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
Thursday, December 2, 2010, 9:00 a.m.
Friday, December 3, 2010, 8:00 a.m.

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

Others Present: Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich
Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, HSS, Maurizio Trevisan
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
Vice Chancellor, Administrative & Legal Affairs, Bart Patterson
Interim Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mark Stevens
Vice Chancellor, HSS, Marcia Turner
CEO & Special Counsel to the Board, Scott Wasserman
President Michael D. Richards, CSN
President Stephen G. Wells, DRI
President Carl Diekhans, GBC
President Lesley DiMare, NSC
President Maria C. Sheehan, TMCC
President Neal J. Smatresk, UNLV
President Milton D. Glick, UNR
President Carol A. Lucey, WNC

Also present were faculty senate chairs Mr. Bill Kerney, CSN; Ms. Laura Edwards, DRI; Ms. Sarah Negrete, GBC; Ms. Robin Herlands, NSC; Ms. Mary Arburua, TMCC; Dr. Jeffrey Sosa, NSHE (Vice Chair); Dr. Cecilia Maldanado, UNLV; Dr. Eric Herzik, UNR; Mr. Scott Huber, TMCC; and Mr. Jim Strange, WNC. Student government leaders present included Mr. J.T. Creedon, ASCSN President, CSN; Mr. Steve Gronstal; GRAD President, DRI; Ms. Jacqueline Lemback, SGA Vice President, GBC; Ms. Sebring Frehner, NSSA Vice President, NSC; Mr. David Rapoport, CSUN President, UNLV; Mr. Kyle George, GPSA President, UNLV; Mr. Charlie Jose, ASUN President, UNR; Mr. Matthew J. Smith, GSA President, UNR; Mr. Adam Porsborg, ASTM Board Chair, TMCC; and Mr. Jason McGill, ASWN President, WNC.

1. Introductions and Campus Updates (Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Klaich related that Chancellor Emeritus Jim Rogers, owner and operator of KVBC in Las Vegas, has supported the NSHE by once again donating air time for interviews. Interviews have been taped with

2. Information Only - Institutional Student and Faculty Presentations (Agenda Item #2) – (Cont'd.)

necessary for commercial production of algal biofuel in southern Nevada. Miss Moazeni has one peer-reviewed publication and two manuscripts in preparation (no presentation on file in the Board office)

Regent Cobb asked if this process has been patented. Miss. Moazeni replied that the process is not yet complete. Regent Cobb asked what type of interface is being done with other agencies in Nevada. Miss Moazeni indicated that she understood DRI is working with UNLV's Harry Reid Center.

3. Information Only - Chairman's Report (Agenda Item #3) – Chairman James Dean Leavitt discussed current NSHE events and his current activities as Chairman.

Chairman Leavitt related that he, Chancellor Klaich, Reg (t)]TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw 7w G3.9 (i K)-1.v4 (in

9. Approved -Procedures & Guidelines Manual

10.

11.

11. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Differential Program Fee Proposals (Agenda Item #11) (Cont'd.)

clarified that the current cost to educate a student at UNLV is $12,000 per year per FTE student, while the institutional average in other places is $11,000. What UNLV is paying out is relatively high. In order to recover that difference, UNLV is proposing to double tuition which will reduce the average cost so that this program no longer stands out as a program in which cutting would generate a lot of income for the university.

Regent Geddes asked what the average UNLV student cost the university. President Smatresk stated it was approximately $6,000 per FTE. In other words, the architecture program is about double the cost per FTE of the typical UNLV upper division student.

Regent Geddes referred to Section 4 of the three proposals, and noted that the institutional average of $11,800 is the same. He asked if that meant that the institutional average for nursing architecture and physical therapy were the same. President Smatresk r

13. Approved -Employment Contract, President, UNLV and Code Provision Waiver for President Search (Agenda Item #15) (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Klaich reported that input was solicited from the UNLV community, the broader Las Vegas community, the UNLV Alumni Association, the UNLV Foundation, as well as with the UNLV faculty, students and staffs. Each constituent group was asked two very distinct and difficult questions. One was how each group felt Dr. Smatresk was doing, and the second being should this recommendation be made at this point and without a search process. Chancellor Klaich related that although the answer was clear to him, it was not a simple question because of the core values that govern the Board of Regents. If the Board waives an executive search and appoints Dr. Smatresk as permanent president, the System would be unable to look at a diverse pool of candidates. However, Chancellor Klaich related that Dr. Smatresk had been initially hired as Provost after being recruited and vetted in a national search.

