

11/30/06 & 12/01/06

BOARD OF REGENTS

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

>

Stan Fulton Building, Room 130
International Gaming Institute
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, November 30 - December 1, 2006

Members Present: Mr. Bret Whipple, Chair

Mrs. Linda C. Howard, Vice Chair

Mr. Mark Alden

Dr. Stavros S. Anthony

Dr. Jill Derby

Mrs. Thalia M. Dondero

Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher

Dr. Jason Geddes

Mr. James Dean Leavitt

Mr. Howard Rosenberg

Dr. Jack Lund Schofield

Mr. Steve Sisolak

Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Others Present: Chancellor James E. Rogers

Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich

Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols

Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mike Reed

Assoc. Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, Kenneth McCollum

Chief Counsel Bart Patterson

Special Counsel Brooke Nielsen

President Richard Carpenter, CCSN

President Stephen G. Wells, DRI

President Paul T. Killpatrick, GBC

President Fred Maryanski, NSC

President Philip M. Ringle, TMCC

President David B. Ashley, UNLV

President Milton D. Glick, UNR

President Carol Lucey, WNCC

Secretary of the Board Scott G. Wasserman

Also present were faculty senate chairs Mr. Alok Pandey, CCSN; Dr. Hampden Kuhns, DRI; Dr. Linda Uhlenkott, GBC; Dr. Larry Rudd, NSC; Mr. Kurt Hall, TMCC; Dr. William Robinson, UNLV; Dr. Michelle Rousselle, WNCC; Ms. Annie Macias, System Administration; and Dr. Guy Hoelzer and Mrs. Robin Gonzales representing UNR. Student government leaders present included Ms. Carrie Rowley, GBC; Mr. Aaron McGary, TMCC; Mr. Jeff A. Panchavinin, UNLV; Mr. Frederick W. Krauss, UNLV-GPSA; Mr. Jeff Champagne, UNR; Ms. Rebecca Bevans, UNR-GSA; and Mr. Dennis Mankel, WNCC.

Chair Bret Whipple called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m. on Thursday, November 30, 2006 with all members present except Regents Anthony and Sisolak.

Regent Geddes led the pledge of allegiance.

Regent Derby offered the invocation.

1. Introductions – Chair Whipple introduced Regent-elect Mr. Ron Knecht and congratulated Regent Mark Alden on his recent re-election.

President Richard Carpenter introduced Mr. Fred Conboy, Executive Director and Chief Development Officer for the CCSN Foundation; Mr. Shah Ardalan, new Chief Information Officer for CCSN; Mr. Larry Mosley, Interim Director of Diversity for CCSN.

President Stephen Wells introduced Dr. Ed Novak, Chief Information Officer for DRI.

President David Ashley introduced Dr. Ron Smith, Interim Vice President for Research for UNLV.

2. Chair's Report - Chair Bret Whipple requested the President of the hosting institution introduce one student and one faculty member to discuss a topic of the hosting President's choosing to help provide Board members with a focus on the reasons they serve as Board members. He also discussed current NSHE events and his current activities as Chair.

President Ashley introduced Dr. John Filler, Special Education Department-UNLV. Dr. Filler has been a member of the UNLV faculty for over 18 years and specializes in early childhood social school development for children with social disabilities. He is currently the faculty coordinator for the Lynn Bennet Early Childhood Education Center at UNLV and is joined by Dr. Catherine Lyons, Director, Lynn Bennet Early Childhood Education Center (LBECEC).

Dr. Filler reported that LBECEC received its accreditation as an education demonstration and research center in 1994 through the National Association for the Education of Young Children. The Center currently serves 239 children ranging in age from 6 weeks to 5 years, with or without disabilities. Approximately 55% are the children of UNLV students, 25-30% are the children of faculty and staff and the remainder live throughout the surrounding community.

The Center's facilities include ten separate classrooms, two fully equipped research classrooms, a multi-purpose room as well as administrative offices and conference rooms. The Center is staffed by ten general education teachers and three Clark County School District special education teachers. Seven of the general education teachers currently hold a license with the State of Nevada and the other three are working to complete their credentials very soon. 135 teaching assistants are currently employed making it the second highest employer of students on campus.

2. Chair's Report – (cont'd.)

Dr. Filler stated that one of the Center's most important functions is to provide training for UNLV students from various children and health related programs as well as staff from other outside agencies. There is also an emphasis placed on the importance of research. Dr. Filler is Chair of the Research Advisory Council, comprised of faculty drawn from various UNLV departments. Their mission and primary goal is to support the faculty and their students by identifying barriers that would keep them from conducting research at their facilities. In 2005-06, five studies were conducted including one that looked at the affects of a type of treatment referred to as social stories on social behavior with autism spectrum disorder. Another was a PhD dissertation that researched the relationship between teacher attention and student behavior. Sophisticated equipment is necessary to conduct research without interfering with the educational process of the children.

President Ashley introduced Stephen Crandall, Graduate Student – UNLV College of Fine Arts. Mr. Crandall stated that the reputation of this University was a major factor for his decision to attend UNLV and he was attracted to the opportunities of attending a large university with a large student body. He recently worked with President Ashley and the UNLV Foundation to create a campus tour video, for use as a presentation to potential

donors. The Board then had the opportunity to view the virtual campus tour video.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Chair Whipple offered congratulatory farewells to outgoing Regents Jill Derby and Linda Howard. Both Regents were presented with plaques displaying pins from each of the institution.

The meeting recessed at 9:03 a.m. for committee meetings and reconvened at 1:28 p.m. on Thursday, November 30, 2006 with all members present. Chair Whipple noted that Regent-elect Mr. Cedric Crear and Senator Bob Coffin were in attendance.

2. Chair's Report – (cont'd.)

Chair Whipple thanked Ms. Suzanne Ernst for her many years of service as Board staff and presented her with a gift certificate to show the Board's appreciation.

3. Chancellor's Report - Chancellor James E. Rogers discussed potential joint ventures with educational institutions such as the University of Warwick, Scripps Institute, Cety's Universidad (Mexicali) and Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara. He also discussed his other projects and events as Chancellor.

Chancellor Rogers reported that he was pleased with the State of the System address where he provided an overview addressing financial shortcomings, the System's relationship with the Governor and Legislature as well as the Health Sciences System. He has spoken with Governor-elect Gibbons about the Health Sciences System and is confident that this Legislature will see a united front from the Governor, the System and the Regents.

3. Chancellor's Report – (cont'd.)

Chancellor Rogers acknowledged Senator Bob Coffin for his time and attendance at today's meeting and recognized that his input on how to address the legislature will be very important.

4. Public Comment – President Carpenter stated that in 2005, CCSN held a 35th Anniversary Gala that raised \$350,000. That event will be an annual fundraising event. The proceeds of the first event allowed CCSN to develop a new program, First Class/First Book, which provides first time students their first class and textbook free. President Carpenter stated that response to the program has been overwhelming.

Vice Chancellor Nichols stated a table has been prepared to showcase the materials that each institution uses to assist students to transfer seamlessly. She urged the Board to visit the table during the break adding that the materials underscore the Board's mandate that the transfer process be as easy as possible for every student.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #1 (*Minutes*), 3 (*Handbook Revision, Public Information Contained in Personnel Files*), 4 (*Handbook Revision, Verification of Post-Employment Credentials*), and 9 (*Capital Improvement Fee Request, NSC*), which were approved separately:

(2) Approved-Handbook Revision, Communication between Presidents and Regents – The Board approved a *Handbook* revision to the Regents Bylaws, (*Title 1, Article VII, Section 4*) requiring Board notification of campus events that may have a significant impact on the institution as soon as practicable by the institution Presidents. This was the second reading for this proposed Bylaw revision (Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office).

(5) Approved-Handbook Revision, Community College Course Prefixes – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols' recommendation for a revision to Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 17*) concerning community college course prefixes. This revision will align Board policy with current practice and will correct conflicts between various sections of the Board's policy on course numbering (Ref. C-5 on file in the Board office).

(6) Approved-Handbook Revision, Student Government Association Constitution Addition, GBC – The Board approved GBC President Paul Killpatrick’s request, on behalf of Ms. Carrie Rowley, President of GBC’s Student Government Association, for approval of a *Handbook* revision (*Title 5, Chapter 11, Article III A 3*) to add student representation from the Pahrump campus to the SGA constitution (*Ref. C-6 on file in the Board office*) .

(7) Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Summer 2007 Salary Schedule, UNR – The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request, in accordance with Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 33, for the Summer Salary Schedule for the University of Nevada, Reno for the 2007 Summer Session. These revisions will be reflected in the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* (*Chapter 3, Section 5*) (*Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office*) .

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

(8) Approved-Capital Improvement Request, CCSN – The Board approved CCSN President Richard Carpenter’s request for the use of \$125,000 in Capital Improvement Fee funds to install leased portable modular units near the baseball field, which will be used as locker rooms, shower room, additional office area and storage space for the Southern Desert Regional Police Academy located on the Henderson campus. This plan will free up sorely needed space that can be converted into classrooms and training rooms to accommodate larger police recruit classes (*Ref. C-8 on file in the Board office*) .

(10) Approved-Capital Improvement Request, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley’s request for the use of \$3,490,000 in Capital Improvement Fee funds to be utilized for capital projects which cannot be funded from other institutional funds (*Ref. C-10 on file in the Board office*) :

- · Wilson Advising Center renovation \$200,000
- · Summer term offices relocation 165,000
- · Current Student Health Center renovation 1,000,000
- · Server room modifications 450,000
- · Bigelow Physics Building re-cabling 275,000
- · Server security improvements 250,000
- · Tennis Complex lights 500,000
- · Ham Concert Hall safety rigging 650,000

TOTAL: \$3,490,000

Regent Dondero moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #1 (*Minutes*) , 3 (*Handbook Revision, Public Information Contained in Personnel Files*) , 4 (*Handbook Revision, Verification of Post-Employment Credentials*) , and 9 (*Capital Improvement Fee Request, NSC*) . Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Alden was absent.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY:

(1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the UNR President Search Committee meetings held April 14, and May 1, 2006 and the special Board meetings held May 5, May 18, June 1, and August 4, 2006 (*Ref. C-1a, Ref. C-1b, Ref. C-1c, Ref. C-1d, Ref. C-1e, Ref. C-1f on file in the Board office*) .

