

VIDEOCONFERENCE

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Conference Rooms, System Administration
2601 Enterprise Road, Reno
5550 W. Flamingo, Las Vegas
Thursday, June 1, 2006

Members Present: Mr. Bret Whipple, Chair *{Las Vegas site}*

Mr. Mark Alden *{Las Vegas site}*

Dr. Jill Derby *{Las Vegas site}*

Mrs. Thalia M. Dondero *{Las Vegas site}*

Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher *{Reno site}*

Mr. Douglas Roman Hill *{Reno site}*

Mrs. Linda C. Howard *{Las Vegas site}*

Mr. James Dean Leavitt *{Las Vegas site}*

Mr. Howard Rosenberg *{Reno site}*

Dr. Jack Lund Schofield *{Las Vegas site}*

Mr. Steve Sisolak *{Las Vegas site}*

Mr. Michael B. Wixom *{Las Vegas site}*

Members Absent: Dr. Stavros S. Anthony

Others Present: Chancellor James E. Rogers

Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich

Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols

Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen

President Richard Carpenter, CCSN

President Stephen Wells, DRI

Vice President Carl Diekhans, GBC

President Fred Maryanski, NSC

President Philip Ringle, TMCC

President Carol Harter, UNLV

Interim President Joseph Crowley, UNR

Vice President Dan Neverett, WNCC

Secretary of the Board Scott Wasserman

Also present was faculty senate chair Dr. William Robinson, UNLV.

Chair Bret Whipple called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. with all members present except Regents Alden and Anthony.

Regent Howard led the pledge of allegiance.

Regent Wixom offered the invocation.

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – Chancellor James E. Rogers and NSHE staff presented updated reports concerning the biennial budget requests for capital, operating, and one-shots for the 2007 legislative session as previously presented to the Budget and Finance Committee on March 16, 2006. The

reports included, but were not limited to, the general overview of the biennial budget process, the establishment of System priorities, a discussion of the Fall 2005 Space Utilization and Inventory by institution, and a proposal for budgets associated with the Health Sciences Center. In order to comply with the State's budgetary timelines, the Capital Improvement request must be finalized by the Board in June 2006, and the Operating Budget/One-shot requests must be finalized by the Board in August 2006 (*Bound Report for use at June 1 and June 8-9 meetings on file in the Board office*).

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich thanked System Administration employees Dr. Jane Nichols, Mr. Dan Miles, Mr. Larry Eardley, Ms. Crystal McGee and Ms. Ginny Wiswell for their assistance in preparing the biennial budget requests. He also thanked the institution Presidents and their staffs for their efforts in this process. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich recalled that the operating budget request for the 2007-2009 biennium blends together a number of important elements including Board of Regents' priorities, the NSHE master plan, the funding formula, instructions from the Governor, legislative actions and the needs of the individual institutions. He related his presentation would also include a budget request for the University of Nevada Health Sciences Center (*UNHSC*). He assured members that the Center would not be built on the backs of the institutional budgets. Because it is such a critical state need, new state dollars will be requested rather than a reallocation of System budgets. NSHE is seeking an increase in the state operating budget for the implementation of this project (*from \$27 million to approximately \$53 million; an increase of less than one-half of one percent*).

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich discussed the operating and one-shot budgets beginning with a discussion of enrollments. The NSHE has sustained a period of prolonged, significant growth. While enrollment growth is expected to flatten somewhat in the next few years, the impact on the budgetary process of a slightly reduced growth curve could result in reduced state funding for a number of the NSHE institutions. The levels of growth required to justify budgeted funding levels are not currently attainable. If the System is to avoid budget shortfalls and cutbacks, the funding formula will need to be increased. The Chancellor has begun discussions regarding enrichment of the formula funding from its current 85% level to one that avoids having any NSHE institution in a negative dollar amount without costing the state a significant amount of money.

Regent Gallagher requested an estimated figure for this increase. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied it was not known at this point as the numbers are still being developed. He estimated an increase to the funding formula of approximately five percentage points (*approximately \$50 million*).

Regent Wixom asked about the source of funding and why this would not cost the state a great deal of money. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied they would be funding fewer full-time equivalent students at a higher percentage level. The net effect would be a wash.

