

# **SPECIAL MEETING**

## **BOARD OF REGENTS NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Third Floor Rotunda  
Frank H. Rogers Science & Technology Building  
Desert Research Institute  
755 E. Flamingo Road, Las Vegas  
9:00 a.m., Friday, April 16, 2010

Members Present: Mr. James Dean Leavitt, Chairman  
Dr. Jason Geddes, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Mark Alden  
Dr. Andrea Anderson  
Mr. Robert Blakely  
Mr. William G. Cobb  
Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher  
Mr. Ron Knecht  
Mr. Kevin J. Page  
Dr. Raymond D. Rawson  
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield  
Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Members Absent: Mr. Cedric Crear



2. Information Only - 2011 Capital Improvement Projects (Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)

As indicated in the reference materials, there are three categories of projects that staff is asking the Board to prioritize. The category titled “Two-Percent Replacement Value Projects” reflects projects recommended by the campuses for deferred maintenance. The “Systemwide Deferred Maintenance” category reflects what the System normally receives in HECC/SHECC funds. The third category, “Unfunded 2009 Priorities,” reflects each campus’ highest priority new project, which may have changed from the previous biennium. Also included in this category is the ISU (t)-2 (ds)-1 [ce

2. Information Only - 2011 Capital Improvement Projects (Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Klaich requested that the Board allow him to return with the final list in June, including details on those campus projects that require matching funds.

Regent Knecht agreed that prioritization was essential and that replacement value and deferred maintenance were important. He asked that the projects be ranked without regard  
ce 40nolr

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)

B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) – (Cont'd.)

Chairman Leavitt received Public Comment during the consideration of this agenda item.

President Richards presented CSN's FY 2010 and FY 2011 Budget Reduction plan (*see Exhibit 1*)

President Richards also shared with the Board a few samples of questions that he has received. First, it has been asked if CSN will need to come back to the Board for additional action on its budget. In answer to that question, President Richards stated that CSN would need to return to the Board prior to the next biennium in order to address bridge funding. Second, it has been asked what preparations CSN is making for the next potential round of budget cuts. President Richards stated that CSN has an excellent process in place for communication and input from its constituents as well as a plan for the implementation of a measured growth strategy. Finally, it has been asked how the budget reduction affects CSN's academic quality. President Richards stated that CSN has constricted to its core mission and is sacrificing its access mission in order to preserve the academic quality. However, that could not be sustained for the long term.

Chancellor Klaich added that deferred maintenance was allocated as a percentage amount among the appropriation lines of the budget. Although the legislature imposed budget cuts on general fund dollars only, the System has allocated the cuts based on general fund and ARRA funds.

Regent Geddes asked President Richards to elaborate on the term "redeployment" as it relates to the satellite locations. President Richards explained that CSN has tried to redistribute resources from sites that are waning to sites that are experience growth. Regent Geddes observed that was not necessarily an actual reduction to the budget. President Richards stated that was correct.

Regent Page asked what the process for employee buyouts entailed. President Richards replied that in the past, the opportunity for buyouts applied to professional staff and faculty. This year, it was extended to the classified staff. Regent Page asked what the response to that opportunity has been. President Richards replied that early indications suggest that this incentive will be more successful than in previous years.

Regent Gallagher felt it was important for the presidents to be mindful that quality must be maintained throughout this process. President Richards agreed and related that approximately four years ago, CSN decided to pursue every specialized accreditation that was available. To-date, the institution has obtained 30 out of 34 of those accreditations. He felt that was a tremendous tribute to the CSN faculty. Secondly, CSN decided to embark on a long term strategy to hire more full-time faculty in key disciplines.

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)

B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Cobb asked if CSN would be making horizontal as well as vertical cuts. President Richards stated that both types of cuts were being made. Regent Cobb asked if CSN was able to quantify savings in efficiencies. President Richards replied that CSN was not yet able to quantify those savings. However, a final report on the reorganizational efforts will be available at the end of April. Regent Cobb asked that if efficiencies are found, that the information be shared with the Chancellor so it may be passed on and possibly adopted within the System-wide Efficiency and Effectiveness initiative.