Regent Sisolak expressed his concern for the age of the minutes. Mr. Scott Wasserman, Secretary of the Board, replied that he is in the process of posting an additional position and as soon as hired, he is confident the Board office would quickly catch up.

Regent Sisolak moved to approve the minutes as presented. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Alden was absent.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY: (*cont’d.*)

(3) Approved-Handbook Revision, Public Information Contained in Personnel Files – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich’s recommendation for a change to the NSHE Code (*Title 2, Chapter 5,*

Sections 5.6.2 and 5.6.3) to provide that educational and employment history submitted for consideration of employment become public records upon acceptance of an employment offer by the candidate. This was the second reading for this proposed Code revision (*Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office*) .

Regent Wixom asked whether this revision would allow information to be made public during the search process. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that no, it would only apply upon acceptance of an offer of employment. Currently there is a disconnect between the hiring policies and the confidentiality policies. Once an individual has been hired, their personnel file becomes confidential and their credentials cannot be shared. This policy revision will allow the campuses to publicly share the experience and education of its faculty.

Regent Sisolak moved to approve the Handbook Revision concerning Public Information Contained in Personnel Files. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Alden was absent.

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

(4) Approved-Handbook Revision, Verification of Post-Employment Credentials – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich’s recommendation for a change to the NSHE Code (*Title 2, Chapter 5, Section 5.10.2(a)*) to require NSHE institutions to independently verify the authenticity of academic credentials obtained after an employee’s original hire date and prior to recognizing such credentials in official personnel files, academic catalogues, institutional publications, other official documents, or for the purpose of promotion and title change. This was the second reading for this proposed Code revision (*Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office*) .

Regent Sisolak asked what recourse was available to the System if fraudulent or mistaken information is provided. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that recently the Board adopted a policy that allowed credentials to be verified during the employment process; however, for current employees, there needs to be a process authorizing the verification of current credentials as it applies to salary increases or promotions.

Regent Sisolak asked if there was a more expedient termination process than Chapter 6 if it is determined that information has been falsified. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that this policy revision is directed to those employees that were already in the System prior to the adoption of the degree verification and application falsification policies recently adopted by the Board.

-
CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY: (*cont’d.*)

(4) Approved-Handbook Revision, Verification of Post-Employment Credentials – (*cont’d.*)

Regent Howard asked if this policy revision allows for periodic checks on the status of current credentials. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that it was not designed for that purpose. This policy is intended to provide the System with the authority to verify new or previously claimed credentials when a current employee uses them to apply for a promotion or another job opportunity within the System.

Regent Howard asked what happens if a falsification is discovered after a promotion has occurred. Chief Counsel Patterson stated that under Board policy relative to misrepresentation, if an employee agrees to degree verification and it is discovered that a misrepresentation was made termination can occur without applying the Chapter 6 process. If a misrepresentation was made because the application, at the time it was completed, did not ask for certain information or asked for information in a way that was unclear, then Chapter 6 would apply. Regent Howard asked if there is an applicable Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) to address this concern. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that he is not aware of any specific NRS but that the Legislature did pass a statute regarding misrepresentation of educational degrees. Regent Leavitt also replied that there is at least one criminal statute regarding obtaining money under false pretenses that could refer these cases for criminal prosecution, from which civil liability may occur. There are mechanisms in place for punishment of such violations.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that during the last Legislative session, he appeared before the Legislature to testify in support of a statute regarding the integrity of credentials. He emphasized that this policy

revision is a fairly narrow change and does not cover falsification of applications to obtain employment. It is specifically for post employment credentials verification as it relates to a salary increase or promotion.

Regent Sisolak moved to approve the Handbook Revision concerning Verification of Post Employment Credentials. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained.

(9) Approved-Capital Improvement Request, NSC – The Board approved NSC President Fred Maryanski’s request for the use of \$284,000 in Capital Improvement Fee (CIP) funds for the following projects (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office) :

- · Furnish new lease space available in January 2007 \$98,000
 - · Additional enhancements to same new lease space 113,000
 - · Develop and furnish new science laboratory (Dawson campus) 73,000
- TOTAL: \$284,000**

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY: (cont'd.)

(9) Approved-Capital Improvement Request, NSC – (cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked what the per-credit allocation is for CIP fees. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that allocation differs between the universities, state college and community colleges.

Regent Sisolak asked how much it is for Nevada State College. President Maryanski replied that he would estimate it to be \$10 per credit. Regent Sisolak stated that at that amount, they would not have enough to cover this request. President Maryanski clarified that funds have accumulated over time in anticipation of these expenditures. Regent Sisolak asked if it was possible to request FF&E from the Legislature for leased space. Regent Maryanski replied no; however, in next year’s budget, they will look at the overall space leased and will increase the O&M accordingly.

Regent Sisolak requested that Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich provide the Regents with the per-credit allocation for CIP fees by institution.

Regent Sisolak moved to approve the Capital Improvement Request from NSC. Regent Howard seconded. Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained.

Chair Whipple announced that Chancellor Rogers had left the meeting feeling ill.

6. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Special Student Fees – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed’s request for new and revised special student fees for academic year 2007-2008. These revisions will be reflected in the *Procedures & Guidelines Manual* (Chapter 7, Sections 6-11)(Ref. A on file in the Board office) .

Vice Chancellor Nichols presented the requested changes to regular student fees, special course fees, student housing, food service items, apartment rentals, and some of the other more detailed fees that are set by the Board. This request does not include student health fees, including insurance fees, which are determined in the spring. The reference on page 2 of 16 to student health and insurance fees is to notify the Regents that WNCC and TMCC will no longer be part of the UNR program for health services.

Regent Wixom asked if there is a methodology and rationale for establishing fees. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the Board has a very clear policy that course fees must be based on actual expenditures and must be spent for disposable items within that semester, or the very next. In response to Regent Wixom, Vice Chancellor Nichols indicated there is an approval process in place for additional fees.

Regent Rosenberg also replied that teachers are required to cost out the fee to ensure the student receives full value adding that the instructors can buy in bulk and pass the better deal to the students.

6. Approved-Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Special Student Fees –(cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak asked if the term “disposable” was defined as items such as paint for the art classes. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied yes and the fees are not intended for permanent equipment or salaries. Regent Sisolak stated that he was concerned that certain items listed, such as mannequins for the GBC Nursing Department, are actually equipment. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that although she would ask GBC to clarify, the mannequins probably change on a frequent basis. Students are not asked to pay for items that are designated as equipment, which are \$2,000 or more. President Killpatrick stated that the request for mannequins may be to replace resuscitation equipment that wears out over time. Regent Sisolak reiterated his position that he feels this should be designated as equipment and not as disposable.

Regent Sisolak observed that the other colleges refer to consumable goods and do not call them disposable. Regent Wixom asked Regent Sisolak if he is asking if fees are being used to enhance the operating budget. Regent Sisolak replied yes and in addition, asked why Ref. A., Page 7 of 16, states that a portion of the lab fee is going to other departments. Ms. Lynn Mahlberg, Vice President Student Services-GBC, replied that in some cases more than one department is involved such as with the WEB-CT course. The Radiology Department requires the assistance of the Technology Department and they would share the fee. Regent Sisolak expressed his concern that special fees are not added or increased to remedy a shortfall in the budget.

Regent Wixom stated this he understands the need to pass this revision so that the fees can be in place for inclusion in the catalogs but he is also uncomfortable with the use of fees to enhance budgets. Chair Whipple asked President Killpatrick to follow-up on this matter and report to the Board at tomorrow’s meeting.

Regent Alden stated that he has never voted for a fee increase and will not do so today.

Regent Sisolak asked what is meant when it refers to the need to purchase instructional material to meet curriculum and accreditation standards. President Killpatrick stated that he will research that as well.

Ms. Carrie Rowley, Student Body President-GBC, noted that the mannequins used by the GBC nursing program are very expensive and are used by several departments until the wear and tear make them inoperable. Regent Sisolak again stated that this was not disposable and should be designated as equipment. Regent Geddes asked Ms. Rowley if they also have items that would be considered disposable. Ms. Rowley stated yes, in the form of kits that contain perishable chemicals.

Vice Chancellor Nichols commented that the policy states it can be used for class supplies, special transportation, individual instruction or some combination of reasons.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the special student fees for academic year 2007-2008. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden voted no.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY: (cont'd.)

(9) Approved-Capital Improvement Request, NSC – (cont'd.)

Chair Whipple stated that Assistant Vice Chancellor Cardinal has provided the requested information regarding the per credit allocation for CIP fees by institution. President Maryanski’s estimate of \$10 per credit at NSC was correct. Regent Sisolak asked how much will be in NSC’s account after this allocation has been deducted. Mr. Buster Neel, Vice President of Finance & Administration –NSC, replied that currently the balance is \$500,000. Regent Sisolak asked if the Board could be provided with the balance and uses by each institution to which Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that he would supply the requested information.

7. Information Only-Cost of Textbooks – The Board discussed the costs and pricing of textbooks at the institution bookstores.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the Board directed the Presidents to report back at the Mach

meeting what each institution can do to reduce the actual costs of textbooks and urged the Board not to take any specific action until that time.

