medicine was going to be an economical growth area and a health growth area. He continued that separating it out from the university has a cost to it. Dr. Glick said there were very few examples of two-campus medical schools; there were some examples of independent medical schools, and the Mayo does not count because it was a very distinct entity. He stated the University of California, San Francisco was an example where it has its own chancellor, so it was not unheard of. Dr. Glick said those were the pros and cons and on balance, he felt it was not the way to go. He concluded it was one of those critical path questions that should be asked, and clearly the university presidents need to be an integral part of that conversation because aggression was what was best for medical education in the state, but also what was best for the overall health of Nevada's universities. Regent Leavitt agreed that the presidents should be involved in those conversations.

Regent Rosenberg asked Dr. Glick how forceful he felt he could be as president because the Chancellor has very definite ideas. Regent Rosenberg was most concerned that whoever comes to UNR and UNLV be capable of having a good discussion with the Chancellor without being cowed, and holding their own. He asked Dr. Glick if he could do that. Dr. Glick stated that outcomes would have to be measured. He expressed hope that the

Chancellor and president of UNR would come to an agreement and have an open dialogue and/or argument to get there, but in the end it would be his expectation that they would reach a comfortable resolution. Dr. Glick said he was very willing to make his cases, state his mind and speak openly. He expressed that he also understood that eventually certain decisions were made and everyone joined hands.

Regent Rosenberg explained that the UNR faculty was worried about being heard, not listened to. Dr. Glick said when the faculty says “the administration has not communicated with us”, what they really mean was that there has been no dialogue. Dr.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont’d.)

Glick stated part of his view was he was not going to try to understand what happened yesterday, he was only interested in what happens tomorrow. Dr. Glick said he would ask the faculty to suspend disbelief about him and give him a chance.

Regent Schofield was pleased to hear what Dr. Glick had to say about the medical school. Dr. Glick said it was one of the values of the university’s medical education and he was very grateful to the University of Washington Medical Center who saved his grandson’s life. No one wants to sacrifice quality healthcare.

Regent Howard wondered what ASU does for recruiting and retaining minority students. Dr. Glick said there were 1,200 Native American students at ASU. He stated they do not do as well as the Anglo-Americans do, but then in contrast, the Spanish students do exactly as well as the Anglo students. The first president of the Navajo nation was hired as a special assistant to the president and goes to the reservation to speak with the tribal leaders. There was an Indian student center at ASU, but the best thing that could happen for them was adequate financial aid, which was the core for Native American success.

Regent Howard asked how many African-American students ASU had. Dr. Glick said, on a national basis, there was a very small amount of African-American students just because of location, and it could be better if financial aid was available. Their statistics were better than the Native American students. ASU has the strongest Indian law program in the country. He stated they have produced a number of Supreme Court justices, and presently have over 20 Native American faculty. The diverse population in Arizona contributed to the diversity of the institution.

Regent Leavitt asked Dr. Glick what would be needed or expected from the Board to help him succeed. Dr. Glick said he would need honest critique, an open dialogue, clear expectations of the president, shared goals and exploration of differences of opinion, and a time allowance for accomplishments. He would like to convince the legislature that we can solve our own problems. He stated he would look for the Board for guidance to bring the university to the best that it can be.

Dr. Glick said something else he would expect from the Board, not being a native Nevadan, would be for them to inform him of what the state was all about.

Regent Leavitt explained that he often heard discussions about the constitutional autonomy of this Board which governs all of higher education in Nevada. There were 13 incredibly strong, spirited, passionate personalities and the Chancellor enters as number 14. He asked Dr. Glick how he would keep in communication with a Board this size. Dr. Glick commented that, obviously, there were formal interactions. Dr. Glick explained he does not like surprises, he does not feel the Board would like surprises and he would have to understand what was allowable under the law, but he does not want Board members to read things in the paper they feel they should have been told about. On the other hand, he would not want to become a burden by giving more information than necessary. Dr. Glick thought that understanding the complexity of the open meeting environment was one that would be clearly understood. Regent Leavitt urged and cautioned Dr. Glick to be

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont’d.)

sure to talk to enough people so the picture was representative and to be certain that he got enough information for accuracy.

Regent Sisolak asked Dr. Glick if he was aware of the situation in agriculture where some assets were sold off

and the community was upset. Dr. Glick said he was not aware of it. Regent Sisolak said he had a long term relationship with Mr. Morgan from the law school, and asked if he had a long-term relationship with the Chancellor. Dr. Glick said he met him once last week because the Chancellor was not available for this interview. He had never met him before that. Dr. Glick was aware of him because he was a major benefactor of Arizona State University.