Regent Wixom related that due to the economic situation, there has been an increasing reliance on adjunct or part-time faculty throughout the nation. That has initiated an ongoing discussion on whether that will affect quality, and asked if that discussion was occurring within the System. Chancellor Klaich stated that he and the community college presidents were working to put together a study group that will address those issues. It was preferred that the group be chaired by someone outside of the System. Chancellor Klaich related that the presidents have recommended an individual with whom he was having ongoing discussions and will report the outcome of those discussions to the Board at the appropriate time. Regent Wixom asked that the Chancellor also address the different types of adjunct faculty and the success rates of adjunct faculty who are provided a course outline and class objectives opposed to those that are required to develop that information on their own.

Regent Knecht indicated that, while he shared Regent Wixom's concerns, he felt that it was entirely possible to manage and improve faculty while increasing reliance on adjunct faculty. He asked that operational measures in support of the adjunct faculty be taken into consideration.

Regent Anderson supported CSN's strategy in hiring more full time faculty and relying less on adjunct faculty. While she agreed that adjunct faculty is vitally important to the institutions, she felt that there were many aspects of college life that the adjunct faculty do not have the opportunity to become involved in that she felt was extremely important.

Regent Anderson asked if CSN had found it necessary to turn students away. President Richards replied that a manual calculation conducted in the School of Science and Mathematics showed that approximately 5,000 students had been turned away. That

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)
  - A. Approved -





3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)
  - A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)
  - B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Gil Martin, Faculty Senate Chair, WNC, related that there is a real community environment at WNC and all have come together to weather this crisis the best way it could. He commended President Lucey and the WNC administration for its careful planning over a number of years. He added that it was important to have good financial planning for the future, and although the hiring freeze has helped, it is a fine line to walk. He commended the faculty for absorbing enrollment increases and maintaining academic quality.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Crear were absent.

President Sheehan presented TMCC's FY 2010 and FY 2011 Budget Reduction plan (*see Exhibit 1*)

Regent Alden entered the meeting.

Mr. Scott Huber, Faculty Senate Chair, TMCC, related that the faculty has had a very collaborative role with TMCC's administration throughout this crisis. He felt that TMCC had been very conservative but pro-active in its approach and that had served the institution well. In order for TMCC to protect its core mission of instruction, all other areas were affected, including employee buyouts, program consolidation, curtailing of adjunct faculty and deferment of maintenance. Mr. Huber felt that the high level of communication had fostered confidence and trust between the faculty, staff and administration. He felt that TMCC had done everything at it could to position itself for the future.

Regent Geddes expressed concern that all of the campuses had deferred maintenance even further as part of deferainten0 .( )]6 t TaraT15ustf

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Cobb noted that TMCC's deferred maintenance was approximately \$120,000 (5% of TMCC's budget) and indicated that he would rather those funds not have come from academic program. He asked how many students would be impacted by the vertical cuts listed on page 30 of the reference material (*see Exhibit 1*). President Sheehan replied that those programs had been recommended for phase out as a result of curriculum review. The impact on students would be negligible.

Regent Cobb asked President Sheehan to confirm if there had been several dean positions eliminated at TMCC. President Sheehan stated that was correct. Regent Cobb related that he has repeatedly heard that the administration was bloated and that the budget reductions did not affect that level. In asking that question, he wanted to emphasize that administration is not immune to the impact of the budget cuts.

President Sheehan acknowledged the Regents' concerns in deferring maintenance, adding that extreme care was needed in determining projects that could safely be deferred.

Regent Gallagher asked Chancellor Klaich if there was a way to strongly emphasize to the legislature that funds were needed more for the maintenance of existing buildings than for the construction of new buildings. Chancellor Klaich replied that part of the answer lied with the Board, adding that the Board had made it clear two years ago that maintenance was a priority.

Regent Rawson related that, from a legislative standpoint, there is rarely money available to make up for past errors, adding that a prudent legislature will not bond maintenance. However, the campuses are starting to feel the impact of the lack of funding. As Regents, it may be necessary to make some very unpopular decisions in the future.

