SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Third Floor Rotunda
Frank H. Rogers Science & Technology Building
Desert Research Institute
755 East Flamingo Road, Las Vegas
Friday, July 10, 2009, 9:00 a.m.

Members Present:	Mr. James Dean Leavitt, Chairman Dr. Jason Geddes, Vice Chairman Mr. Mark Alden Mr. Robert Blakely Mr. William G. Cobb Mr. Cedric Crear Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher Mr. Ron Knecht Mr. Kevin Page Dr. Raymond D. Rawson Dr. Jack Lund Schofield Mr. Michael B. Wixom
OthersPresent:	Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, HSS, Maurizio Trevisan Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols Chief Counsel BJohn Filler, UNLV. Student government leaders present in President, UNLV; and M ll members

llegiance.

nmentowld be heard at two different times during the
ng conclusion of the consultant's report and the second
neeting.

1. Information Only - Personnel Session –

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

presidential evaluation had certain expectations and asked that these expectations be the focus of the discussion, and that this not be considered a hearing.

Dr. Ashley related that upon coming to UNLV in July 2006, he had committed to being the good manager that the Board was looking for. However, he also wanted to build an outstanding university, adding that there was great deal of potential for UNLV. In 2006, the community was experiencing strong growth and enjoying a strong economy with the availability of many resources. There was a developing recognition for UNLV's catalytic role in moving the region forward and contributing to the local economy. Dr. Ashley related that it was that promise that brought him to Las Vegas and that allowed him to recruit and assemble an outstanding leadership team. Almost immediately, significant budget issues were faced, including a hold harmless situation which required the University to consider a reduction in resources while living up to its commitments. The University also experienced significant budget reductions in that biennium as well as the next.

Dr. Ashley felt it was important to note that although UNLV was facing significant fiscal issues, it was still very important for the University to consider the future and the setting of priorities and expectations. In his first year, Dr. Ashley related that eighteen town hall meetings were held that resulted in the development of some outstanding principles. The an academic strategic plan provided opportunities to identify areas where a university could invest and build. However, in a resource constrained environment, planning also helped to focus on areas that needed protection.

Dr. Ashley acknowledged that the evaluation report reflected some areas of concern, including the proposed policy on Bias Incidents and Hate Crimes. However, he felt that the situation had been misrepresented. He related that Regents had required a hate crimes policy that also addressed prevention. UNLV engaged the community through extensive town hall and group meetings to try and build a consensus on how to go forward. He felt that this was a situation in which there existed a range of views and values that was not allowing policy development to reach closure. During that time, he had not received a satisfactory recommendation that could be implemented. In the spring of 2009, Dr. Ashley related that an ad hoc task force was created and was asked to develop three options for consideration. As a result of that process, UNLV now has a policy which he felt was in many ways what the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee had asked for. However the bias incidents portion still needed to be fully vetted. The Faculty Senate was asked, as a body, to come forward with a recommendation on that piece. He felt that this debate was really about the open discussion of ideas, adding that if that could not occur at a university, it could not be done anywhere. He stated that he would defend the process as being inclusive of all constituents and in identifying and debating the issues in a public format. Although the process was only modestly successful in identifying a recommendation, he felt that the dialogue and debate had been critical.

Dr. Ashley acknowledged that the second concern raised in the report was visibility. He recalled that during Dr. Welty's closing remarks to the Evaluation Committee, he and the student representative spoke of the desire and need for greater visibility. Dr. Ashley agreed that visibility was important and that it was something that he could work on.

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley – *(Agenda Item #1) (Cont'd.)*

the accusations that were made. Dr. Welty replied that, based on his interviews, there were instances in former Chancellor Rogers' memo that he could not agree with. He repeated that he had simply tried to summarize the interviews as called for in the procedure.

Regent Cobb expressed great concern for the validity of Dr. Welty's report when it had failed to include an interview with former Chancellor Rogers as Dr. Ashley's immediate supervisor or to follow up with the concerns that supervisor had made in his memo.