With those questions in mind, Chancellor Klaich reported the following findings. First, he related that he found an enthusiastic and engaged community that was excited not only about the institution but about the leadership of that institution. There was unanimity about what an excellent job Dr. Smatresk was doing here. There was not a single community that found fault with Dr. Smatresk. It was easy to determine that Dr. Smatresk is a great fit for Nevada, for Las Vegas and one that has given UNLV its voice back. There were no concerns as to whether Dr. Smatresk should be appointed.

Chancellor Klaich related that there was a greater concern expressed as to whether the Board should waive, on a one-time basis, the Code provisions regarding the search for a president. This was not a concern for the greater UNLV community, except for with the faculty. As expected, the faculty was more divided and introspective on that issue and raised a number of concerns including one regarding the respect for the Code and procedures. It was asked that (y)r (h)-10 e to -4 (e)]TJ 0 Tc C BT /Span <</MCID 13 >>B5C

13. Approved -Employment Contract, President, UNLV and Code Revision Waiver for President Search (Agenda Item #15) (Cont'd.)

The negative comments expressed comments that Dr. Smatresk was more concerned with himself rather than the UNLV campus and expressed concern about the actions of Dr. Smatresk's subordinates.

Dr. Maldanado reported that the second open ended question asked what action Dr. Smatresk could take in the next year that would have the greatest impact on UNLV. The responses included preventing budget cuts, a call to remove or replace most of the vice presidents, all of the deans and many others in middle management, better continued communication, undergraduate education, research support, Dr. Smatresk's resignation and other varied comments.

Finally, in regard to the direct question on whether Dr. Smatresk should be appointed as president, approximately 70% of the tenured faculty gave a positive answer, and approximately 23% disagreed. The academic faculty gave him approximately 80% positive response and an approximate 10% negative response.

Dr. Maldanado related that although some concerns were raised in regard to the wording of the second question on whether the Code should be waived, the responses received showed that approximately 50% of the faculty indicated their support of a waiver while 38% did not.

Mr. David Rapoport, CSUN President, UNLV, thanked the Chancellor and Regents for meeting with all of the UNLV stakeholders. Mr. Rapoport related that the first thing that came to mind when he thought about Dthoughtxn (ht)-3-1 (pona -0 0 12 e)4 (d t)-2(ht)-3S

13. Approved - Employment Contract, President, UNLV and Code Revision Waiver for President Search (Agenda Item #15) (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Klaich thanked Mr. Mark Fine, Chairman of the UNLV Foundation, and its members for its continued partnership in assisting in the funding of UNLV when the state has not. Mr. Fine related that twelve members of the Foundation were present at the interviews. He stated that although UNLV is a very young university, it is important to the future of the children and businesses in Las Vegas. He felt that Dr. Smatresk represents a continuity to address the challenges presently facing the institution. Since Dr. Smatresk's appointment as Acting President in August 2009, he felt that Dr. Smatresk had taken the university to heart and has guided the university through some very difficult financial times. In regard to the decision before the Board to retain Dr. Smatresk permanently or to conduct a search, Mr. Fine stated that although there is always a temptation to see what one might find in a search, he felt that Dr. Smatresk has shown the Foundation, faculty, student body and the community that he has the desire, the will and the capability to lead the university. Prior to becoming Acting President, Dr. Smatresk had done an exceptional job. He realized that appointing Dr. Smatresk as permanent president required an exception to the rule, but felt that once in a while it is necessary to make an exception to the rules. Mr. Fine felt that Dr. Smatresk has demonstrated a commitment to the university and that Dr. Smatresk recognizes the value of the university to the business community, not just to higher education. Mr. Fine related that Dr. Smatresk has been involved and engaged in fundraising activities and has personally met with donors when and where it is convenient for them and in making gifts accountable and transparent. Mr. Fine felt that UNLV was fortunate to have Dr. Smatresk as its leader, and it is his sincere hope that he would continue to have the privilege of working with Dr. Smatresk. He respectfully requested that the Board retain Dr. Smatresk as president.