Regent Rawson asked if there was a firm handle on how many insurance policies were currently in effect throughout the System including malpractice insurance, automobile coverage, and so forth. Chancellor Klaich thanked Regent Rawson for his leadership on that issue and felt that there was significant opportunity for savings going forward in terms of normalizing the System's business and purchasing practices. Regent Rawson asked that the opportunity also be taken to make sure that the System and institutions are adequately insured.

In terms of the deferred maintenance issue, Regent Blakely suggested that the institutions utilize the skills of various student work study programs. He asked if the list of position vacancies at TMCC were prioritized. Mr. Huber related that there are currently positions in every discipline that need to be filled.

Regent Anderson asked if TMCC found that it was turning students away. President Sheehan indicated that in the current semester, 1,700 students were unable to access a single course after multiple attempts.

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)

B.



3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)

B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) – (Cont'd.)

President Maryanski expressed concern for quality and its relationship to the management of adjunct faculty. In the current environment, there is a heavy amount of online instruction for which a national pool of adjunct faculty is accessed. NSC continues to explore alternatives for coordination for efficiency and effectiveness.

President Maryanski felt that one reason behind increased enrollment was the excellent job that NSC has done with retention through its commitment and compassion. NSC has worked hard to make sure its programs are responsive to the working-class demographic.

Regent Anderson asked if NSC found it necessary to turn students away. President Maryanski replied that although firm data is not available, NSC has 98 fewer sections offered for this coming fall than it had one year ago.

Regent Wixom asked President Maryanski to share his experiences from Connecticut. President Maryanski related that he was in Connecticut in the mid-1990's when the state's legislature committed to the university system approximately \$3 billion over a 19-year period to address deferred maintenance issues. Much of those funds were dedicated to the tear down and rebuild of an old building. However, much of that critical damage had been done by deferring maintenance. He felt that the NSHE did not want to find itself in a position that would require such a drastic response as it did in Connecticut.

Ms. Amsala Alemu-Johnson, NSSA President, NSC, stated that the decisions made for the budget reduction plan were made in a collaborative effort. She thanked President Maryanski, Provost Lesley Di Mare and Vice Provost Buster Neel for their frequent visits with the student government representatives. She expressed pride in the NSC faculty and staff. Although she felt that the reduction plan was well thought out, she was not satisfied or pleased that a reduction plan had to be developed.

Mr. Gregory Robinson, Faculty Senate Chair, NSC, related that this would be his last meeting as a Faculty Senate Chair and thanked the Board and Chancellor for helping faculty and students through the crisis. He greatly appreciated the Regents response to his phone calls and emails. Mr. Robinson thanked President Maryanski, Provost DiMare and Vice Provost Neel for facilitating a remarkably inclusive process and felt that the institution was stronger for it.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of NSC's budget reduction plan. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Crear was absent.

President Wells presented DRI's FY 2010 and FY 2011 Budget Reduction plan (*see Exhibit 1*)

04/16/2010 – B/R

3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)
  - A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)



- 3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)
  - A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) – (Cont'd.)
  - B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Wixom moved approval of System Administration's FY 2010 budget reduction plan. Regent Rawson seconded. Motion carried. Regent Crear was absent.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

President Glick presented UNR's FY 2010 budget reduction plan (*see Exhibit 1*). President Glick will present the UNR FY 2011 budget reduction plan to the Board at the June meeting.

Regent Gallagher moved approval of UNR's FY 2010 budget reduction plan. Regent Rawson seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Crear were absent.

President Glick related that several of the colleges and programs have responded to the recommended program reductions and eliminations with alternative solutions that save the same amount of money, some of which have been adopted and embraced. President Glick related that either he or UNR Provost, Dr. Marc Johnson, have met with numerous groups including affected faculty, the Faculty Senate, the undergraduate student senate, the graduate student senate and various other stakeholder groups throughout the state.

President Glick felt that this was a watershed moment that would define what kind

of univ28.79 0 Td42 ( ki)-2 (nd )]TJ -28.79 -1.15 Td (n)2 (a)6 (l)-2 (u)]TJ [(di.n(a)6 (s)1t)-2 o5aE





3. Approved -



3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)
  - A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) - (Cont'd.)
  - B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) - (Cont'd.)