Chairman Leavitt stated that, in fairness, Dr. Welty had indicated that he did have the opportunity to have an extensive discussion with former Chancellor Rogers after the memo had been distributed. However, everything that was said in the memo had been included in the discussion and therefore Dr. Welty did not feel the need to include it in his report. Dr. Welty stated that was correct.

Regent Crear related that he and Chief Counsel Patterson did have a conference call with Dr. Welty to communicate the reasons for rescheduling an open meeting report of the evaluation. At that time, Dr. Welty was invited to please follow-up with any of the interviewees that he felt necessary. Regent Crear added that a list of interviewees and their contact information had been provided to Dr. Welty.

Regent Alden related that he had written six memos to Dr. Ashley over the last three years without receiving a single response although he and former Regent Sisolak had met with Dr. Ashley to address some of those issues. Regent Alden stated that he had received more phone calls in the last 30 days than he had received since the entire time

614 l/0avp64 (5)]v2 (Soc6f6 TJ [(614 76 TJ [(2 l.)f.aiwH S 3IS-64.Cg 3IS-64..f)#vv-6 l IMa T

07/10/2009 -

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

treat the president's spouse as if they speak with the authority of the president.

Regent Knecht referred to the public record of communication between the President's spouse and UNLV employees. He asked Dr. Welty if he perceived that this type of issue, if left unresolved for some period of time, would be detrimental to the staff morale and if it was concerning that Dr. Ashley maintained his response that staff needed to work it out directly with his spouse.

Special Counsel Nielsen cautioned that this issue is solely how that situation reflected on Dr. Ashley's leadership and handling of the situation.

Regent Knecht restated his question and asked Dr. Welty if he was concerned that the issue had continued on without resolution, how that reflected on leadership and the implication that had on employee morale. Dr. Welty indicated that he had noted that in his summary as a situation that needed to be addressed.

Regent Knecht asked Dr. Welty if it was concerning that this type of situation had been allowed to continue as long as it has without being addressed. Dr. Welty replied yes.

Regent Cobb referred to the fourth bullet point in former Chancellor Rogers' memo. He asked Dr. Welty if he had received a email from Dr. Brian Spangelo, former Faculty Senate Chair, UNLV. Dr. Welty indicated that he had not received the email during the evaluation but had interviewed Dr. Spangelo. Regent Cobb asked if Dr. Welty had since had the opportunity to review the email from Dr. Spangelo dated February 29, 2008. Dr. Welty indicated that he had seen and briefly reviewed the email that morning.

Regent Cobb asked Dr. Welty, if during Dr. Spangelo's interview, was there an opportunity to address the perceived faculty issues that somewhat paralleled the concerns outlined in point #4 of former Chancellor Rogers' memo. Dr. Welty indicated that some, although not all, of the concerns expressed in the email were mentioned by Dr. Spangelo during the interview. However, Dr. Spangelo's concerns were not consistently expressed by the other faculty members interviewed nor were they reflected in the faculty survey.

Regent Cobb asked Dr. Welty if his evaluation report referenced any of the concerns that Dr. Spangelo expressed as then Chair of the UNLV Faculty Senate. Dr. Welty indicated that Dr. Spangelo's concerns were not specifically referenced in the evaluation report but were reflected in the summary under Faculty Governance.

Regent Cobb asked if Dr. Welty's report reflected a positive relationship between Dr. Ashley and the faculty. Dr. Welty indicated that it did.

Regent Cobb asked if Dr. Spangelo's comments during the interview were consistent with those expressed in the February 29, 2008 email. Dr. Welty indicated that some of the comments made during the interview were consistent with the email. However, not all the concerns expressed in the email were raised during the interview.

Regent Cobb asked where in the evaluation report Dr. Welty indicated the concerns expressed by the then Chair of the UNLV Faculty Senate. Dr. Welty indicated that was not included in the report.