Regent Geddes asked that in preparing their reports, the Presidents also provide a comparison of textbook prices at institutions in other states near or similar to ours. President Ashley replied that when compared to national markets and resources like Amazon.com, we are experiencing similar problems and are similar to other states. Each president is approaching the Board's direction in terms of what actions the faculty can take to reduce the actual cost of textbooks. What is in our control versus what is out of our control.

The meeting recessed at 2:33 p.m. and reconvened at 2:54 p.m. on Thursday, November 30, 2006 with all members present except Regent Howard.

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – The Board approved direction to staff regarding future direction for the iNtegrate project. Pursuant to the request of the Board, staff led a discussion concerning the iNtegrate project. The discussion included: (a) an overview presentation and discussion of the concept of enterprise resource planning (ERP), including what an ERP is, how higher education has used ERP systems, what kind of benefits ERP systems can produce, why an ERP implementation is resource intensive and what drives success in these projects; (b) an overview of the System's ERP project to date, including the project drivers, analysis of the project to date and key decisions to be made; and (c) a general discussion of what the next steps in the project are, whether the case for action is clear, what the timetable is for moving forward and what must be decided regarding the implementation strategy. The discussion included agreement regarding reasonable expectations among the various stakeholders in the System. The Board provided direction to staff regarding future direction on the foregoing points.

Regent Wixom stated that with the assistance of Mr. Phil Goldstein, Goldstein & Associates, Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich and Interim Vice Chancellor

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (cont'd.)

Kenneth McCollum, he hoped to lead a discussion regarding the expectations of an ERP. He stated it was important for the Regents and Presidents to have an opportunity to participate and be comfortable with the direction of the project, including its funding and implementation.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that today's discussion will focus, not so much on hardware and software, but rather more on business models and best practices that are aided by technology. He hopes that today's presentation will familiarize everyone with this ERP/iNtegrate project and provide more clarity and thanked the Board for focusing their attention on the importance of participation by the institutions, leadership, faculty and students.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich introduced Mr. Phil Goldstein, Goldstein & Associates. Mr. Goldstein stated that he has worked with several different higher education institutions regarding what an ERP is and what is gained or not gained from implementing one. His presentation is to share the fundamental lessons that have been learned along the way (*See Nevada System of Higher Education – Board of Regents Discussion of ERP - November 30, 2006 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Wixom stated that NSHE has a combination of multi-campus considerations as well as different needs unique to each institution. He asked how those specific needs could be addressed without going into hyper modifications. Mr. Goldstein replied that NSHE is essentially balancing two things; the need to take advantage of the opportunity to manage and understand the system better with the need to be able to acknowledge and tailor systems to local practices and legitimate differences of mission. That is not an insurmountable obstacle and there are ways to allow campuses to control legitimate differences while still agreeing to a fundamental set of principles. The Regents and campuses need to agree from the onset where the differences and similarities will lie.

Regent Wixom stated that the ERP has been broken into three main components: human resources (*HR*), finance and administration services, and student information services (*SIS*). Based on what he has learned, there could be uniform practices among all the institutions with respect to HR and finance but the main area of divergence would be student services. President Ashley replied that was accurate to a point, citing for example that the research universities may have individuals that are both student and employee. President Glick also noted that it is important not to impose the bureaucracy of the large institutions on the smaller ones due to their limited resources.

Regent Wixom asked Mr. Goldstein where in the process these concerns should be addressed. Mr. Goldstein replied that each concern needs to be addressed at multiple points throughout the process. The vendors need to be addressed in a way that challenges them on their credentials to operate a system to work in diverse worlds with major differences. In the early stages of planning, it is important to identify strategic changes in the operating model so that design and implementation can align with the goals. For example, one question before the Board is if the project will supply each student with an

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (*cont'd.*)

ID that is transferable from campus to campus with a single academic record. It is also important to ask the implementation consultants where campuses can work individually and where one task can be completed for the benefit of the whole. Mr. Goldstein emphasized the need to work corroboratively on the areas of commonality and then work independently on the differences.

Regent Dondero asked how much physical space is needed. Mr. Goldstein replied that depends upon the size of the project implementation team and the amount of collaboration necessary.

President Killpatrick asked how much money should be spent now on gearing up for such a project. Mr. Goldstein replied that he would recommend that they System not do anything without having secured the necessary resources in advance. It is important to define a scope for what the System has already identified and then set the next step. He never recommends implementing a project knowing the necessary resources are unavailable to finish it.

Regent Derby asked if an ERP is necessary and if there are any alternatives. Regent Wixom stated that from a planning perspective this would be a reasonable option since the systems must be replaced anyway.

Regent Wixom stated that there is a concern that the project will run out of money and the institutions will have to come up with the funds required for completion and asked Mr. Goldstein if he is suggesting that the implementation occur in phases. Mr. Goldstein replied that not only can the implementation occur in phases, it should be assumed that will be the implementation approach. It is very risky to simultaneously implement all major components at one time. He suggested that the system identify available funds and implement one module first while committing to a general operating directive that will be achieved over time.

Regent Howard asked what type of security risk or vulnerabilities shared data will present. Mr. Goldstein replied generally, implementation of an ERP does not introduce any new concerns not currently being dealt with.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the System needs to avoid temptation to buy a system that is more expensive than the System can afford. Each module can be implemented in a way that allows other platforms to be integrated as funds are available.

Mr. Goldstein continued with his presentation (*See Nevada System of Higher Education – Board of Regents Discussion of ERP - November 30, 2006 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Dondero asked how often and what costs are associated with upgrades. Mr. Goldstein replied that each vendor has a different upgrade schedule but typically every 6-12 months a new upgrade is released. The magnitude of each upgrade will fluctuate from unnoticeable to significant.

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (cont'd.)

Regent Wixom asked the Presidents how they would respond to a proposal to implement the SIS component first and the other two modules later as funds become available. President Lucey replied that in Dr. Goldstein's presentation he referred to infrastructure hardware and software as being about 20% of the project's total cost. She asked if the project is \$25 million, is it possible to purchase the necessary SIS module hardware and software for \$8 million. Mr. Goldstein replied it would be tight but it could be done.

President Lucey asked if the "common model" was less expensive than the "independent model". Mr. Goldstein replied that the more independent the system, the higher the cost. He suggested there is economy in commonality and that the System spend on the areas where it is important to be different. President Lucy stated that she would support developing the SIS module first.

President Ringle agreed with implementation of the SIS module first and with the general approach that only one module should be implemented first. He also stated that it would be important to develop a data warehouse.

President Killpatrick stated he recommends implementing the finance module first.

President Carpenter stated that at a previous discussion the Presidents, with the exception of President Killpatrick, all agreed with implementation of the SIS module first. They also expressed their concern with asking the students to fund something that they consider to be the responsibility of the System and would not be able to support such a fee.

President Maryanski stated that he would support the SIS module first as well as development of a data warehouse. He also stated that when determining costs, it is important to address the impact of staff backfill.

President Wells stated SIS should be addressed first as that is the most pressing need and will allow the presidents the time to agree upon commonalities for the other modules.

President Glick stated that the SIS module impacts our customers, the students, and they are substantially disadvantaged right now in comparison to other institutions. This causes the students grief as well as reduces the university's ability to recruit and retain the best.

President Ashley agreed that the student information component should be first.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich urged caution to understand that the System has multiple opportunities to exercise some leverage but will still want to maintain flexibility when negotiating with vendors.

Regent Wixom stated that the Presidents' perspective was very helpful. The Regents need to clearly understand the enormous, multi-year commitment they are undertaking. The consensus appears to be that we secure funding for and implement the SIS module first, and then as the process is more understood, the other components will move forward.

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (cont'd.)

Mr. Goldstein stated it is important that the Board validate what the indicated \$25 million will pay for. The SIS module is typically the most complex and therefore expensive.

Regent Anthony asked what the advantage was of implementing one module at a time versus all at once. Mr. Goldstein replied that typically finance or HR are implemented first with SIS last. Each module needs to fit into the normal cycles of the campuses, for example, Finance takes 12-14 months to implement and follows a fiscal year. Human Resources takes about the same implementation time as finance but usually follows a calendar year. SIS implementation typically takes 18 to 24 months on a single campus and follows an academic calendar. The advantage of implementing one component at a time is that they only do what the System can afford. The disadvantage is that there are some additional costs that come with starts and stops including technical staff that

may need to be retained or rehired.

President Ringle asked if it would behoove them to map the student service processes prior to making decisions within multi-campus applications. Mr. Goldstein replied that it is even more important for a multi-campus system to map the processes beforehand.

Regent Gallagher asked what choices the System has over the next 10 years. Regent Wixom replied there are few to none. Regent Gallagher suggested that when evaluating the hardware and software, the System consider something a little higher than the least expensive. She also stated she is pleased to hear that the Presidents have spoken with each other and noted that the majority have indicated a SIS module is needed. In response to Regent Gallagher, Mr. Goldstein agreed the next step would be to determine what could be purchased with the available funds.

Mr. Goldstein concluded his presentation (*See Nevada System of Higher Education – Board of Regents Discussion of ERP - November 30, 2006 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Sisolak asked if the systems will run parallel until they are fully tested. Mr. Goldstein replied there are multiple testing points, not necessarily parallel.

Regent Sisolak asked the Presidents if they were aware that implementation of the SIS first was not the advice of the consultant. President Glick stated that yes, he was aware. President Maryanski stated that the Presidents had discussed that the typical order of implementation was not the SIS module first. President Carpenter stated that the consultant has suggested a normal or more typical method of implementation but has not necessarily recommended any one or the other. Mr. Goldstein agreed that he has seen institutions implement SIS first so it can be accomplished, it is just more complex. He suggested that the System first identify what benefits are needed for their most important constituent group for the money available.

Chair Whipple asked which of the three components is most expensive. Mr. Goldstein replied SIS is usually equal to the cost of finance and HR components combined.