Mr. Matt Engle, President of the UNLV Alumni Association, related that the UNLV Alumni Association's mission is about keeping the alumni engaged with UNLV and keeping leaders in the community. Mr. Engle related that not a single negative comment about Dr. Smatresk was expressed at the Alumni Association's interview. Dr. Smatresk's ability to build and establish relationships among the different facets of the university has been tremendous. Based on that, he strongly supported the Chancellor's recommendation.

Ms. Pam Hicks addressed the Board on behalf of the past presidents of the UNLV Alumni Association. Ms. Hicks related that although the Board had received a letter from the past presidents, they asked her to be present to represent and expand their voice. Due to the diverse vocations and avocations of the past presidents of UNLV's Alumni Association, the members know what they want their university to be, and what they want it to achieve. Ms. Hicks related that Dr. Smatresk defines and exemplifies the courage to turn the tide. They believe that Dr. Smatresk can affect the change needed to alter t

13. Approved -Employment Contract, President, UNLV and Code Revision Waiver for President Search (Agenda Item #15) (Cont'd.)

12/02/10 & 12/03/10 –

13. Approved -

13. Approved - Employment Contract, President, UNLV and Code Revision Waiver for President Search (Agenda Item #15) (Cont'd.)

President Smatresk expressed his appreciation to all. He related that the System has had many opportunities and challenges over the last several months. It has been his privilege and pleasure that each member of the Board has been there with him as friends and confidants. Together, with the other institution presidents, he has been able to (a)n presi

14. Approved ~~-~~Faculty Hire~~-~~Above Salary Schedule, UNSOM (Agenda Item #12~~)~~ (Cont'd.)
salary will be paid if the funding is revoked.

12/02/10 & 12/03/10 –

16. Approved -Tenure Upon Hire, Director for the Center For Business and Economic Research (CBER) UNLV (Agenda Item #14) (Cont'd.)

Regent Crear asked why Dr. Brown had not yet attained tenure prior to this position. President Smatresk explained that Dr. Brown had been hired for very high powered positions throughout the world and then for approximately 20 years as the head of the Reserve in Dallas, Texas. President Smatresk emphasized that Dr. Brown has a very steady publication record and is a renowned expert in energy policy, adding that this is a remarkable hire of an incredibly talented person at way below market.

Regent Crear asked if the department faculty is in support of Dr. Brown's hire. President Smatresk related that there had been a unanimous vote from the Department of Economics for the hire of Dr. Brown.

Regent Geddes asked Vice Chancellor Patterson and Chancellor Klaich to consider the process or policies that require bringing such a contract to the Board. He felt that this should have been a presidential decision and should not be brought before the Board. Chancellor Klaich stated that it would require a change in Board policy.

Chairman Leavitt requested that Vice Chancellor Patterson determine the appropriate revisions to the current policy and that it be brought back to the Board through the Efficiency and Effectiveness Initiative.

Regent Page expressed his support of this hire. However, he also asked for caution when extending tenure with hires as it may cause issues in the future.

Motion carried.

The Board of Regents' regular meeting recessed at 10:12 am. on Friday, December 3, 2010, and reconvened at 10:12 am. on Friday, December 3, 2010, sitting as Mem 3 Tc 0.003 Tw [(h)-3 (i)-5 (P3

12/02/10 & 12/03/10 –

20. Approved -

20. Approved -Research, Technology and Workforce Development Report (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

Nevada Bioscience Roadmap – A joint effort between UNLV, UNR, DRI, the

20. Approved - Research, Technology and Workforce Development Report (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

Statewide Vision for Economic Growth:

- State funding for universities' and DRI research and technology transfer, along with workforce education at the colleges all with focus on economic growth.
  - Focus areas to be set by a state entity based on business needs & faculty strengths.
- Look to western states like Colorado, Utah and New Mexico to see how they have invested in higher education and technology transfer.
- Significant opportunities for building industrial strength in key areas if state takes lead with investment and structure for support of NSHE efforts.
- Long-term vision and commitment from civic and political leaders necessary.