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley – *(Cont'd.)* *(Agenda Item #1)*

Regent Rawson related that upon reading Dr. Ashley's self-evaluation, he held the impression that particular document had been

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Crear stated for the record that this was a harsh evaluation process, adding that what he had been told by many was in contradiction with Dr. Ashley's statement. Dr. Ashley replied that he did not have the benefit of the details of Regent Crear's conversations and therefore could not verify the substance of what was being cited.

Chairman Leavitt cautioned the Board that many conversations had occurred during this process and asked that specific questions be directed to Dr. Ashley.

Regent Crear asked Dr. Ashley for his opinion of the memo submitted by former Chancellor Rogers. Dr. Ashley felt that the memo mischaracterized his performance and he would have liked to have seen the support for the claims listed against him.

In terms of the unresolved spouse issue indicated in former Chancellor Rogers' memo, Regent Page asked Dr. Ashley if he felt it was appropriate for the president of an institution to direct staff to work their concerns out for themselves, without his intervention. Dr. Ashley replied that his observation was that the situation had in fact been resolved

Regent Cobb noted that Dr. Ashley had stated that there was no substantive support for the claims in former Chancellor Rogers' memo. Dr. Ashley felt that was the case for almost every issue raised in the memo.

Given that response, Regent Cobb asked Dr. Ashley if he had responded to the concerns raised in Dr. Spangelo's e-mail dated February 29, 2008. Dr. Ashley asked if that was the e-mail that was sent to Regent Wixom. Regent Cobb indicated that was correct. Dr. Ashley replied that he had not seen that correspondence until two days ago, feeling that it had been a secret communication between Dr. Spangelo and Regent Wixom. He felt the results of the faculty survey countered just about every point made in Dr. Spangelo's e-mail.

Regent Cobb noted that attached to Dr. Spangelo's e-mail was a memorandum to Dr. Ashley from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that raised a number of issues. He asked Dr. Ashley if he had responded to those issues. Dr. Ashley replied that he had met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the current Faculty Senate Chair and continues to work on those issues. He noted that at that point in time, there was concern for how UNLV dealt with the first budget reduction of 4.5%. Dr. Ashley related that his interpretation of the Faculty Senate's concerns was that they felt they had not been appropriately involved in fiscal discussions. He indicated that there was some validity to that argument as decisions had to be made under a short turnaround requirement over the course of the winter break. Dr. Ashley related that those concerns continue to be taken under diligent consideration in terms of the most recent round of budget reductions, adding that he felt they were no longer valid.

Regent Cobb asked if that memo by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had been included in Dr. Ashley's self-evaluation. Dr. Ashley indicated that he had no knowledge of that.

2. Information Only -Public Comment *(Agenda Item #3)* – *(Cont'd.)*

the relationship and communication between Dr. Ashley and the Board of Regents and the Las Vegas community. As to whether Dr. Ashley's management style was conducive to continued development of UNLV, the Board needed to first determine what management style it wanted. If the Board wanted a person that was smart, intelligent and data driven and that empowered his team to make decisions, then Dr. Ashley was a good fit. From the perspective of a donor, Mr. Cox felt that a shifting of the presidency created great disruption within the organization and impacted a donor's decisions. Currently UNLV has a team in place that has already dealt with one budget reduction, and will be able to deal with further reductions in the context of the university's vision and plan. He understood that the options before the Board were to terminate Dr. Ashley and reassign him to a faculty position in the School of Engineering. However, he felt that would be a waste of talent. A second option would be to allow Dr. Ashley to finish out his term. However, that would create a lame duck situation. A final option would be for the Board to place their support in Dr. Ashley and his team, to let them do their jobs and use the resulting time to work out the issues.