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Crear were absent.

President Smatresk stated that rather than risking systemic collapse, it was important to approach the cuts surgically. He added that trying to administer this level of cuts within a three month period has been a tortuous and unrealistic exercise.

Dr. Michael Bowers, UNLV Provost, continued with a report concerning UNLV's proposal regarding FY 2011 potential reductions. (*see Exhibit 1*).

Provost Bowers emphasized that UNLV's process adhered to Code and UNLV Bylaws and to the shared governance and consultation model. Also, under UNLV's proposals, no tenured faculty will be laid off even if their program is eliminated, adding that affected tenured faculty may be reassigned. In addition, students will be given two years to complete their degree programs. Lastly, Provost Bowers indicated that UNLV was in support of differential tuition only in certain programs where there is high cost and/or high demand. Although differential tuition will protect some programs, it will not be the panacea to the issues before the System.

In terms of a program elimination, Regent Cobb asked what the savings will be if the applicable faculty and staff positions are not eliminated accordingly. President Smatresk clarified that the staff positions will be eliminated and the assistant professors that do not have tenure will be given the appropriate notice. There will be some savings, projected as being approximately 20-30% in year one and 20% the year after.

Regent Cobb expressed concern for that approach, adding that he may request further justification at the June meeting. President Smatresk replied that the challenge with program entrenchment is that it is often just as costly in legal fees as



3. Approved - FY 2010 And FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

A. Approved - FY 2010 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2A) - (Cont'd.)

B. Approved - FY 2011 Budget Reduction (Agenda Item #2B) - (Cont'd.)

national centers for academic research including the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Mr. Lester also indicated that the program generated revenue. In conclusion, Mr. Lester felt that cutting the program will decrease the quality of university administration throughout the state.

Mr. Adam Cronis, outgoing CSUN President, UNLV, expressed appreciation for the collaborative approach that the Board has supported throughout the process. He credited President Smatresk for doing an excellent job during such difficult conditions. Mr. Cronis felt that out of this terrible situation there has come unity but he feared that as the months unfold, that unity would begin to fray. He urged all those involved to continue to walk shoulder to shoulder and remain unified.

Regent Cobb related that Mr. Cronis had circulated an interesting survey regarding the UNLV student attitude toward tuition increases. He felt it had been very informative and appreciated that it had been shared with the Board.

Ms. Jessica Lucero, outgoing GPSA President, UNLV, related that UNLV's Program Evaluation Committee was doing an excellent job. She also thanked President Smatresk for talking with the students before making the final decisions.

Regent Knecht asked that when presenting substantive arguments on the merits of a particular program that the commentary include factual numbers, any possible  
, UN



4. Approved - Handbook and Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2011-12 and 2012-13(Agenda Item #4) – (Cont'd.)

bridge funding or differential program fees. He clarified that the Board should not think that this request precludes future requests for other various reasons.

Chancellor Klaich recommended that the Board adopt the recommendations of the Tuition and Fee Committee as presented. Instead of the mathematical policy traditionally followed in the past, it has been recommended that items such as tuition and fees charged at peer institutions, higher education inflation, anticipated state funding and institutional needs be considered. At the March meeting, Regent Knecht had questioned the propriety of that recommendation without an accompanying contraction measure on the expenditure side. Chancellor Klaich explained that although he did not like to return to the Board without pursuing proposed recommendations, he felt it would be better served as a possible budgeting parameter for the FY 2011-13 budget discussion.

Chancellor Klaich related that the Tuition and Fee Committee proposal also recommends discontinuation of the Children of A tui, bett

Chancellor Kla(i)-6 ((r)-1 (t(i)-6 po-3.9(i)-2 6K)2 (n4.11 (t(i)-6n 1h.i)-7  
bmtuim2 (hout()-2 (ng)10 (c)4 (om)-2 (c)4 (om)-2d t)-2 -2 (onoi)-2 (or

4. Approved - Handbook and Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Recommended

4. Approved - *Handbook* and

4. Approved - Handbook and Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Recommended Tuition & Fees, 2011-12 and 2012-13(Agenda Item #4) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rawson asked if the NSHE was still a member of WICHE and if there were requirements to use that organization's statistics. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that it is the choice of this Board to use any WICHE ranking or statistic. There is no requirement to use those statistics.