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Wixom asked whether anyone was reviewing the demographics of the student growth to determine the underlying reason for these changes. He asked how far out student enrollment had been projected. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied there is a direct relationship between the economy and student enrollment. The matter is currently under review. He said it was not indicated in the state growth demographics or in the projected high school graduation rates. Regent Wixom observed that, in the past, Nevada has experienced nearly full employment and it has not affected enrollment growth. As the state's population has grown, enrollment in higher education has generally tracked this population increase. He was curious about the sudden change and felt the Board should address and understand this right away.

Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that each institution is providing enrollment growth data, including the differences in graduate, undergraduate, upper-division and lower-division enrollment. Each institution is studying this issue. Nevada is still the fastest growing system in the United States in spite of experiencing a decrease in enrollment growth. For the past ten years, the NSHE has been unable to grow fast enough to keep pace with the state's population growth. As the numbers increase, the percentages decrease because the absolute numbers become a smaller percentage of a larger number. The budget is based totally on percentage growth and drives an ever increasing absolute number. The two universities have experienced some shifts in graduate

enrollment. The obvious area for improvement for both universities is upper-division, which is a retention issue. Retention has a huge impact on these numbers. There are also not enough classrooms to meet the current demand.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich explained that the adjustment to the funding formula was currently unknown. This is a stand-alone request and firm numbers will be provided at a later date.

Vice Chancellor Nichols reported that the first priority recommended for Board adoption is an adjustment to the funding formula for enrollment growth and to preserve the institutions' budgets, though the figure has not been determined at this time. In addition to growth and enrollment, enhancements are also requested. The enhancements are comprised of:

1. Student Access and Success:

- · Caseload Adjustment/Growth (*AB 203*) – Before the 2005 Session, the Legislature's Interim Study Committee brought in a team of experts to address whether or not higher education in Nevada was as efficient and effective as it could be. Area of improvement noted:
 - ✓ · CCSN base budget adjustment for student services (*\$21 million*).
- · Counseling/Advising/Student Services – Budgeted amounts by institution for what it would take to improve retention, access and success for students.
- · Part-Time Faculty Enhancements - \$6,977,323 for each year of the biennium.
- · STEM Initiative (*Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics*):
 - ✓ · Nevada STEM Scholarship Program – Though not part of the budget request, this bill draft builds on the new federal SMART Grant program. These need-based scholarships will target baccalaureate degree-seeking

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

university/college juniors and seniors pursuing a major in the physical, life or computer sciences, technology, engineering or mathematics. It is anticipated these significant awards will be an incentive for students to consider majoring in and becoming successful in the STEM fields.

- ✓ · Adopt-a-School P-16 Program – All eight NSHE institutions will adopt at least one Nevada K-12 public school as an education partner in STEM education with the goal of improving science and mathematics education preparation for all students to be well prepared to enter the higher education system. Each institution will receive \$200,000 over the biennium to support a new program. A report on the success of these activities will be made annually to the Board of Regents and the Nevada Legislature. Total cost for the biennium \$1.6 million.
- ✓ · Research/Graduate Assistantships (*STARS*) – Nevada STARS research assistantships will be offered to the top graduate students of their field nationally in STEM areas identified by UNR, UNLV and DRI as fields of excellence in which they have the ability to achieve high national rankings. Ten per year for UNR and UNLV and five per year for DRI are requested at \$45,000 each. Total for the biennium is \$5 million.
- ✓ · Nevada MESA Program – An integrated science and math enrichment program for students in grades 6-12. The program's goal is to increase the proportions of Hispanic, African American and Native American students excelling in mathematics and science in middle and high school and make them fully eligible for admission to the two universities. Total cost for the biennium is \$1.31 million.
- · Athletic Fee Waivers – Represents the Board of Regents' desire to fund athletic fee waivers at the community colleges. \$386,429 for the biennium.
- · Regents' Academy – A new program bringing System faculty together over the course of two days to study becoming better teachers. \$80,000 for the biennium.
- · P-16 initiatives – A staff position for the P-16 Council and money for College Bowl Sunday. \$361,500 for the biennium.

2. Research and Economic Development:

- · Research Infrastructure (*AB 203*) – Area of improvement noted by the Legislature's Interim Study Committee:
 - ✓ · UNLV base budget adjustment to achieve research university status (*\$13 million*).
- · Workforce/Economic Development initiatives.
- ✓ · Nursing 8:1 ratio – Adequate funding for nursing programs and instructors.
- ✓ · NSC teacher prep programs; increase capacity.