Mr. Jim Ratigan, past President of the UNLV Alumni Association, recognized that the job of a university president was not an easy one. However, one of the attributes of a good leader, much less a great leader, was to cultivate relations with a variety of interest groups and campus constituencies including the UNLV Foundation, the business community, the Alumni Association, faculty, staff and students. He felt that Dr. Ashley had not done a very good job in

2. Information Only -Public Comment *(Agenda Item #3)* – *(Cont'd.)*

that partnership. Specifically, he shared the concern that there was a general lack of engagement. Without the leadership of former Chancellor Rogers, the Alumni Association would not have

07/10/2009 -

2. Information Only -Public Comment *(Agenda Item #3)* – *(Cont'd.)*

point that it was more important to know that a degree from UNLV meant something, and

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)*

Regent Cobb asked if the Faculty Senate was satisfied with Dr. Ashley's response to its concerns. Dr. Robinson indicated that they were. Dr. Daneshvary added that on approximately December 19, 2008, the administration had begun speaking with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the upcoming budget issues. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee was under the impression that they would then be consulted before any decisions were made over the holiday break, a town hall meeting was conducted in which information was provided that made it sound like the decisions had been finalized. However, that was a complete misunderstanding which resulted in a learning situation in which Dr. Ashley and his administration learned that if options were going to be discussed with the campus community, the Faculty Senate must first be involved.

Chancellor Klaich noted that the response categories in the survey included a neutral column with positive or negative options to the left and right. However, the question related to contract renewal included a different set of options and asked if that was a conscious decision, and if so, why. Dr. Robinson replied that because no comparative data exists for that question, the Campus Affairs Committee had initially felt it should not be included on the questionnaire. However, in the end it was decided that it should be included. He agreed that the questions should have been structured consistently. He expected that the question would change over time.

Chancellor Klaich expressed his appreciation to the Faculty Senate and its Executive Committee for the process and success of the survey.

Regent Knecht related that he had heard the characterization that the distribution of the results was flatter than normally seen. He questioned if that reflected Dr. Robinson's opinion or rather a misunderstanding of the results. Dr. Robinson related that the Campus Affairs Committee had debated on the best way to present the data, particularly because of the unusually large percentage of neutral responses. In the end, it was decided to submit the data to the Board in its raw form because, statistically speaking, it could not be decided if there was a best way to present the data. The ration of the number of agree versus disagree were significant. However, at the same time, there was a large cluster of neutral responses. Dr. Daneshvary agreed that there was a flatter distribution. However, some of the questions were fairly technical and specific to individual departments. He

1. Information Only - Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

the very public battle related to Dr. Ashley's wife. Dr. Welty had indicated that although he had heard of the issues, he was not comfortable including negative information in a public document. Former Chancellor Rogers stated that he conveyed to Dr. Welty his distress that the analysis did not include the good, the bad and the mediocre aspects of Dr. Ashley's administration. He informed Dr. Welty that the report was inadequate and gave the appearance of a white wash and that would need to be addressed. Dr. Welty indicated to the Chancellor that he understood.

Former Chancellor Rogers related that in toegrte(eg)-4lc d (R)-1 (h)-14..8Pn]TJ 0.002 Tc -8[(l)

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

people what needed to be done, to support them in getting that done and in ensuring that they feel comfortable and secure in their positions.

Former Chancellor Rogers indicated that although he had heard rumblings about Dr. Ashley's spouse, the significance of the situation materialized when she was not present at what he felt to be a very important UNLV function.

Special Counsel Nielsen remin3od(a)4 (t)-2 (72 (g)10 (e)-4 (r)3 (2 (c)4 (i)-2 (i)-24 (e)4 (l)-2 (l)-2

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)*

of this individual to Dr. Ashley, that gave the person the appearance of an implied authority, especially if nothing was done to prevent that implied authority. However, former Chancellor Rogers indicated that Dr. Ashley did not agree.

Former Chancellor Rogers indicated that he had several conversations with Dr. Ashley on this topic. Although Dr. Ashley does not agree, former Chancellor Rogers stated that he had indicated to him that his failure to manage this situation would potentially cost him his job.

Former Chancellor Rogers had told Dr. Ashley that when the Board considered his evaluation, they would also consider his leadership and how it affected all of the issues. Former Chancellor Rogers indicated that Dr. Ashley's response had been that the situation encompassed only a few individuals and involved no one important.