Regent Gallagher related that at one time, the Board refused to raise student fees so the legislature calculated what would have been the outcome of increasing student fees and reduced the System's budget accordingly. She stated that she would rather present a plan to the legislature than to have the legislature make the decision for the System.

Regent Wixom moved approval of Option A, with rA004 Tor]TJ 018

At the request of Regent Alden, Mr. Wasserman related that although Regent Alden had to leave the meeting, had he remained he would have voted against agenda items #4 through #8. Regent Alden felt that it was the wrong time to increase student fees given the current environment.

- 5. Information Only - Public Comment (Agenda Item #13) – Mr. Robert Maxey, CSUN President-Elect, UNLV, read a prepared statement regarding the increasing cost of higher education (*full statement on file in the Board office*).

Regents Anderson and Gallagher returned to the meeting.

- 6. Approved - Request for Sale of Property, Fire Science Academy Site, Carlin, Nevada (Agenda Item #11) – The Board of Regents approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request to sell to the Nevada State Lands Division 408.06 acres (*APN 005-280-002*) and related improvements located in Carlin, Nevada and more commonly known as the UNR Fire Science Academy for the proposed sale price of \$10 million. This included a request that the Board grant the Chancellor authorization to execute the finalized Sales and Purchase Agreement as well as any documents in connection with the sale. In addition, this request sought authorization for UNR and the NSHE to join with the State Public Works Board and Nevada Department of the Military to present the proposed Fire Science Academy site sale plan to the Interim Finance Committee (*Ref. BOR-11a; BOR-11b; BOR-11c; BOR-11d; BOR-11e on file in the Board office*).

Senator Richard Bryan urged the Board to support this request, adding that time was of the essence. He related that the military appropriation had been made available due to a Nevada National Guard Armory planned for construction in Elko. He felt that the proposed co-location plan was a win-win option for all those involved and would leverage monies

28-4 (n)12.7 ( 6 (ch)-4(d t)-2 (o )10 (4 (ve)-6td [(ous)-5a (l)-6 ( )-10 (an)-4(ad)-4 (as)-5tel)-6 (at)-6 )-9-3.9  
RfegentS (e)4 (s)-1 ( m)-2 (ve)4 ((h)-10 (l)-6p( pr)3 v( a)4 (l)-2 on f)3 U wRfores (e)4n( )-10 (t)-2 N  
Nevad[(S)-8telaty

7. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, 2011-13, Tuition & Fees, University of Nevada School of Medicine, UNR (Agenda Item #5) – The Board of Regents approved UNR President Milton D. Glick’s request for approval of the proposed tuition and fee structure for the 2011-13 biennium for the University of Nevada School of Medicine (*UNSOM*). This request reflected an increase in both *UNSOM* resident and non-resident tuition and fees of 15% per year for each year of the 2011-13 biennium and included a proposed distribution of fees and tuition (*P&GM Chapter 7, Sections 2 and 14*) (Ref. *BOR-5 on file in the Board office*).

President Glick related that as a result of the Board’s removal of a policy that restricted tuition increases at the School of Medicine to no more than 9% per year, the School has returned for the required final reading of a recommendation of a 15% increase for each year in the next biennium. This increase would still leave tuition below that found at most every other medical school in the region.

Although 15% was significant, Chairman Leavitt asked why a higher increase was not recommended if it still left the School of Medicine lower than most other schools in the region. President Glick replied that there was concern to keep the tuition affordable, and

8. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Academic Success Initiatives Fee and Performing Arts Fee, UNR (Agenda Item #6) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Page moved approval of





10. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, FY 2010-11 and 2011-13 Tuition & Fees, School of Dental Medicine, UNLV (Agenda Item #8) – The Board of Regents approved the request of UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk and Dr. Karen P. West, Dean of the UNLV School of Dental Medicine, for approval of the proposed tuition and fee structure for FY 2010-11 and the 2011-13 biennium for the School of Dental Medicine (*P&GM Chapter 7, Sections 4 and 16*) (*Ref. BOR-8 on file in the Board office*).