Regent Sisolak asked how much permanent, physical space is necessary to house the hardware. Mr. Kenneth McCollum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology replied that it depends upon the approach. The current data-center is sufficient but may

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (*cont'd.*)

need to expand slightly. Regent Sisolak expressed his concern that we determine exactly how much space is necessary prior to the start of the project. Dr. McCollum confirmed that the hardware to be centralized, decentralized or leased will have been determined prior to the start of the project. Regent Sisolak asked if that would still hold true in the case of dual implementation. Dr. McCollum replied that yes, it is a changeover process.

Regent Anthony asked if the System has \$25 million designated for this project or if that is a fluctuating number dependent on the bid process. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that it was entirely possible that number will change adding that it is important that the Board not commit to a specific number. The \$25 million being referred to is derived from two sources; the first being \$15 million earmarked by the Investment Committee, and approved by the Board, from undistributed investment earnings, the second is \$10 million in recommendations that Governor Guinn has made to Governor-elect Gibbons for budgetary purposes.

President Glick emphasized that the more the systems are customized the more costly they will become. It is also important to consider that the cost to backfill staff positions will be a factor. There is a real concern for taking experienced staff from their departments to commit them to this project for two years.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

Regent Howard asked Mr. Goldstein if he could estimate what the average cost would be. Mr. Goldstein replied

that there is very little comparable information on how institutions cost out their projects. Some include backfill, some do not. He suggested collecting information directly from other institutions and comparing them. In response to Regent Howard, Mr. Goldstein indicated he could provide the names of institutions that they could contact.

Regent Howard asked if scope creep becomes more of a factor if the project is implemented in stages. Mr. Goldstein replied that scope creep happens on smaller issues within a single project, or module, that suddenly increases the budget.

Regent Howard asked at what point costs for people, resources and space are identified. Mr. Goldstein responded that most institutions identify those in the planning phase prior to commitment to the investment. Regent Whipple noted that we are currently in the planning phase.

Dr. McCollum provided a PowerPoint presentation (*See presentation - What is Driving NSHE to iNtegrate? on file in the Board office*).

Regent Wixom moved approval of proceeding with an implementation in the RFP of the student information systems services first, subject to negotiation with the potential vendors to determine that system requirements can be met with the price and subject to an agreement amongst the presidents

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (*cont'd.*)

as to the specific principles associated with the student information services to ensure common agreement with what is necessary for common functions. Regent Dondero seconded.

Mr. William Robinson, Senate Faculty Chair-UNLV, stated that implementing the SIS module first is good and the motion presented allows for adjustments to be made.

Regent Sisolak asked if there is a timeline. Regent Wixom replied that a timeline has not been determined due to the many issues subject to negotiation and undetermined funding sources. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that a chart was attempted but proved to be too arbitrary. Regent Sisolak asked that when a timeline is determined that it be distributed to the Regents.

President Carpenter referred to Dr. McCollum's presentation and asked which RFP did SAP respond to. Dr. McCollum replied that SAP responded to the second RFP with a letter that was determined to be nonresponsive. President Carpenter also asked Dr. McCollum to provide a 2006 version of the Gartner Group slide.

Dr. Guy Hoelzer, Faculty Senate Chair-UNR, stated that it was important for the System to determine the needs and desires of the institutions first and then move forward. He also stated that it was important to develop a long term plan in advance.

Mr. Jeff Champagne, Student Body President-UNR, indicated that the student body presidents are in support of implementing SIS first. The student leaders have been involved in this project for two to three years and it is very important to them. Mr. Champagne indicated that a report has been compiled that outline the things that are important to the students. Chair Whipple stated that he had received the report and will provide copies to the Regents tomorrow morning.

Regent Howard asked the Board to remember that the Health Sciences System and this ERP project will occur simultaneously and it is important that the other areas of the system do not.

Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

Mr. Robinson stated that the System Master Plan implies that the campuses need to distinguish themselves from each other but also work together. The System Master Plan needs to be updated considerably and used as a

planning tool to determine what is needed for this project. It is very important that the Board understand the two very different RFP models (7540 & 7549) proposed. Chair Whipple encouraged every Regent with questions or concerns to follow up with the Technology Committee.

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (cont'd.)

Dr. Hoelzer stated that during the planning process, it is important to determine the project manager on each campus and to assign a person to coordinate the backfill. Chair Whipple asked if Dr. McCollum would be the natural project manager. Dr. Hoelzer requested that there be one on each campus.

Mr. Robinson stated that one RFP proposes that System Computing Services (SCS) play a central role while the other does not. He feels it is important that the Board understand the consequences of each RFP and plan accordingly.

Dr. McCollum clarified that System Computing Services (SCS) has many functions throughout the system and will be in existence no matter how much of a role they play in this project.

Regent Sisolak asked if the needs of the Health Sciences System have been considered. Regent Wixom replied that implementation of both projects are still in the planning phase and have been discussed in general terms. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that the whole face of medical education is changing. He pointed out that Dr. Steven Zink, Vice President, Information Technology and Mr. James Curtis, Director, Savitt Medical Library are very interested in this project and have participated in some discussions.

The meeting recessed at 5:22 p.m. on Thursday, November 30, 2006.

The Board of Regents convened on Friday, December 1, 2006 at 8:13 a.m. sitting as Members of the Corporation for the respective institutions with all members present except Regents Anthony, Howard, Leavitt and Sisolak.

9. Information Only-Foundation Reports - Sitting as members of the respective institution foundations, the Board reviewed presentations from the institution foundations (*See individual Foundation minutes filed separately in the Board office*).

The Board of Regents' regular meeting reconvened at 9:49 a.m. on Friday, December 1, 2006 with all members present except Regents Anthony and Leavitt.

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (Cont'd.)

Chair Whipple summarized that yesterday afternoon the Board had the opportunity to hear from Mr. Philip Goldstein and Associate Vice Chancellor Kenneth McCollum in regard to the future of the ERP. He thanked Mr. Champagne for presenting to him the Nevada Student Alliance iNtegrate Report, Fall 2006 which provides a summary of the requests and concerns of all students. He added that it was important to have these discussions at the Board level so that the Regents are aware of the magnitude of this project.

Regents Anthony and Leavitt entered the meeting.

Regent Wixom stated that the next meeting of the Technology Task Force (TTF) will occur in the first part of January. At that point, they will take the motion passed yesterday

8. Approved-iNtegrate Project Update – (Cont'd.)

and establish directives to the campuses in addition to a business plan for each campus, a business plan for the system, identification of budgetary issues and a project template. The TTF recommendations will then be presented to the Board at the January meeting. At that time, a final decision will also need to be made between the first and second RFP.

Regent Gallagher asked if the date of the next TTF meeting could be determined as soon as possible. Regent

Wixom replied that he and Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich would try and determine the date before the end of the day.

10. Approved-Handbook Revision, Degree Revocation – The Board approved Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich’s request for a policy proposal setting forth the circumstances under which a student’s degree may be revoked for serious acts of misconduct that occur during the time a student is enrolled at an NSHE institution, but are not discovered until after graduation (*Title 2, Chapter 6, Sections 6.3*). This was the second required hearing for a Code change, the first of which occurred before the Student and Academic Affairs Committee on October 12, 2006 (*Ref. B on file in the Board office*).

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated he and Chief Counsel Bart Patterson have had extensive conversations with the faculty senate chairs and students regarding this proposed policy. As a result, the ASUN submitted a memorandum dated November 30, 2006, a copy of which was provided to the Board.

The ASUN memorandum requests two amendments to the proposed policy. The first is that the statute of limitations be a flat rule of seven years. The second is that Chapter 6, Section 3.8 (a), first sentence, be changed to state “The Board and its institutions reserve the right to withdraw academic degrees in the event that a case is brought after graduation for material academic misconduct that impacts the reputation of the institution.”

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that he agreed to the appropriateness of the recommended amendment changes.

Regent Alden moved approval of the *Handbook* revision regarding degree revocation. Regent Howard seconded.

Regent Wixom expressed his concern that upon the granting of a degree, the recipient has received a property right. Under U.S. and Nevada Constitutions, you cannot deny a property right without due process of law. He is not sure that this revision rises to the level of due process of law. For example, Mr. Champagne is working on a project with other individuals. He graduates from one of our universities, moves out of state and is getting a graduate degree. It is determined that while he was a student in Nevada one of his partners on a class project had plagiarized. He is suddenly in a position to protect a property right when he does not live here anymore and was not responsible in the first place.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich responded that although Regent Wixom raises a legitimate question he does not agree with his conclusion. A student is responsible for

10. Approved-Handbook Revision, Degree Revocation – (*cont’d.*)
material in such a situation because they are signing their name as part of a collaborative project. When framing this policy, they took this consideration into account. Chapter 6 is referred to several times because it provides the basic academic due-process procedure within the Code.

Regent Wixom stated that the Board needs to determine whether or not this provides due process. He stated that the System will be expecting a student to return from another state to defend a property right that may or may not be legitimate that could impact the rest of their life and urged the Board’s caution.

Chief Counsel Patterson stated that they opted to follow the Chapter 6 due-process because it is fairly thorough. It requires all Presidents and the institutions to follow all investigation and notice requirements. He asked that the Board also keep in mind that if a degree is ever revoked, the individual could appeal to the Board.

Regent Derby asked if this policy is consistent with other universities. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that Mrs. Crystal Abba, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Director of Public Policy performed the research and found a wide array of policies. Some institutions did not have a policy, some were quite onerous in terms of a list of reasons a revocation could occur but the majority had policies that limit the reason for revocation to academic misconduct that mirrors the one being recommended. This policy is permissive and gives the presidents a great deal of

discretion based on the facts of the investigation. Regent Derby stated that she is comfortable with the policy because it focuses on academic conduct and includes presidential flexibility.