Former Chancellor Rogers told Dr. Ashley at that point that he had spent a great deal of time talking with people that were much involved in the situation and told Dr. Ashley that uncertainty existed that must be addressed. He indicated that he received no response from Dr. Ashley. The day before Dr. Ashley and his spouse left for Singapore, former Chancellor Rogers related that he had met with Dr. Ashley to tell him he already was self-destructed with this one issue. Again, former Chancellor Rogers indicated that Dr. Ashley gave no response other than it was not his responsibility. Former Chancellor Rogers stated that he then recommended to Dr. Ashley that he quit and he expressed concern that the situation would permanently injure his ability to attain a position elsewhere. Dr. Ashley repeated to him that he did not feel the situation was relevant to his evaluation. Former Chancellor Rogers indicated to Dr. Ashley that because of his lack of relationship with the Board, a request for a contract extension would be viewed as more in line with a new application.

Former Chancellor Rogers recommended that Dr. Ashley's contract not be extended, adding that the information received since the evaluation report has not indicated a change of mind. He also felt that Dr. Welty's report earlier that day had been inadequate.

Regent Alden expressed his deep regard for the Board of Regents. Secondly, he stated that he had not been an initial supporter of Dr. Ashley. However, Regent Alden felt that he had tried very hard to help him. As former Chancellor Rogers stated, Dr. Ashley does not listen. He asked former Chancellor Rogers, in the overall perspective of his remarks, if he was still consciously recommending to the Board of Regents that Dr. Ashley's contract not be renewed. Former Chancellor Rogers indicated that was correct. Regent Alden stated that he had no further questions.

Regent Gallagher felt it fair to relate her experience with Dr. Ashley to the Board. She related that some time ago she had wanted representatives from Georgia Tech to meet with the presidents of UNR, UNLV and DRI. She stated that she was quickly able to communicate that request with the presidents of UNR and DRI. However, when she called for Dr. Ashley, she had been told that he would need to call her back. After a week went by without that return phone call, Regent Gallagher stated that she called Dr.

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)*

Ashley's office again. She was then told that Dr. Ashley had been too busy but he would be told to return her call. She stated that she never did receive that phone call.

Regent Gallagher stated that even with being a Regent for as long as she has, she realizes that some people like her and some do not. However, when any president does not return a Regent's phone call, there is cause for concern. She related that there has never been a president that she did not eventually hear from, except for Dr. Ashley. After some urging by former Chancellor Rogers, Dr. Ashley did invite her to lunch. At that lunch, she felt she had been very straightforward with him but also felt that she was getting nowhere. In terms of disagreements that were so demeaning to many people, she emphasized that it was important to know that, at the conclusion of the process, it had been handled fairly. As vocal as former Chancellor Rogers could be, she knew that in this particular situation,

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

some of the people in the UNLV Foundation. He stated that when someone from your

07/10/2009

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Blakely addressed each of the concerns listed in former Chancellor Rogers' memo. He stated that where Dr. Ashley chose to live was of no concern to him. Secondly, the issues related to Dr. Ashley's spouse were of no concern to him other than he would have like that it never happened. In terms of being unresponsive, Regent Blakely agreed that was sometimes a challenge for Dr. Ashley and he had seen that to be a concern. As far as Board interaction, Regent Blakely felt that he and Dr. Ashley had a good relationship but indicated that significant improvement would be needed depending upon the outcome of this meeting. Regent Blakely related that his most significant concern was in tangible versus intangible issues. He related that Dr. Ashley was strong to excellent in terms of concrete issues. However, in areas that involve intangible issues, he felt that Dr. Ashley showed a weakness.