- ✓ · UNR computer gaming (*IGT partnership*).
- ✓ · UNLV Southern Nevada Small Business Development.
- · Statewide Programs.
- · Institutional Support for Enhancement Initiatives – A recommendation for additional administrative positions at DRI, which are consistent with

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

administrative positions that are supported at the two research universities. This would allow DRI to leverage its grant and indirect costs to support other research efforts.

Vice Chancellor Nichols reported the enhancements total \$42,166,807 for FY 2008 and \$40,885,715 for FY 2009.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich then reviewed the One-Shot requests. A focus was placed on technology through distance education, which will be a critical aspect of student outreach. Under Research and Economic Development, each institution has included their most critical need for equipment that can make a significant inroad to some research or economic development activity. A request has also been included for support of the iNtegrate project. The state will be asked to provide a portion of the estimated \$17 million cost.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich then reviewed the Capital Improvement request as prioritized by the institution Presidents. He noted a few differences from a previous presentation at the Board's Budget & Finance Committee meeting:

- · #2 DRI CAVE Completion – A restoration of the project to its originally configured size that had been eroded by inflation.
- · #26 DRI CAVE Expansion - An expansion to the project allowing a portion of the building to serve as an outreach to the community and a link between community and K-12 for the sciences.
- · #1 UNLV Greenspun Completion – Hyperinflation in the construction industry has taken a toll on the building. This would restore the building to its original scope.
- · #5 UNR Science & Math Center Completion - Hyperinflation in the construction industry has taken a toll on the building. This would restore the building to its original scope.
- · #4 CCSN Student Learning Access & Classroom Building (*w/NSC*) – increased space to provide opportunities for students not meeting increased university admission standards.
- · #7 NSC Education Building (*planning*) – increased space to provide opportunities for students not meeting increased university admission standards.
- · #8 TMCC Spanish Springs Project - increased space to provide opportunities for students not meeting increased university admission standards.
- · #23 CCSN North Campus Planning – President Carpenter bundled like projects in a single request for his multi-campus institution.
- · #16 WNCC Wellness & Community Center – The Carson City Council has approved a bond issue that will match dollars at the college (or the System). This is now recommended as a construction project rather than a planning project.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

- · #17 UNLV Nursing Relocation Shadow Lane Campus – An \$8 million request to renovate and equip a portion of Building B on the Shadow Lane campus. The initial purpose would be to relocate the School of Nursing to the preferred site of

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

the UNHSC. The relocation will also free critical space for other programs and disciplines. This is also reflected in the Capital Budget request for the UNHSC. If endorsed by the Board, this will go forward as part of the HSC budget and will be removed from this list.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich then reviewed the Health Sciences Center request. In December 2005, a needs assessment was performed. LarsonAllen Consultants interviewed over one-hundred stakeholders regarding the

requirements. Research was conducted regarding underserved physicians, allied health workforces, disease demographics and Nevada's greatest health care opportunity challenges. It was determined that the community and the state are ready for and require a Health Sciences Center. The School of Medicine and the allied schools of public health and nursing throughout the System are prepared to step up and do their share in meeting these needs. The needs assessment revealed the need for a dramatic change. Nevada has a growing and aging population with poor population health. Nevada has a major shortage of physicians, particularly in critical specialties. There are also major nursing and health professional shortages. Nevada has a small medical school with limited graduate medical education opportunities. From this arose the concept of the University of Nevada Health Sciences Center (UNHSC). In order to increase the physician workforce, Nevada requires a more complete School of Medicine with an increased class size and increased residency opportunities. In order for this to succeed it is critical to work with community partners, including the Nevada Cancer Institute, the Lou Ruvo Keep the Memory Alive Foundation, Touro University, community physicians and others. More nurses are also necessary. A school of pharmacy is also proposed to assist with the delivery of quality cost-efficient care. A Health Sciences Center is comprised of quality faculty with breadth and depth across the disciplines and passionate career commitments to teaching and research.

Mr. Greg Hart, Consultant, LarsonAllen, reviewed the UNHSC vision:

- · A great place to get a health professional education in a multi-professional learning environment.
- · A major producer of Nevada's future health professionals.
- · A tool for creation of targeted approaches to Nevada's community health issues through education, research and service.
- · A respected research enterprise with focus, contributing to Nevada's economic development.
- · An effective collaborator known for working with community resources in the interest of Nevada's health.
- · A catalyst for health system change in Nevada.