Regent Sisolak requested clarification that the student only has to defend himself once. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich confirmed that was correct. If the student prevails at the presidential level, they keep their degree; however, if there is an adverse determination and the degree is revoked, the student has the right to appeal to the Board. If the president takes no action, this policy does not provide that the Board could review.

Regent Sisolak asked if one president did not take action could a new president take a different action. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that he personally felt that is so offensive to the notion of justice and fair play that the answer has to be no. Regent Sisolak asked if subsequent degrees could be revoked as well. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the seven year period does not allow for a tremendous amount of activity between attainment of bachelors and higher degrees; however, if the foundation degree is revoked the subsequent higher degrees would be jeopardized. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the practice of advanced degree revocation has been the choice of the institution and that a prior degree is not always a prerequisite.

Regent Sisolak asked if the individual institutions do not have a policy, how would they proceed regarding subsequent degrees. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that he believes the policy is currently drafted in such a way that the student's current institution would be advised that they would be required to follow this policy to revoke a subsequent degree based on the undergraduate misconduct.

10. Approved-Handbook Revision, Degree Revocation – (cont'd.)

Regent Derby stated that it is important that each institution be allowed to handle such issues on a case-by-case basis with presidential flexibility.

Regent Sisolak asked what happens if a student cheats on an entrance examination. President Glick stated that he was aware of schools that have disqualified students for misrepresenting their credentials upon entry and cheating would be a form of misrepresentation.

Regent Rosenberg stated that as a professor he is responsible for what he will or will not accept from students. He agreed with Regent Derby that there needs to be as much flexibility as possible rather than reacting to a specific occurrence.

Regent Sisolak asked what happens if a complaint is received between when the degree is awarded but before the awarding ceremony. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that if a degree has not yet been awarded, the institution would proceed with Chapter 6, Section 3.8 (a) and postpone award until an investigation has been completed. If a degree has already been awarded, the institutions would follow the procedures in subsection (b).

Regent Dondero asked if there is a list of potential reasons for misconduct. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that writing a policy to regulate morality is a difficult undertaking of any elected body. Regent Dondero asked if reference was made in the Handbook. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that, certain standards are set forth in the Handbook.

Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that all campuses are requiring orientation of students and impressing upon them the responsibilities of being in college. It would be impossible to make an all inclusive list of dishonest behavior but the campuses are spending more time with students warning them of potential bad behavior.

Regent Wixom asked what percentage of institutions have a degree revocation policy. Assistant Vice Chancellor Abba stated that she could not answer that question but stated that even without this policy the Board still has the authority to revoke a degree.

Regent Wixom asked if the presidents were aware of revocation policies at their prior institutions. President Ashley stated that he could not recall such a policy or of one being pursued. President Glick also replied that he was unaware of such a policy.

Regent Wixom asked if it was fair for the Board to say that under precedent they have the authority to revoke a degree and this policy adds due process protections. Assistant Vice Chancellor Abba stated yes. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich agreed with Assistant Vice Chancellor Abba adding that in addition to due process, it also provides a structure.

Regent Sisolak asked Chief Counsel Patterson to clarify if the Board has the ability to revoke a degree without this policy. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that the Board was previously advised not to involve itself if no action was taken at the institutional level. Secondly, this policy adds due process and provides a warning too, which implies to students that a contractual policy is in place.

10. Approved-Handbook Revision, Degree Revocation – (cont'd.)

Regents Alden and Howard accepted the additional proposed friendly amendments. Motion carried.

11. Approved-Handbook Revision, Evaluation and Merit Review Policy Modifications – The Board approved Chief Counsel Bart Patterson's recommendation for modifications to the NSHE Code (Title 2, Chapter 5, Sections 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.7.2, new Sections 5.12.3 and 5.16) and a minor modification to the *Handbook* (Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 4(5)) to provide institutions with more flexibility in designing procedures to review annual evaluations and merit pay determinations. This was the second reading for this proposed Code revision (Ref. C on file in the Board office) .

Regent Alden moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning evaluation and merit review policy. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Sisolak suggested that the other institutions review and follow UNR's response document.

Motion carried.

12. Approved-Handbook Revision, Resignations/Leave Policy – The Board approved Chief Counsel Bart Patterson's recommendation for an addition to the NSHE Code (Title 2, Chapter 5, new Section 5.15) to provide for a resignation policy and clarification of the Board's leave policy (Ref. D1 on file in the Board office) . This was the second reading for this proposed Code revision. The original version presented to the Board was provided as Ref. D2 (on file in the Board office) .

Regent Alden moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning resignations and leave policy. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Chief Counsel Patterson explained that the entire job abandonment section has been removed. The Board's policy on leave without pay and the Chapter 6 process for termination more than adequately covers the issue.

Regent Sisolak asked if working day is defined. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that the term "working day" is not defined but interpreted into days that the college is in operation, or business days. Regent Sisolak requested that this language be clearly defined to avoid future argument. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that they will review the Code and look at defining the term.

Motion carried.

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum– The Board approved amending the effective date for the Millennium Scholarship core curriculum. In response to a letter from Senator William Raggio, Chairman, Legislative Committee on

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum– (cont'd.)

Education (Nevada Revised Statutes 218.5352), urging that the effective date of the Millennium Scholarship core curriculum be changed from Spring 2010 to Spring 2008, the Board discussed and acted upon the proposal to amend the effective date (Title 4, Chapter 18, Section 19.14) (Ref. E on file in the Board office) .

Vice Chancellor Nichols referred to three letters; two from Senator Raggio and one from the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (*on file in the Board office*) regarding the implementation date for this matter and offered to provide an explanation.

Regent Rosenberg requested clarification for what exactly the Board is being asked to approve. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied the Board will be considering changing the effective date for the new core curriculum requirements.

Regent Sisolak observed that the agenda information specifically states changing the deadline from 2010 to 2008 and asked whether the Board would still be in compliance with the open meeting law if they considered any other dates. Chief Counsel Patterson replied that he felt the agenda language provided adequate notice to the public that a date change of some duration is being considered.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich suggested that the Board listen to Vice Chancellor Nichols's explanation which might answer many of their questions regarding effective dates.

Vice Chancellor Nichols explained that the item had been included on the agenda in response to Senator Raggio's letter of October 16, 2006 (Ref. E.) requesting an implementation date of 2008.

Vice Chancellor Nichols explained that the Legislative Committee on Education has been considering ways to encourage or require more students to take courses that lead to college and workplace success which led to the October 16, 2006 letter. The System and the Board have always felt it critical to provide students with adequate notice of requirement changes. Implementing the 2008 date impacts this year's high school juniors. Last year, there were 8,671 graduating seniors eligible for the scholarship. At least that number of students will be impacted by this change which she felt would not be fair to those students or their families. Efforts began to consider which institutions could offer more high school math courses for those students that would not meet the requirements, including offering summer school courses. Due to the severe shortage of math teachers in Nevada, it is difficult to have a sufficient number of sections available. She expressed concern that the students mostly likely to need those courses are the same students the System is trying to encourage to go to college.

Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that the Legislature gives by statute the Board of Regents the power to set the curriculum, but the Legislature can take this power back. She stated that it is extremely important for the Board of Regents to keep the power to control the issue so that the System can put together a cohesive pattern that works for Nevada's students. When Senator Raggio's letter was received regarding the 2008 deadline, Vice

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum– (*cont'd.*)

Chancellor Nichols and Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich met with him. At that time she told Senator Raggio that she highly recommends not going to 2008. She also shared with him the letter dated November 14, 2006 from the Association of Superintendents stating that, as the educators, they felt they could not fulfill a 2008 expectation. Their concern is that there will be students who cannot get the millennium scholarship through no fault of their own. In some cases it will not be because they did not choose to take the courses; they could not obtain the courses. Senator Raggio stated he would think about the concerns and in his letter dated November 27, 2006 he has recommended a compromise of 2009.

Vice Chancellor Nichols reported that both Clark County and Washoe County School Districts are considering core curriculum changes that will become effective in 2010. If the Board were to approve a 2009 implementation date, there would be a disconnect between high school graduation requirements and the Millennium Scholarship requirements. This would place a heavy burden on the System to work with students to make sure they are aware of the change in requirements and offer courses at NSHE institutions to help bridge that gap. Vice Chancellor Nichols noted that the Legislative Committee on Education feels that it is an injustice to students to further delay requiring courses that are known to lead to student success in college.

Regent Rosenberg asked who has made the recommendation that four years of math is necessary. Vice

Chancellor Nichols replied that years of data, at the national level indicates that the second year of algebra is one of the strongest predictors of success in college. The fourth year of math allows for the students to enter the college system three months after their last math class instead of twelve. Regent Rosenberg asked Vice Chancellor Nichols what she recommends. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the compromise of 2009 is better than 2008.

Regent Derby stated that acceleration is good, but asked if it could be done around the entire state and would sophomores potentially be disqualified. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that there are at least three high schools that do not provide four years of math so the burden then falls on the community colleges. UNR and UNLV also offer high school math courses via distance education. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that she feels if the students are motivated they will find a way to get the required courses but there will be students that fall through the cracks.

Regent Leavitt asked if the sophomore level students have any property rights in terms of their expectations. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that in his opinion, students have a mere expectancy which does not rise to the level of a constitutionally vested right.

Regent Leavitt left the meeting.

Regent Rosenberg asked if it was possible to make an exception for students who legitimately do not have access to the required classes. Regent Whipple further requested if there is an opt-out opportunity for students that live in the rural areas or attend a disadvantaged school.

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum– (cont'd.)

Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that it may be possible for the System to work with the school districts to define specific circumstances for identifying students in the class of 2009 that are unable to get the fourth year of math. The Millennium Scholarship office is located within the State Treasurer's office and receives the certification list directly from the school districts; however, under our policy and under state statute, the System and the Board of Regents control the final certification of eligibility and the appeals process.

Regent Geddes stated that he thinks it is absolutely critical to change the date to 2009, if not 2008. The State Board of Education and the school districts have known this has been an issue and have delayed on it far too long. He favors 2008 but would support the compromise of 2009.

Regent Leavitt entered the meeting.

Ms. Connie Capurro, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs-WNCC stated that the academic officers around the state are committed to providing necessary courses. The Board has made this easier by allowing the System to offer high school math courses at reduced rates. She also stated that summer courses could be also be provided.

Regent Howard asked Vice Chancellor Nichols how many students would be negatively impacted. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that since the requirements are new there is no way of knowing. Regent Howard stated that she agrees with the motivation but feels it is unfair to the students already in the 10th and 11th grade. She stated that we are doing the students a disservice by not allowing them to succeed but also by allowing some to fall through the cracks. Regent Howard encouraged the Board not to allow other entities to usurp the Board's governance of higher education.

Regent Wixom stated that while he appreciates the Legislature's desire to accelerate the process, no state funds are being provided for this effort and he asked Vice Chancellor Nichols if NSHE would be absorbing the costs. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that each campus would need to set aside resources.

Regent Geddes stated that when the school districts realize this is the requirement they will reassign their budgets to ensure that the fourth year of math is offered. The students need to know what the standard of success

is and the System needs to help provide a bridge.

Regent Wixom asked if it is fair to say that NSHE would be covering the costs for roughly a year or so. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that for some of the rural and inner cities the community colleges have already realized they have an important role to play and have been going into high schools to fill the gap. To prepare the class of 2009 we might have to gear up faster and have a heavier load for a year, but generally the commitment to provide resources will continue.

Regent Anthony asked to clarify that three years of math is currently required. Vice Chancellor Nichols explained that right now there are no course requirements to qualify for the Millennium Scholarship. The graduation requirements for most of the school

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum– (cont'd.)

districts include three years of math; however, they do not specify Algebra II. Regent Anthony asked if it was possible for current sophomores to have not taken any math. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated that math is a normal course in the first and second years of high school and it would be a very rare occurrence. For sophomores not already in their second year of math their options are to go to summer school, take the community college course or double up their high school courses. Regent Anthony asked if a waiver could be obtained for any reason provided by the student. Vice Chancellor Nichols stated no, that it has to be an exception and can only be granted with the involvement of the school district.

Regent Anthony expressed concern that everything be in place to guarantee that a fourth year of math will be available to all students. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that she cannot provide that guarantee but the System's partnership with the school districts will allow us to do everything possible to provide the necessary courses. Regent Anthony stated that he felt that those students that want the scholarship will put forth the extra effort and he can support the 2009 compromise.

Regent Howard asked what direct communication Senator Raggio had with the school districts. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that she could not speak for Senator Raggio; however the school district superintendents have attended the hearings and are aware of the bill draft request requiring four years of math in all districts. Regent Howard stated that she still feels it is more reasonable to stay with 2010 adding that she felt this was a K-12 responsibility and should not be a higher education cost.

Regent Sisolak expressed concern for those students graduating in 2009. He stated that it is very time intensive for students to take math courses in the summer. Chair Whipple suggested consideration be given to allowing waivers for those students who have made a diligent effort to take the courses but were unable to access them. Regent Sisolak stated that he is also concerned that the school districts do not have the counseling resources to advise all students in a timely manner.

Regent Derby stated that it is important to identify the students that will fall through the cracks. Due to the shortage of math teachers, there are at least three school districts that currently cannot offer the fourth year of math and other districts that are very challenged to meet the demands. The students without a support structure will give up more easily and they are the very ones we are trying to get to college. The students were told what to anticipate and half way through we are changing the rules. There is no argument that we do the students no favors by not preparing them; however, it may only be fair to advance the standards as planned in 2010 or to provide exceptions.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that if there is a motion that includes exception language he encourage it to be phrased in a general direction that a specific policy be brought back to Board.

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum– (cont'd.)

Regent Geddes moved to amend Title 4, Chapter 18, Section 19.14 to accelerate the high school course

requirements including four years of math from 2010 to 2009 with an exception policy for those school districts that are unable to provide that fourth year of math to be drafted and brought before the Board at a future time for discussion. Regent Wixom seconded.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that a fair definition of what an exception policy is will need to be developed to provide clear guidelines.

Regent Geddes stated that he made the motion regardless of a letter from anyone. To him the data is compelling that we either spend resources now providing the appropriate courses or we spend it later on remedial education and counseling. He also pointed out that the fourth year of math will be a high school graduation requirement in 2010 and for the last decade, all of the school districts and the university system have recommended the fourth year of math to any student that will be continuing to college.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Dondero, Gallagher, Geddes, Leavitt, Rosenberg, Schofield, Whipple, Wixom, Anthony and Derby voted yes. Regents Sisolak and Alden voted no. Regent Howard abstained.

Regent Sisolak stated that lack of available high school counselors is an issue. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the System will be doubling its efforts, particularly in the next 6 months, to get the information to the high school students and to the counselors, adding that a letter has been drafted and is ready to be mailed out early next week to the parents and students that will be affected by this change.

Regent Howard noted that she abstained from voting on this issue because she feels it is not a higher education issue and that a plan for reaching every student has not been clearly defined. Chair Whipple stated that he believes that the exception policy will partly address Regent Howard's concern.

The meeting recessed at 12:04 p.m. and reconvened at 12:29 p.m. on Friday, December 1, 2006 with all members present except Regents Alden, Howard and Leavitt.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Tuition and Fees, Graduate Programs, NSC – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Mike Reed's recommendation for a revision to Board policy (*Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 1*) concerning the establishment of in-state registration fees, non-resident tuition and discounted tuition rates for graduate students at Nevada State College. Additionally, the Board approved the actual graduate state college fees for academic years 2006-07 through 2008-09. This item follows from the Board's approval

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Tuition and Fees, Graduate Programs, NSC – (*cont'd.*)

of NSC's first graduate program (*in Speech Pathology*) at the October 2006 Board meeting (*Ref. F on file in the Board office*) .

Regents Leavitt and Alden entered meeting.

Regent Anthony moved approval of the *Handbook* revision concerning tuition and fees for graduate programs at NSC and the actual graduate state college fees for academic years 2006-07 through 2008-09. Regent Schofield seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked if there was a process behind setting of fees for graduate courses. Assistant Vice Chancellor and Director of Public Policy Crystal Abba replied that normally a WICHE median is used as a benchmark; unfortunately, that benchmark does not exist for state colleges. Historically for undergraduates at state colleges, it has been based on the mid-point between fees at the community colleges and undergraduate fees at the universities.

Regent Sisolak asked if they could be setting the fees too low. Assistant Vice Chancellor Abba stated that she could research further but delaying this item will put the state college at some risk because of the January enrollment deadline. Regent Sisolak asked why, if the programs offered at the state college are not offered at the

universities, rates should be any lower. Regent Derby stated that data from across the country indicates degradation between undergraduate and graduate fees but that perhaps it would be useful for Assistant Vice Chancellor Abba to return with more information on the policies of other institutions.

Regent Rosenberg asked if the percentage difference between the undergraduate credit and graduate credit at the university level could be applied to the state college. Vice Chancellor Abba replied that is possible adding that the Board could provisionally accept the fees for the spring semester only and then revisit the policy at the next Board meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked why fees were not requested sooner if enrollment is in January. President Maryanski stated that the program received the Boards approval in October. Regent Sisolak asked why program approval and proposed fees could not have been requested simultaneously. President Maryanski replied they were following the standard procedures.

Regent Geddes stated that if the same ratios were applied at Nevada State College as were at the universities, first year fees would be \$112.00 vs. \$114.50. By the third year fees would be \$143.85 vs. \$145.75. On a ratio basis, these figures are higher than the universities. Regent Rosenberg requested that all future requests be accompanied by financial impact statements.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich asked if applications were currently being accepted for the graduate program. President Maryanski replied that they officially were not; however,

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Tuition and Fees, Graduate Programs, NSC – (cont'd.)

pending final approval by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, there will be approximately 20 students enrolled in the initial classes.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich asked when final approval from the Northwest Commission was expected. President Maryanski replied that approval should be received in January adding that there is a phone meeting scheduled on Monday. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich asked what would happen if the Board did not make a decision on the fees until January. President Maryanski replied that, if necessary, this specific program could begin a week or two late.

Chair Whipple stated he thought it appropriate that a policy for the setting of fees be reviewed at the Budget and Finance or Audit Committee.

Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich asked if the fees could be approved for this graduate program only at Nevada State College without setting a policy for the establishment of all graduate fees. A policy can then be presented to the Budget and Finance or Audit Committee.

Regent Sisolak asked if he has the fee breakdown available for review. Assistant Vice Chancellor Abba stated that historically, following Board approval of the fees, the Presidents and the Chancellor determine the distribution of the increase and then present it to the Board. Regent Sisolak noted that all information on an agenda item should be presented to the Board for their consideration before they are asked to vote.

Chair Whipple called attention to a handout that summarized the distribution of fees for current undergraduate and graduate programs. Regent Sisolak asked why NSC is not distributing its fees in the same manner as the other institutions and expressed his concern that the proposed fee and its distribution were not thought through and therefore the Board is being asked to vote on a request without sufficient information.

Chair Whipple stated that an allocation method has been proposed and if the Board determines that it is unacceptable, the issue can be addressed through the committee process. Chair Whipple asked Regent Alden to address fee distribution at the Budget and Finance Committee.

Chair Whipple clarified that the current motion is to approve the fees as presented.