Dr. Ashley requested that Regent Blakely provide examples. Regent Blakely related that, in terms of fundraising, Dr. Ashley needed to build much stronger relationships but questioned Dr. Ashley's ability to do that at this point. In terms of faculty, Regent Blak.15 Td .63 B,n (e)4 (nt)-2 aegtfaculculhis poiis moyaRe2 (ha)4 (t) (R)-3ook-1 (i)-2 (d)4 (ul)-

1. Information Only - Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)*

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

dissented from the group, which Regent Geddes felt could be good to a point. However, once the full group or Regents have made a decision, continued dissention could lead to isolation. For example, he noted the strategy for how the System would present its budget to the legislature. The Council of Presidents had discussed the recommendation that was to be made to the Regents which resulted in a seven to one vote, Dr. Ashley being the dissenting vote. The Board of Regents then discussed the Council of President's recommendation and had made a decision on how to address the legislature. However, throughout the 2009-2011 legislative session, Dr. Ashley continued to pursue his dissention with the final legislative budget reflecting support for that dissenting position. Regent Geddes found it very troubling that Dr. Ashley and his representatives pursued that support throughout the course of the legislature despite the Board's statement that was not the course it had wanted to take. He asked Dr. Ashley to address that issue and how the Board could expect Dr. Ashley to be less isolated when he continues to pursue his own dissenting opinion.

Dr. Ashley felt that the Council of Presidents was where many important issues were debated amongst the presidents, adding that may involve differences in philosophy and aggressive interaction but always with mutual respect. Dr. Ashley related that as an example of collaboration in the Health Science System discussions, UNLV has been a very strong collaborator and even instigator of things that lead to further collaboration as well as things that lead to tension. He elaborated that there is now a joint Ph.D. in Public Health which was the result of collaboration between UNLV and UNR. Dr. Ashley also related that when it came to the nursing simulation facility at the Shadow Lane campus, he felt that in many respects he had forced the issue of collaboration when NSC had been kept from being involved. In regard to the budget issue, Dr. Ashley felt the Council of Presidents discussion was very quick and did not place UNLV in a position to have an honest discussion that would have resulted in a healthy resolution. He acknowledged that the vote was seven to one. However, in speaking with Chancellor

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley – *(Cont'd.)* *(Agenda Item #1)*

had changed and that in turn places pressure on the Board. The situation that was created in the last legislative session will have to be dealt with in the next legislative session Regent Rawson felt there were bigger consequences than was

1. Information Only - Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley *(Agenda Item #1)* – *(Cont'd.)*

year and each group receiving $150,000. Those funds had been included in the total number that had been reported.

In response to the concerns related to supplier diversity, Dr. Ashley related that TMCC President was leading the effort in working with Regent Crear's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee to rally the presidents around the supplier diversity issue. The EDIC *(Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Council),* is currently an element of that Committee and is comprised of representatives from each of the institutions. UNLV's Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion was Co-Chair of that activity and due to her personal experience with supplier diversity is really one of the forces in that effort. Dr. Ashley felt that UNLV was probably the most resistant of all of the institutions to join into that effort. UNLV participation was through the use of the expertise of one of its administrators; however, that initiative did not necessarily fit into UNLV's independent interests although their campus remains committed to making advances in that area.

Regent Knecht stated that he did not get his information from the newspapers and had conducted due diligence to gain the facts.

In conclusion, Regent Crear stated that he personally had found issue with the evaluation, the evaluator and the evaluator's summary. He added that although the situation was unfortunate, a decision would need to be made.

2. Information Only -Public Comment – *(Cont'd.)*

Dr. Brian Spangelo, former Faculty Senate Chair, UNLV, expressed concern for the future of UNLV and its research mission. As a campus leader, he expressed regret at having to address the Board in regard to the President's performance. Due to his many opportunities to serve UNLV, Dr. Spangelo stated that he had many committee and individual interactions with Dr. Ashley. He related that he had brought issues of faculty concern to Dr. Ashley including the delayed opening of the Science and Engineering building, the elimination of the position of Senior Advisor to the President, Dr. Ashley's lack of visibility and communication to the campus community as well as a disappointing level of commitment to shared governance. Dr. Spangelo indicated that though his suggestions were cordially received by Dr. Ashley, the outcome of those conversations were retention of the status quo. He discovered that Dr. Ashley kept his own counsel and did not explain his decisions. In his opinion, the leadership picture that emerged was one of a non-productive, hands-off management style that does not demand accountability. The further lack of presence and visibility on campus has created a palpable frustration within the UNLV community. He too had felt it necessary to question the integrity of the final evaluation report. His concerns and those of other participants have been quietly dismissed. Because of these and other legitimate concerns, including the recent divisive Hate Crimes and Bias Incident policy situation, a crisis of confidence existed in the President's leadership. Dr. Spangelo respectfully but strongly requested that the Board of Regents take decisive action for a change in leadership.