Mr. Hart related this was the first phase of work in a decade's long process of budgetary requests and investments. With the assistance of Dr. John McDonald, Dean, University of Nevada School of Medicine (UNSOM), he then reviewed the UNHSC 2007-2009 Legislative Request, noting that the Regents' ad hoc Health Sciences Committee had reviewed the request thoroughly at its last meeting. The major focus areas of the request include:

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

- · UNSOM - Early implementation of a growth plan to help solve Nevada's physician shortage and to develop a more complete School of Medicine.
 - ✓ · Nevada ranks in the bottom five in the country in terms of physician workforce to population. Nevada also has a small program with limited graduate medical education (GME) opportunities. The undergraduate medical class size will be expanded over the next few years (*from 52 to 62 students in 2007, and 96 students in 2010*).
 - ✓ · Significant expansion of the GME programs is expected (*207 new slots between July 2006 and July 2010*). Graduate medical education is typically funded by the federal government. Currently, the Nevada Hospital Association and several of its members have committed to funding this increase.
 - ✓ · Faculty additions primarily in support of GME program growth (*48 in 2007-08 @ \$10 million, 83 in 2008-09 @ \$10 million*).
 - ✓ · Classified staff and other operating expenses are needed to support the faculty growth (*\$2.6 million in 2007-08 and \$3.5 million in 2008-09*).
 - ✓ · New program development – Department of Medical Genetics and Development and Department of Molecular Medicine. Legislative request of \$2.9 million over the biennium (*\$1.1 million for faculty and \$0.4 million for classified staff in 2007-08, \$0.9 million for faculty and \$0.5 million for classified staff in 2008-09*).

Dean McDonald provided information about new frontiers in medicine. There are approximately five-hundred molecular markers for inherited disease. Predictive medicine is the next wave in medicine. Approximately 70% of the total healthcare budget goes toward common chronic diseases that take decades to develop and are the result of complex interactions between environment and genetics. Recent developments have allowed physicians to concentrate on predictors in populations of patients who will develop such chronic diseases (*e.g., hypertension, Type II diabetes*). Within the next five years, it will be possible to warn patients who are at risk for developing

these chronic disorders before severe organ damage occurs. Patients will be able to modify their lifestyles to prevent such illnesses from occurring. With the HSC initiative, the future public health needs of Nevada can be strategically and tactically addressed via a public-private partnership.

Mr. Hart continued his review of the HSC legislative request:

- · UNHSC - Multi-professional initiatives to improve the health and wellness of Nevada residents.
- ✓ · Initiatives: Inter-disciplinary research, education and service programs involving multiple health professional schools directed at Nevada's core health problems. Legislative request: \$13.1 million over the biennium.
- · NSHE schools of nursing and nursing programs - Contributing to the solution to Nevada's nursing shortage and addressing the shortage of nursing educators. The legislative request is yet to be determined. NSHE must anticipate the need to be responsive to policy recommendations from the Interim Legislative Commission on Health and the Governor's Commission on Medical Education and Research.
- · School of Pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences – Addressing Nevada's pharmacist shortage, especially in hospital settings. Capturing the improved patient care outcomes at lower cost, which clinical pharmacy practitioners can

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

provide. Advance the health sciences research agenda through pharmaceutical/biomedical research.

- ✓ · Initiative: Start a School of Pharmacy in 2007-09 with the first student class in Fall 2009. Legislative request: \$2.9 million over the biennium.
- · School of Dental Medicine – Expand rural outreach programs to meet underserved areas and underserved populations. Increase breadth and depth of dental education in Nevada through development of advanced education programs in endodontics, periodontics, oral and maxillofacial surgery and pediatric dentistry.
- ✓ · Initiatives: Develop four new advanced dental education programs with related faculty growth and new students starting in July 2007. Establish mobile dental office to serve rural and underserved communities and pediatric populations. Legislative request: \$1.6 million over the biennium.
- · UNHSC infrastructure and integration – Provide leadership, infrastructure and integration support to implement the UNHSC strategic plan.
- ✓ · Initiatives: UNHSC leadership team, faculty development (*clinical scholarship and leadership*), electronic health record (*education, research, pharmacology and patient care*), informatics, clinical skills laboratory. Legislative request: \$5.1 million over the biennium.