Regent Sisolak asked Legal Counsel if it was good legal policy to vote on a fee without having the distribution information. General Counsel Nielsen replied that this is a policy question and not a legal question. Regent Sisolak asked if fees are typically set without having the distribution clarified. Executive Vice Chancellor Klaich stated that in the past, fees have been set using the same process and procedures as other fee increases. Today's discussion indicates that this process may be inadequate and should potentially be changed.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Tuition and Fees, Graduate Programs, NSC – (cont'd.)

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Gallagher, Geddes, Leavitt, Rosenberg, Schofield, Whipple, Wixom, Alden, Anthony, Derby and Dondero voted yes. Regent Sisolak voted no. Regent Howard was absent.

Vice Chancellor Reed requested that items #15 (*Resolution #06-11- Refund Portion of 2000C Revenue Bond Issue and Additional Funding for Air Conditioning Chiller, UNLV*) and #16 (*Resolution #06-11, Refund Portion of 2001 Revenue Bond Issue*) be combined as one item to comply with an IRS provision.

15. Approved-Resolution #06-11, Refund Portion of 2000C Revenue Bond Issue and Additional Funding for Air Conditioning Chiller, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request to refund portions of the 2000C revenue bond issue with bank financing due to the current favorable interest rates and to provide additional funding for the air conditioning chiller at the Thomas & Mack Center (*Ref. G on file in the Board office*) .

16. Approved- Resolution #06-11, Refund Portion of 2001 Revenue Bond Issue, UNLV – The Board approved UNLV President David B. Ashley's request to refund portions of the 2001 revenue bond issue with bank financing if the current favorable interest rates exist (*Ref. H on file in the Board office*) .

Regent Alden moved approval of Resolution #06-11 refunding a portion of the 2000C revenue bond issue to provide additional funding for an air conditioning chiller and refunding a portion of the 2001 revenue bond issue. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Alden asked if it was appropriate to consolidate both bond issues if they are with separate institutions. Mr. Scott Nash, Johnson Consulting, replied that via one motion, the resolution will award both loans separately. Regent Alden asked for confirmation that legal counsel has reviewed to which Mr. Nash stated yes.

Regent Wixom notified the Board that because several of the institutions are his clients, he will abstain for purposes of conflict of interest.

Regent Geddes would like an explanation on the chiller retrofit portion of the funding. Mr. Gerry J. Bomotti, Vice President for Business and Finance replied that of the two requests for refinancing, one does not have any additional project funding and one does. In January 2006 the Board approved replacement of the chillers. Upon opening, the bids came in at \$7.9 million, significantly higher than the consultant estimate of \$4.85 million. Mr. Bomotti stated that this has occurred on a number of projects recently. The condition of the chillers leaves no option to replacing them. The systems are 23 years old and the engineering study indicates that there is a high probability of catastrophic failure. Nine bid requests were submitted to mechanical plumbing contractors, of which only one

16. Approved- Resolution #06-11, Refund Portion of 2001 Revenue Bond Issue, UNLV – (cont'd)
responded. A better price has been negotiated with that one contractor but it is difficult for them to find the people necessary for this type of job.

Chair Whipple asked if the system was heating and air conditioning. Mr. Bomotti replied air conditioning only. Chair Whipple asked if out of state and local contractors were solicited. Mr. Bomotti replied that many of the subcontractors have licenses to work in several states including Nevada. It is also difficult to find subcontractors at this point in time due to the much larger construction projects in the Las Vegas area.

Regent Sisolak asked why the two items were not combined into one financing option. Mr. Nash replied that the items were separated due to the difference in the borrowing terms and the concern that one project would be penalized over the other. Regent Sisolak noted that there was a significant difference between the two bids and asked if a better rate may have been achieved with one bid.

Mr. Nash replied that some banks will only fund customers to a certain maximum and therefore only bid on one project. Some banks are more interested in 15 years loans or shorter and would bid a higher rate on longer terms. Regent Sisolak stated that he understands that, but bidding them together could have been beneficial. Mr. Bomotti stated that this was the System's largest bank financing by far and there was some concern about the appetite of the banks to finance because usually at this level it would normally be a bond financing with higher overhead costs.

Regent Sisolak asked what prompted the bids at this specific time. Mr. Nash stated that they do watch the various financing and rates over time. They initially looked at this as a bond issue but concluded after discussions with the banks that it could be better accomplished as a bank loan.

Chair Whipple asked if the request to refinance is due in part to the needed replacement of the chillers. Mr. Bomotti replied that no, it was merely a convenient coincidence.

Regent Sisolak expressed his concern that millions of dollars could be lost due to our internal processes. Mr. Nash replied that currently the Board has the authorization to delegate to staff to negotiate and prepare a bond issue and then bring it before the Board which provides flexibility because we do not have to wait for a regents meeting. Current state statutes do not include bank loans in that process. He suggested that if it was the Board's desire, they might want to consider a bill draft request to allow bank loans the same flexibility as bond requests.

Motion carried. Regent Wixom abstained. Regent Howard was absent.

Regent Wixom stated that it may be helpful to step back and take a global view of the System's financial arrangements. The institutions need to project two to five years in advance to allow for appropriate planning. Vice Chancellor Reed agreed and suggested

16. Approved- Resolution #06-11, Refund Portion of 2001 Revenue Bond Issue, UNLV – (cont'd)
that the status of the arrangements be reported to the Board on a regular basis. He will also take a closer look at how the arrangements are currently tracked and managed.

Chair Whipple announced that Agenda items #17 (*Boyd School of Law Northern Nevada Program, UNLV*) and #18 (*Apartment Complex, CCSN*) had been withdrawn.

Regent Wixom left the meeting.

17. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the Audit Committee met November 30, 2006 and received a follow-up response for one internal audit report presented at the June 2006 Committee meeting.

Ms. Denise Baclawski, Executive Director, UNR Fire Science Academy (*FSA*), provided an update to a report presented at the October 2006 Committee meeting. She discussed different options the FSA is researching to address rising fuel costs.

The Committee discussed whistleblower hotlines and decided not to pursue a hotline at this time.

The Committee requested the following items be placed on the next Committee agenda:

➤ · A follow-up response for the UNLV School of Dental Medicine specifically related to equipment inventory and accounts receivable to/from CCSN.

- · A fiscal analysis of the Intercollegiate Athletic programs at UNLV, UNR, WNCC and CCSN.

Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 12, 2006 Committee meeting >(Ref. A-1 on file in the Board office) .
- · Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended approval of the following internal audit reports (*Audit Summary Document* on file in the Board office) :
 - ✓ · School of Dental Medicine, UNLV (Ref. A-2 on file in the Board office) .
 - ✓ · Special Review of the UNLV Research Foundation, Travel and Meals, UNLV (Ref. A-3 on file in the Board office) .
 - ✓ · College of Agriculture, Biochemistry and Natural Resources, UNR (Ref. A-4 on file in the Board office) .
 - ✓ · Follow-up: Libraries Computer Environment, UNR (Ref. A-5 on file in the Board office) .

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

Regent Sisolak expressed his appreciation to the President Ashley, President Carpenter and the financial officers for their assistance with resolving an incomplete transaction between those institutions.

18. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations - Chair Mark Alden reported the Budget & Finance Committee met November 30, 2006 and heard the following reports:

- · A discussion was held regarding formula funding issues and possible modifications of the current formula to make it a more effective mechanism for funding higher education.
- · Self-supporting budget to actual comparison for fiscal year 2005-2006.
- · All Funds revenues and expenses for the first quarter of fiscal year 2006-2007.
- · NSHE fiscal exceptions of self-supporting budgets and the status of state appropriated budgets for the first quarter of fiscal year 2006-2007.
- · Student association reports of revenues and expenditures for fiscal year 2005-2006. The Committee requested that all student government accounts be included in the annual report of revenues and expenditures, be brought back to the next Committee meeting and that the revenue and expenditure detail be consistently reported by the institutions' student government organizations.

Regent Alden requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 12, 2006 Committee meeting (Ref. BF-1 on file in the Board office) .
- · Interim Finance Committee (IFC) Approval for Additional Student Fee Revenues – The Committee recommended approval for NSHE to seek Interim Finance Committee authorization to expend additional student fee revenues within the state operating budgets for fiscal year 2006-2007. The Committee also recommended approval to expend additional student registration fee revenues on part-time faculty salaries and related benefits, action which does not require IFC authorization (Ref. BF-7 on file in the Board office) .

Regent Alden moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regents Howard and Wixom were absent.

Regent Wixom entered the meeting.

19. Approved-Cultural Diversity and Security Committee Recommendation - Chair Stavros S. Anthony reported the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee met November 30, 2006. Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols presented information requested at the October 2006 Committee meeting regarding the ethnic distribution of K-12 enrollment; high school graduation dropout and graduation rates; the ethnic distribution of NSHE student capture, retention, remediation and graduation rates; and the ethnic distribution of NSHE faculty and staff.

The Committee reviewed institutional policies and practices related to employee background checks at daycare centers and the use of alcohol on campuses and at campus sponsored events. Staff will bring back

recommendations for a potential System-wide policy on background checks ensuring uniform practices and procedures throughout the NSHE. UNR and UNLV Athletic Directors will bring back their plans to ensure that

19. Approved-Cultural Diversity and Security Committee Recommendation –(cont'd.)
positive changes occur in reducing alcohol abuse resulting in uncivil behavior at athletic events.

Regent Anthony requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

➤ · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 12, 2006 Committee meeting (Ref. CDS-1 on file in the Board office)with the revisions as noted during the Committee meeting.

Regent Anthony moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Geddes seconded.