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the proposed tuition and fee structure for the FY 2010-11 and 2011-13 biennium for the School of Dental Medicine. Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. Regent Geddes voted no. Regents Alden and Crear were absent.

11. Information Only - 2011-13 Biennial Budget Discussion (Agenda Item #9) – Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich related that the System would present the 2011-13 biennial budget at the June Board meeting.

Regent Rawson asked if it was possible for the proposed budget to include language for a trust fund, stabilization fund or a carry-over fund from surplus or savings. Chancellor Klaich indicated that was a top priority.

12. Approved - Trust Fund for the Education of Dependent Children (Agenda Item #10)- The Board granted Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich authority to seek Board of Examiners and Interim Finance Committee (*IFC*) approval for an allocation of \$25,000 from the IFC contingency fund to provide sufficient funding in FY 2011 to make payments for registration fees, laboratory fees and expenses for required textbooks incurred by a dependent child of a police officer, firefighter, Nevada Highway Patrol Officer, volunteer ambulance driver or attendant who was killed in the line of duty. (*Ref. BOR-10 on file in the Board office*)

Regent Page related that the balance of the account (*approximately \$3,200*), would not cover the costs of summer tuition for the six students that are currently eligible. In addition to the request to approach the IFC for \$25,000, Regent Page related that alternative funding sources such as grants were also being pursued.

Regent Wixom moved approval of granting the requested authority to Chancellor Klaich to seek Board of Examiners and Interim Finance Committee (*IFC*) approval for an allocation of \$25,000. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Regent Rawson asked if there was any obligation on behalf of dependents of members of the Nevada National Guard. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that there is a different mechanism that addresses military dependents under Nevada Revised Statute. Although both mechanisms are a cost to the state, the Trust Fund for the Education of Dependent Children is completely dependent upon the availability of funds within the designated account.

12.

14. Information Only – Revisions to the NSHE Code (Agenda Item #3) – (Cont'd.)

considered financial exigency and the second, to consider if the Code allowed pay reductions even in the event that financial exigency was declared. Third, if the Legislature cuts the pay lines of the appropriations bill, is there a way for the System to manage that loss without having to declare financial exigency. He related that Vice Chancellor Patterson has been working with the faculty senate chairs to prepare these recommendations. He emphasized that this is the first reading of these revisions with the final reading to be heard at the June Board meeting.

Vice Chancellor Patterson related that although there was a lengthy process involved with the developul 12 607of the proposed revisions, he indicated that the proposals are not universally supported and that it was an ongoing process.

Vice Chancellor Patterson pointed out that, when considering pay reduction, it be noted that System employees, just as with other state employees, are already under a 4.6% pay reduction. However, due to contractual restrictions, that legislatively-mandated reduction posed issues for the faculty and professional staff contract structure. Tenured faculty were given a workload increase options and there was a delay in providing a year's notice before fully iupleul 12 60ing the 4.6% reduction for notia faculty. The legislature had concerns regarding the System's ability to respond to its request. The objltive of these proposed revisions is to try and meet some of the legislature's concerns while retaining the core of the contractual expectations of the System's employees and ret

14. Information Only – Revisions to the NSHE Code (*Agenda Item #3*) – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Geddes asked if there was a way to tie that number to appropriation levels instead



4. Information Only - Public Comment (*Agenda Item #13*) – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Rawson stated that although there is great concern for the outcome of the next legislative session, he was impressed that so many creative ideas were coming forward. He felt there was a fundamental restructuring and redesign occurring. Despite all of the difficulties that the System faces, it has the best team possible among the presidents and Regents.

Chairman Leavitt indicated that although there are positives to be made, the System and its institutions were not adequately funded. Although the System is being as innovative as possible, it was impPublic Comment (Agenda Item #13) (Cont'd.)