Mr. Hart reported the combined operations enhancement (*UNHSC Growth Plan, UNHSC Health/Wellness, School of Pharmacy, School of Dental Medicine, UNHSC Infrastructure/Integration*) would total \$51.7 million over the biennium, with figures for nursing yet to be determined.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich then reviewed the HSC Capital request. Four capital initiatives are proposed within the UNHSC:

- · In order to increase the pipeline of undergraduate students, the medical education facility needs to be expanded at the University of Nevada, Reno. This will increase laboratory and classroom space, and create additional research and educational space for health sciences schools. Though the figures are still being fine tuned, it is estimated it will cost \$75 million.
- · It is projected the HSC must have a permanent presence in Las Vegas, initially anticipated in two locations very close together. One, as a companion building to the Ruvo facility that will be a center for health aging, will include services related to non-interventional medicine (*i.e., vision, diabetes, wellness, internal medicine*) is estimated to cost approximately \$25 million. Additionally, a leadership team and expansion of graduate medical education (*clinical offerings*) will be housed in a proposed center in Las Vegas with a focus on classroom, library, the required administrative facilities and invasive clinical services (*surgery, reconstructive and transplant centers*).
- · UNLV proposes to renovate and equip Building B on the Shadow Lane campus. It is estimated it will cost \$28 to renovate the entire building.
- · An estimated \$5 million is included for planning of the UNHSC development.

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

Regent Wixom asked about student growth. He asked whether the dip in enrollments was due to a failure to reach out to minority communities within the state. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that NSHE was not doing a good enough job in reaching out to minority populations in the state and is least effective in the fastest growing areas, particularly the Hispanic population. Enrollment patterns reveal that the loss is not occurring in the freshman year. Nevada's going-to-college rate is still increasing significantly, including in minority groups. Each president can describe different occurrences on their campuses that could contribute to the decrease. Each of them is trying to analyze that and other factors to ascertain the cause. Part of the problem is the way the formula was constructed with a three-year rolling average, which does not consider a non-sustainable rate of growth.

Regent Wixom had heard that NSHE is losing students to other types of educational providers because it cannot meet students' needs (*i.e., provision of classes, class times, locations*). He asked whether that was indeed occurring. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that no hard data exists regarding NSHE's dropouts and the reasons. A lot of money has been included in the budget for distance education and new technology. NSHE is behind the curve in new technologies and does not do a good job in counting space for non-traditional classes. Nevada is not competitive with many providers who are able to accomplish more electronically and offer classes with 6-week intervals. The current budget reflects the campus' ideals for moving the System forward in this area.

In light of diminishing enrollments, Regent Wixom said it would be easier to justify a fairly aggressive budgetary increase if the Board were able to explain that efforts were being made to recapture students that had been lost due to the System's inability to meet their needs. Vice Chancellor Nichols agreed that providing a rationale for each of the expenditures would be useful.

Regent Hill asked whether a profile exists for students who persist versus those who dropout. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that such data does exist. Students who complete the appropriate curriculum in high school are more likely to persist. Students who have adequate financial assistance (*so they do not have to work full-time*) are more likely to persist. Students who declare a major early and remain focused on completing their degree are more likely to persist. Students who are able to take their courses any time, any place and get them in a convenient manner are more likely to persist.

Regent Sisolak asked why students who drop out were not surveyed. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that almost every institution tries to survey those students. That data has not been collected at the System level. President Harter related that some students do not respond. Vice Chancellor Nichols related that national data indicates that students tend to provide socially acceptable reasons and not necessarily the real reasons. Regent Sisolak requested a report from each institution providing this data.

President Harter provided an overview of some of the factors that are so unusual and difficult to predict. The average baccalaureate age is 27 years old and a good percentage of students are either married, have partners or jobs. UNLV graduated 22% more students this year (*5,100 degrees compared with 4,200 last year*). Many students are coming to

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

the university eight-ten years later to finish their degrees. Many students finish, but not in the traditional 18-22 year old range in five-six years. Older student populations contain factors that are not normally measured in national terms. She related there was not enough full-time faculty at the upper division. More space is required for classrooms and classes. She related there were a multitude of different issues that impact retention, attrition and where people move in and out of the economy that are not measured in traditional terms.

Regent Sisolak felt that decreased enrollment could be attributed to counseling and student services. He observed that more money was requested in this area for NSC than for UNR. President Maryanski said there were some areas in which NSC has no staff. Students have indicated that NSC needs to do a better job in academic advising. Regent Sisolak felt the entire System needs to do a better job in this area to stem the decrease in enrollments.