Regent Sisolak expressed his concern for the safety of night students on campus and asked if it was possible for the university to provide a service to accompany students to their vehicles, or perhaps provide temporary lighting. He stated that he has walked the campus at night and is very concerned about the area immediate east of the Cox Pavilion where lighting has been removed due to construction. Regent Anthony recommended that President Ashley have an opportunity to address these concerns prior to it being referred to the committee.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether UNLV has a campus security-related escort service. President Ashley replied not that he was aware of. Regent Sisolak noted that he was told there had been a shuttle service that has since been discontinued. Mr. Bomotti replied that there was a small electric car service that traveled within the campus but has since been replaced by a larger shuttle service that does not operate in the late evening. Annually in October, Campus Security walks the campus with the police department and student leaders to determine if there are lighting issues. Regent Sisolak asked that the area he previously referred to near the Cox Pavilion and another by the student union where the wall is built up be looked at for additional lighting or security.

President Ashley stated that Jose Elique, UNLV Chief of Police is very aware of the recent security issues on campus and is working on a resolution. He also recognized that Regent Sisolak is suggesting a supplementary service possibly run by students.

Mr. Jeff Panchavinin, Student Body President-UNLV, stated that they would also look into the cost of a service to be administered by the student government.

Regent Schofield expressed appreciation to Regent Sisolak for acknowledging the safety concerns.

Motion carried. Regent Howard was absent.

20. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations – Regent Geddes reported the Student and Academic Affairs Committee met November 30, 2006 and discussed a policy proposal regarding disciplinary proceedings involving students for acts of misconduct and appropriate protocols for expunging of student disciplinary records.

20. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations –(cont'd.)

This was the first official reading of the policy proposal and it will come before the Board at the January 2007 meeting for final action.

The Committee received presentations from Dr. William Sullivan, UNLV Associate Vice President for Retention and Outreach, and Ms. Charlotte Curtis, Nevada Department of Education GEAR UP Coordinator, regarding the activities and successes of federal GEAR UP grants that assist traditionally disadvantaged middle and high school students in preparing for college. Mr. Neil Woolf, NSHE Research Analyst, presented the results of the *2006 Transfer/Articulation Campus Review* highlighting institutional compliance with the Board of Regents' policies on transfer and articulation.

Additionally, the Committee reviewed the process for approving new academic programs and received a report from Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols on the first and third year new program reviews as mandated by Board policy. The Committee requested that staff bring back revised policies concerning institutional strategic plans, academic master plans and program reviews to include 1) a template for calculating the costs and enrollment of proposed new programs and 2) potential reorganization and timelines for all planning and program review processes.

Regent Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 12, 2006 Committee meeting (*Ref. SAA-1 on file in the Board office*) .
- · New Degree Proposals – The Committee recommended approval of the following new degree proposals:
 - ✓ · Bachelor of Technology, Construction Management, WNCC (*Ref. SAA-6 on file in the Board office*) .
 - ✓ · Elimination of the named degree Bachelor of Science in Geography at UNR.
 - ✓ · Bachelor of Arts, Geography, UNR and Bachelor of Science, Geography, UNR (*Ref. SAA-7 on file in the Board office*) .

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

21. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations - Chair Thalia M. Dondero reported the Investment Committee met November 21, 2006 and discussed the following:

- · Capital market returns as of September 30, 2006.
- · Asset allocation and investment returns for the period ended September 30, 2006. Endowment investments returned 2.3% for the quarter (*compared to the 3.6% benchmark*) and 7.4% for the calendar year (*compared to the 8.0% benchmark*) . The total return for the pooled operating funds was 2.7% for the quarter (*compared to the 2.8% benchmark*) and 7.5% for the calendar year (*compared to the 7.6% benchmark*) .
- · Sale of the Sahara dental clinics for UNLV.
- · The Center for Academic Enrichment and Outreach lease space for UNLV.

21. Approved-Investment Committee Recommendations – (*cont'd.*)

- · The National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges' building expansion for UNR.
- · Fifth Street School Lease, UNLV – The Committee discussed UNLV's request for authorization to enter into a long-term lease (*5 years with an option for 5 additional years*) with the City of Las Vegas for approximately 4,057 net square feet for the School of Architecture in the historic 5th Street School at a lease amount of \$12 per year and a pro rata share of the building's total operating and utility costs. UNLV's share of operating and utility costs is estimated to be \$32,000 for the first year and is expected to increase with inflation (*Ref. INV-5 on file in the Board office*) .

Regent Dondero requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 6, 2006 Committee meeting (*Ref. INV-1 on file in the Board office*) .
- · City of Las Vegas Easement/Right-of-Way, UNLV – The Committee recommended approval of granting a turn lane easement/right-of-way to the City of Las Vegas for the Charleston Boulevard ingress to the Shadow Lane campus that will enable the City to continue to maintain that portion of Charleston Boulevard (*Ref. INV-4 on file in the Board office*) .
- · Transfer and Banking of Water Rights with Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) , UNR – The Committee recommended approval of entering into an agreement between the Board of Regents and Truckee Meadows Water Authority to transfer and bank 67.0 acre-feet of water rights with TMWA for future projects from the 506.94 acre-feet of water rights allocated to the main campus (*Ref. INV-7 on file in the Board office*) .

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

Regent Wixom commended Regent Dondero for conducting the property inventories. President Lucey added

that the property inventories had proven to be a valuable process for WNCC and uncovered some issues at various campuses that they are now working to resolve.

Regent Dondero thanked Ms. Kathleen Payne, Director, Banking and Investments, System Administration, for her valuable assistance.

Chief Counsel Bart Patterson clarified that the 5th street lease had not been approved, but merely discussed.

Regent Sisolak acknowledged Regent Dondero and the Investment Committee for accomplishing a great deal.

Motion carried. Regent Howard was absent.

Regent Rosenberg left the meeting.

22. Approved-Research and Economic Development Committee Recommendations - Chair Jack Lund Schofield reported the Research and Economic Development Committee met November 21, 2006 and discussed the following:

- · Executive Vice Chancellor Daniel Klaich provided the Committee with an update on the project to reduce the salinity of and increase the water level in the Walker River Basin. Progress was reported on topics including the creation of a stakeholders group, the release of an RFP for an acquisitions coordinator for the project, the collaborative work of DRI and UNR in developing a research plan and announcement that the communications group should present a comprehensive plan during the next steering committee meeting.
- · Mr. Bob Goff, Founder and President of Sierra Angels, provided suggestions for the NSHE to facilitate technology-based and entrepreneurial-driven economic expansion in northern Nevada. The Committee asked that staff bring back recommendations regarding how the Board of Regents can assist the institutions in increasing research and technology commercialization. Mr. Goff will work with the three Vice Presidents for Research to assess the intellectual property and the faculty reward systems that currently exist and how they might further promote entrepreneurial activities.
- · Mr. Sam Males, State Director of the Nevada Small Business Development Center (*SBDC*) , presented information regarding current activities of the SBDC in developing entrepreneurial and business training.
- · Dr. Joan McGee, NSC Interim Provost, Dr. Mike McFarlane, GBC Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Mr. Scott Penzel, WNCC Business and Industry Coordinator, presented activities and programs at their respective institutions that contribute to the economic development of Nevada.
- · Dr. Penny Amy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, informed the Committee about the recently established Economic Development Council (*EDC*) . The EDC will provide oversight, direction and collaboration of NSHE economic development activities.

Regent Schofield requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the October 5, 2006 Committee meeting (Ref. RED-1 on file in the Board office) .

Regent Schofield moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regents Howard and Rosenberg were absent.

Regent Wixom left the meeting.

23. Approved-Health Sciences Center Committee Recommendations – Regent Geddes reported the Health Sciences Center Committee met November 9, 2006 and heard the following reports:

- · Update on staff development and planning activities within the University of Nevada Health Sciences Center (*UNHSC*) , including an overview of the search

23. Approved-Health Sciences Center Committee Recommendations –(*cont'd.*)

- · process for the Executive Vice Chancellor position and the introduction of the new Director of Communications for the UNHSC.

- · Overview of the purpose and objectives of the UNHSC.
- · Discussion regarding potential changes to the name of the UNHSC.
- · Overview of the plans to conduct an analysis of the health-science related programs throughout the eight NSHE institutions.
- · Overview of the UNHSC Capital Improvement Plan budget request for the 2007 Legislative Session.
- · Update on activities relating to the development of Graduate Medical Education (*GME*) opportunities, including participation with the Nevada Hospital Association (*NHA*) in a joint effort to engage a consultant to help enhance identification and coordination of GME placement opportunities.

Regent Geddes requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- · Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the September 22, 2006 Committee meeting (*Ref. HSC-1 on file in the Board office*) .
- · Presentation Regarding Activities Relating to the Development of Graduate Medical Education Opportunities – The Committee recommended acceptance of the report regarding the Graduate Medical Education expansion activities (*HSC-6a, HSC-6b on file in the Board office*) .

Regent Geddes moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried. Regents Howard, Rosenberg and Wixom were absent.

24. Approved-Election of Vice Chair – The Board approved Regent Jack Lund Schofield as the new Vice Chair. In accordance with Regents’ Bylaws(*Article IV, Section 2*) , an election of the Vice Chair was held for the remainder of FY 2006-2007, to assume the office upon the seating of the newly elected members of the Board.

Regent Alden nominated Regent Jack Lund Schofield as Vice Chair.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of closing nominations. Regent Anthony seconded. Motion carried. Regents Howard, Rosenberg and Wixom were absent.

Regent Wixom entered the meeting.

The nomination of Regent Jack Lund Schofield for Vice Chair for the remainder of FY 2006-07 carried. Regents Howard and Rosenberg were absent

25. New Business – Regent Derby congratulated CCSN for their accreditation report. Regent Leavitt stated that he echoes Regent Derby’s comments and said that it was wonderful to have been a part of the experience.

The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Scott G. Wasserman
Secretary of the Board