Regent Howard asked Dr. Glick if Arizona had an elected board or an appointed board. Dr. Glick said it was appointed and he thought there were times they would like less interaction with him. He stated he was the point on a number of very difficult issues where a comfortable resolution was reached. He continued that it often took a great deal of time in both public and private sessions to arrive there. Dr. Glick felt there have been very different boards over his tenure because it was appointed and it need not be politically balanced. He continued that in Iowa it had to be politically and gender balanced. Dr. Glick said with a republican governor there was one group, if democratic, another group. There were different agendas, which changed over time. They represented the people, the owners of the university and their constituents. Dr. Glick said he always found an acceptable conclusion could be reached in the end.

Regent Leavitt asked Dr. Glick about his own personal experiences concerning the quality or responsiveness with that variety of boards. Dr. Glick said he thought that being a board member was a very responsible, difficult position. There were cases where individuals used a board member as a personal advocate for themselves. Part of the job for the university administration was to be sure that board members got all the facts. He related that one board member had an office on a unionized campus and spent full time there. Dr. Glick said he believed the board members must be fully informed for quality responsiveness.

Regent Howard asked if there was an ombudsman on the ASU campus. Dr. Glick said there were lots of ombudsmen, but not a formal office of ombudsmen. The faculty senate had an ombudsman and the student senate had an ombudsman, for example.

Regent Schofield asked how effective Dr. Glick felt that ombudsmen are and were they needed in a campus setting. Dr. Glick stated that it depended on the kind of administration. He said it was a good vehicle, as long as the ombudsman understood that his purpose was to provide people a chance to be heard and find a solution, not to make a decision. He concluded that if they were used too often, there may be a problem. Regent Schofield stated there were three octogenarians on the Board. He said it appeared that Dr. Glick has gained wisdom with his number of years on this earth. Dr. Glick offered that he was 68 years old and felt the same as he did 30 years ago. He said he was one year younger than the senior senator from Arizona.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg asked if Dr. Glick were addressed with a grievance situation, whether he would select a smaller or larger number of people to hear the grievance. Dr. Glick said he thought the question was how to select a grievance committee. He stated it was imperative to keep people off the committee who have a vested interest or a conflict of interest in the case. He questioned how many people were necessary to address a problem. He stated that he felt a balanced committee would be best, but to recognize that in the end the committee only makes recommendations to the president.

Vice Chairman Gallagher asked whether Dr. Glick had any questions for the Board.

Dr. Glick thanked the Board for inviting him to participate in this unusual process. It was a learning experience and he met many people who care a lot. Dr. Glick asked where the Board wanted UNR to be seven years from now. Regent Schofield said he would like to see the finest university system in the United States, like USC, Duke and Notre Dame. Regent Dondero said she hoped that the students would be satisfied when they graduated. Regent Sisolak said he was looking for an institution that was diverse, inclusive, and something the tax payers and government would be proud of and demonstrated that money was spent wisely. He stated the people should feel proud of the institution with everyday citizens feeling a part of it, not excluded, with a sense of openness.

Vice Chairman Gallagher stated that a university should sort out and focus upon their areas of strength. Trying to be everything to everyone results in a loss of quality. She said people should not be excluded, and programs should be sorted out. Those programs done well and those programs that have the potential to do well, and that are meaningful to the people of Nevada and the state, should be recognized and built upon. Regent Rosenberg would like to see vitality, recognizing that the world was changing, and teaching in self-contained boxes does not work anymore. He said medical students needed to be in humanities classes. Excellent doctors were needed but human beings needed to understand human beings. He said the university, in his opinion, was deceptive in that it appeared very calm from the outside, but it was not; it was a dynamic, volatile institution which changed constantly. The change was good, but it required leadership. Regent Rosenberg said it does not need to be driven, it needs to be lead. He believed that in 5, 7 or 10 years it would be a better version of what it already was, but it needed to be able to change. He felt these young people were going to live in a very different world, and the institution has a chance to make that world a better one. Regent Howard said she agreed with focusing on the strengths and would like to see more team building, but in order for that to occur there must be trust in the administration and faculty as well as students' trust with administration. Students needed to feel they were a part of and connected to the university. Dr. Glick felt he got a good idea from everyone's questions and thought one vital question was how big UNR should be. He thought that answer would take a lot of dialogue and it should be sooner rather than later. Vice Chairman Gallagher asked how big. Dr. Glick did not know, but responded bigger than it was today.

1. Information Only-Candidate Visit with Board of Regents – (Cont'd.)

Regent Leavitt said all institutions have a strategic plan and he suggested that if Dr. Glick were offered this position, he recommended Dr. Glick do everything he could to educate his administration, staff, and faculty. It worked both ways and each side must give 100% at all times, and if that was done then everyone would be in touch. When people were talking good things happened and there was nothing that could not be accomplished.

2. Public Comment – None.

3. New Business – None.

–

The meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

Fini S. Dobyms
Secretary of the Board