Regent Rosenberg assured Regent Sisolak that each institution conducts orientations where students are walked through a program to help them acclimate. He observed that students also had a responsibility. It is difficult to

make the transition from high school to the university where more initiative is necessary on the part of the student.

Regent Howard questioned how the amount of money requested by NSC for counseling and advising (*\$1 million*) would be justified by the Legislature. She also asked how they would justify the \$65 million capital request for NSC. She could not understand the justification with the small number of students for that institution. President Maryanski explained that NSC was requesting funds to formalize and establish their advising center. In concert with the other institutions in the state, the recent initiative to establish a transfer center as part of NSC's outreach to develop 2+2 programs at the community colleges NSC will require staff at the community colleges to advise the students properly. Currently, no staff has been dedicated to the issue of retention. There is also no staff in the student activities area. He felt that NSC's total operating budget request was not disproportionate. Regent Howard said she would like more detail.

Regent Schofield observed that the statistics appeared skewed because people are obtaining their degrees at different points in their lives and not necessarily in four straight years. He agreed that money was necessary to provide adequate counseling.

Regarding the MESA project, Adopt-a-School and College Bowl Sunday, Regent Wixom asked how the effectiveness of these programs was measured and how it would be measured in the future. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied there would be an annual report on those programs to the Board and to the Legislature on the Adopt-a-School program. With all of the programs it is expected that long-term impacts will be realized in the number of students who will go into math, science, technology and engineering who might not have. Increasing the number of majors and teachers in those fields will be an indicator. The Adopt-a-School, MESA and scholarship programs will be designed and measured by those factors. It will take time. Currently they are reporting the number of students, what they are doing, whether they are persisting in the program and whether the

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

families are involved. She said that data was available for the MESA program. She felt the Regents and the Legislature would want regular outcome reports regarding the benefits to the state. Regent Wixom felt the outcome reports need to be specifically measurable.

Regent Howard observed that minority health also included low-income. She asked where in the budget the state's poor population health was being addressed. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that, initially, it would be addressed with the multi-professional initiatives within the HSC (*i.e., programs addressing mental health, family health, addiction, geriatrics/aging population health needs, obesity/nutrition/exercise, statewide newborn and early childhood screening, emerging pathogens and bioterrorism, expanding health care providers in rural Nevada and health care policy*). NSHE provides one of the critical safety nets. Without the school of dental medicine and its clinical work, these populations would be horribly underserved. Regent Howard observed that funding for the dental school was not expected to be requested in this budget. President Harter explained that the request is for dental care for the rural populations of the state, which are underserved. The dental school also wants to expand residencies in various areas of dentistry much like the SOM. However, the most important request is the rural outreach program.

Regent Dondero asked whether the healthcare school would be administered from the Reno campus. Chancellor Rogers replied that the central administrative group would fall under the Chancellor's office. There will be an Executive Vice Chancellor for the Nevada Healthcare Sciences, a Chief Operating Officer of the healthcare system. The Executive Vice Chancellor will likely have an MD and a Ph.D. in public health. The medical, dental, pharmacy and nursing schools will all report to that person. The bulk of the work in treating patients will be in southern Nevada. The Dean of the School of Medicine will remain in Reno. The person who heads the Health Sciences department will be in Las Vegas. Regent Dondero asked whether the development of new programs or new buildings would fall under the umbrella of the medical department. Chancellor Rogers replied they would not build a huge staff. The nursing schools will remain where they are, as will the medical and dental schools. He estimated 10-15 people as the coordinating group for the efforts of the medical, dental, pharmacy and nursing schools. Regent Dondero asked who would make the decision for developing programs in specific

areas. Chancellor Rogers replied he did not know the specifics. General authority of the person who is running all of the medical efforts would be defined by the Board. Regent Dondero established that the UNSOM would remain in Reno. Chancellor Rogers said the first two years of the medical school would remain in Reno. The final two years are served in Las Vegas. He said they were not moving anyone, but rather were trying to coordinate all of the efforts throughout the entire state.