2. Information Only - Public Comment – *(Cont'd.)*

Mr. Henry Schuck, Alumni of UNLV, felt that there had been much said about Dr. Ashley's inability and reluctance to engage in the University community. He felt that Las Vegas was a unique community fully engaged in the University's activities. To have a president that was not out in front and embracing that aspect of their job was a significant detriment to UNLV. The Las Vegas community expects the University president to be out in front. Mr. Schuck stated that in 2006, Vice Chancellor Nichols had stated that one of the master plan goals included creating a reputation for excellence and improving the national ranking of Nevada's universities. He noted that although the evaluation report indicates that the campus likes Dr. Ashley's commitment to sustainability, it does not address progress towards the master plan or improvement of UNLV's rankings, which was a significant issue for the UNLV Alumni.

Mr. Jerry Kops, Professor at UNLV, stated that from his perspective, Dr. Ashley allowed the process surrounding the Hate Crimes and Bias Incident policy to get out of control. He questioned that Dr. Ashley did not understand that the use of police to investigate bias incidents on a university campus would not raise academic freedom issues. He also felt that Dr. Ashley was disengaged from the faculty and staff. Mr. Kops observed that the proposed Hate Crimes policy had been presented to the Board of Regents by UNLV's legal counsel who obviously had not participated in its creation as the biased incident portion of the proposed policy had been completely divorced from the hate crimes policy. He felt that was an indication of poor judgment that had tossed the University into turmoil.

Mr. Ernesto Abel-S gpa(4(e)4 (n)-4 (r) (e)4 (d p)-10 (ol)-002 Tw p (t)-

1. Information Only – Personnel Session – UNLV President David B. Ashley – *(Cont'd.)* *(Agenda Item #1)*

Dr. Ashley felt that he had been a very positive contributor to the System concept, noting that the NSHE was as diverse a System as he had ever encountered. Dr. Ashley indicated that he would commit to becoming a collaborator and partner in terms of future legislative issues. He felt that there was a difference in the recollection of what had occurred but he absolutely wanted to be a team player and felt that there was too much at stake. He indicated that he was quite proud of the fact that despite extraordinary budget reductions, the institution was still able to move its mission forward. He felt that was a credit to the UNLV team as much as it was to himself. He noted that the Board had heard from many of the students and indicated his delight and surprise in the level of support that they had expressed.

3. Motion Failed -Presidential Employment Contract, UNLV *(Cont'd.)*

Regent Rawson commented that public life in Nevada had a strong altruistic tradition. As the Board considered the decision before it, he thanked Dr. Ashley for his work, service and sacrifice.

Regent Blakely requested that if the motion was approved, that Dr. Ashley's be reassigned to the civil engineering department, if he so chooses, and at the level of full tenure that he was so entitled.

Upon a roll call vote, Regents Cobb, Crear, Gallagher, Geddes, Knecht, Leavitt, Page, Rawson, Schofield, Alden and Blakely voted yes. Motion carried unanimously. Regent Wixom was absent.

4. Information Only -New Business – Regent Rawson requested that future consideration be given to conveying Emeritus status upon former Chancellor Rogers.

Chairman Leavitt thanked Dr. Ashley for his service to UNLV and thanked the Regents for their due diligence.

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Prepared by: Jessica C. Morris
Administrative Assistant IV

Submitted for approval by: Scott G. Wasserman
Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents

Approved by the Board of Regents at the