In reference to developing four new advanced dental education programs, Regent Sisolak suggested that if they misspoke four years ago when they said they would not ask the state for more money, they should just admit it. President Harter explained that for the basic, fundamental dental school (*the doctoral in dental medicine*) that UNLV was fully enrolled with 300 students. Except for an inflationary increase, UNLV would not ask for any state funds. There are a total of eight residency programs or post-doctoral programs that train people in dentistry specialties. UNLV has two of the eight specialties and is requesting a

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

small amount of funding to create these residency programs, which would provide post-doctoral training in these specialty areas for people in Nevada. Regent Sisolak did not believe that was the Legislature's understanding, nor was it his understanding when the Board initially voted on the dental school. Chancellor Rogers said the distinctions may not have been clearly made at that time. He felt it was unreasonable to say that the dental school would never ask for state money.

Regent Gallagher asked how the Presidents with these professional schools fit into the organizational chart. Chancellor Rogers said the Presidents would continue to report to the Chancellor, but would also interact with the Executive Vice Chancellor for the Nevada Health Sciences system. That person will be a coordinating figure rather than a boss. Differences among the institutions would be mediated by the Executive Vice Chancellor, but the Chancellor will determine final resolution.

Chair Whipple asked whether the Dean of the medical school would have one or two bosses. Chancellor Rogers said that would need to be determined. The Dean of the medical school will report to the President of UNR. When there are issues that relate to the relationship between the medical school and the dental school or any of the other health professions, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences will coordinate those efforts. If there is a problem, the Dean and/or the President can appeal to the Chancellor. Chair Whipple clarified that the line of authority would remain the same, but there would be an additional entity for coordinating purposes.

Regent Rosenberg established there would be an authority for the health sciences. He asked whether there would be another Executive Vice Chancellor. Chancellor Rogers replied there would be a Chief Executive Officer as a Vice Chancellor. The title would be determined by the Board. There will also be an Operating Officer who is responsible for coordinating budgets in the Nevada Health Sciences system. He was unsure about exact titles at this point. Regent Rosenberg observed that the person hired would have two assistants. Chancellor Rogers agreed. The head Vice Chancellor will have oversight over all of the medical institutions. A Chief Operating Officer will be required to raise money to fund this project. Additionally, someone will be necessary to interact with the Legislature, the Governor and local entities.

Regent Leavitt observed that the Health Sciences Center Committee had indicated that the organizational design/structure would be debated at the next Health Sciences Center Committee meeting. These plans are somewhat in their infancy. Chancellor Rogers said they were trying to be all inclusive by involving all areas of the state in order to assure the projects success.

Regent Hill appreciated the Chancellor's efforts to involve different constituencies. With all due respect to the Chancellor's managerial expertise, he did not foresee how this would work with a President and an Executive Vice Chancellor for Healthcare. He suggested that it would require a significant amount of thought. Chancellor Rogers assured him there was a lot of thought going into this and that he understood that someone would need to have the final decision, which would likely be the Chancellor.

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

The Chancellor's authority provides a lot of power to the Vice Chancellors for getting people to cooperate and

get things done.

Chair Whipple asked whether the Board's Health Sciences Center Committee was working in conjunction with the Governor's task force. Regent Leavitt replied they were working closely with Lisa Serwin who is the Executive Assistant to Don Snyder, who was chairing the Governor's task force. Senator Hecht is also a member of the Board's Committee. They are attempting to present a united front with the request to include the nursing groups as well. He said they had representatives from all three groups. He felt that everyone is aligned and working together. Chancellor Rogers said he had never put such a large deal together before. He anticipated there would be many starts and stops. He felt this is the future of medical care in this state. He asked all Board members to be supportive.

Chair Whipple observed that the goal of this initiative and the numbers are so large. He wanted ensure that all groups are on board. He was concerned about a successful legislative presentation without spreading the Chancellor too thin. Chancellor Rogers said they are meeting with representatives daily to discuss the magnitude of the project. The mood of the public is to develop something like this. He said this is the one chance to do this or we'll send everyone out of state for medical care. He felt the atmosphere was accepting of this proposal. He said they had received fairly good response from the town meetings that have been held.

Regent Leavitt observed that most people felt the request was too modest. He said it would require significant resources. He observed that the Chancellor has been working very closely with the Governor and those running for office. Some of the pressure will be removed by the Legislative Committee that will be making some of the same requests. He did not believe they would dip into the System request. These are separate line items requested separately so as not to diminish the other extraordinary System needs.

Chancellor Rogers met with President Harter to discuss a strategy for raising private money. It will involve the System Foundations and the Chancellor's office. He estimated it is a \$500 million to \$1 billion project. He believes that \$400-500 million could come from the private sector.

Regent Alden was under the impression that the primary mission for NSC was undergraduate education for nursing and teaching. He established that the main focus for NSC and other state colleges would be providing teacher education. Vice Chancellor Nichols agreed, adding that it was reflected in the budget. He asked whether they were developing another school of nursing for the Health Sciences Center. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied they were not. She related the key to doubling the nursing output is educating professors who can teach nursing. Thus, extra money was included for UNLV's doctoral program and they created a master's program in nursing that specifies teaching for the community college faculty. Regent Alden felt that undergraduate education for nursing and teaching belongs at the state college and the community colleges. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that both universities will continue to produce nurses. The emphasis is shifting at the universities to the graduate level.

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated the Chancellor has convened a System-wide task force of all the nursing programs within the state. They will bring those together with the same type of conceptual framework as that going into the HSC so the programs will work together.

Regent Alden asked whether residencies and fellowships were identical. Dean McDonald replied they were not. Regent Alden asked about the current number of residency programs in the state. Dean McDonald replied they have internal medicine (*north and south*), pediatrics (*south*), psychiatry (*north and south*), surgery (*south*) and family and community medicine (*north and south*). Chancellor Rogers said they were not ready for specifics yet. This is a major, billion-dollar project that cannot be picked apart \$10 at a time. Regent Alden asked how many residencies there would be in the state if all specialties were offered. Dean McDonald replied that Nevada has a very limited repertoire when compared with other states offering medical education.

Chancellor Rogers said there is a very strong feeling in southern Nevada about whether the medical school should be expanded in northern Nevada. There is a very strong feeling in northern Nevada as to whether

southern Nevada is trying to steal the medical school. Southern Nevada needs to support expansion of the medical school in Reno from 50 students to 100. Reno needs to support the expansion of the Health Sciences Center in Las Vegas because that is where southern Nevadans will be educated and treated. Everyone needs to get something positive out of the deal. All eight institutions are involved in the Health Sciences Center. Any feelings of discontent could destroy the project.

Regent Wixom felt the Regents were on board with the Health Sciences Center concept. One area of focus is the health needs of Nevada and the medical school. Another area of focus relates to student access and success, P-16 and other related issues. When addressing budget issues, the Board needs to discuss the Health Sciences initiative or the student access/success initiative operating in tandem and not in conflict. Chancellor Rogers said that is why the medical budgets were included with the Health Sciences Center project. These two initiatives are equally important. Concessions may need to be made at a later date. Regent Wixom was concerned about giving the Legislature the impression that the request was overly generous. He felt that the needs of the medical center and the needs for student access and success need to be clearly identified. Chancellor Rogers agreed. He said they had spent significant time balancing the requests so as not to overlook basic educational needs.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich reminded Regent Wixom about the research theme that is also emphasized in the budget request. There are three areas of concentration. This request will come forward from the Governor's Commission and the Interim Legislative Committee, which will lend credence to the System's request and differentiate the request from the request for the base System budget in a meaningful manner.

Regent Sisolak observed that they were three complementary issues and not competing with one another. He then addressed part-time faculty salaries. He observed that some

1. Information Only-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)

institutions had made greater progress than others and asked whether that had been taken into account so those institutions would not be penalized. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that it had been considered. A simple request for the funds necessary to reach the Regents' goal would have resulted in some institutions receiving less, namely those institutions that made the difficult decisions and invested dollars in trying to meet the Regents' goal. The two universities have made similar progress, so it was recommended that they be brought to the Regents' goal. With the community colleges, CCSN has made the most progress. CCSN was taken to the Regents' goal and that increase was converted to a percentage. It was recommended that the remaining institutions be funded on that same percentage basis. Regent Sisolak clarified that UNLV had made more progress to get the part-time faculty more money and that they would now not be penalized by receiving less as a result. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich agreed.

Regent Rosenberg was delighted with the progress, noting that more progress was still necessary. Regent Schofield agreed, noting that these instructors required more money.

Chair Whipple encouraged Regents with questions to call Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich. He asked about further opportunities for review of the biennial budget. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the Board would approve it at the June 8-9, 2006 meeting. He said they would discuss it as long as it took the Board to be comfortable with making its decision. Chair Whipple asked about the amount of time allocated to this issue at the June meeting. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied he believed it was scheduled for a couple of hours. He said they would concentrate on the capital request at that time.

2. Public Comment – None.

3. New Business – None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Scott Wasserman
Secretary of the Board