Opportunities:

- Five colleges have 23% of external funding coming into NSHE.
- Opportunities exist to increase the amount of external funding if colleges have more:
  - Sponsored project structure and support

20. Approved - Research, Technology and Workforce Development Report (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

Previous State and National Studies:

- Battelle Memorial Institute Study (2000)
  - Provided a SWOT analysis of Nevada's vision for R & D and a proposed model
- Report of the Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs (2005)
  - Recommendation for Nevada to emulate the Georgia Research Alliance
- Nevada Science and Technology Plan (2009)
  - Plan identifies 9 key focus areas for research and workforce development
- Nevada Vision Stakeholder Group Report (2010)
  - Developed 5, 10 & 20 year strategic goals for improving NV's quality of life in 6 broad areas and advocated for increase in research and workforce development in NSHE
- The Science Coalition and the Rockefeller Institute of Government studies (2010)
  - Examined model research programs and their role in advancing R & D and commercialization for states

How State Investments Can Make A Difference:

- Since 2000 among the 50 states:
  - 9 states have implemented major long-term funding initiatives for research
  - 30 states have provided significant funding
  - 20 states (including Nevada) have no significant funding dedicated to academic research or technology
  - States who have invested have grown their economy

5 Characteristics of Successful Commercialized Technologies

- Research leadership in areas relevant to specific regional economics.
- A large group of nationally prominent faculty.
- Leadership that prioritizes economic growth and links effectively with the business sector to pursue that goal.
- The physical infrastructure necessary to support research, including labs, equipment, research parks, and classroom and conference facilities.
- Enough flexibility in laws and policies to allow the commercialization of research outcomes.

Workforce Development to Support Business and Industry

20. Approved - Research, Technology and Workforce Development Report (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

He expressed his surprise at seeing that the System brings in $316 million in external funding and research. He urged the institutions and the System to share those accomplishments, feeling that they were incredible.

Regent Wixom moved that the Board adopt the three recommendations presented in the report and that those recommendations be submitted to the Legislature as a legislative proposal during the 2011 session.

Chancellor Klaich indicated that the Board heard mostly from the three research institutions that day. However, there is a second half that involves workforce development at the state and community college level.

Regent Wixom restated his motion to move for the adoption of the recommendations as presented that day with respect to three research institutions with the caveat that the proposal be broadened to include workforce development on behalf of the respective community and state colleges. Regent Schofield seconded.

Regent Geddes asked if Nevada's model will be what comes out of the Nevada 2.0 conference on January 7th. Vice Chancellor Nichols replied that the intent is to consider and utilize aspects from a number of models for other states. However, whatever that model is, the basic principles are that the state invests money in helping the higher education system in research and workforce development as a focused area for specific industries where Nevada can grow.

Regent Geddes encouraged the Chancellor to work with the Governor's office to make this a single cohesive statewide effort. Chancellor Klaich related that the Governor-elect has deferred to the Lieutenant Governor who is running an independent task force on this initiative. He also noted that Lieutenant Governor Krolicki is one of the hosts of the upcoming Nevada 2.0 conference.

Regent Geddes suggested that due to the similarities between the programs, that Nevada build upon what Utah has implemented to launch this initiative forward.

Regent Knecht hoped in creating a comprehensive science and technology plan, he would see a set of specific goals and measurements by which effectiveness can be evaluated five or ten years in the future. He hoped that there will be a documentation trail of goals, measurements and achievement so that value can be measured after the fact.

20. Approved - Research, Technology and Workforce Development Report (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

Dr. Surles related that the most successful groups are working with state governments in a sustained multi-term effort with local industry to attract new industries with very explicit and measurable targets in the technical and scientific areas.

Dr. Read indicated that it was very important to each institution's plan to constantly know what has been achieved and what goals remain

Regent Knecht wanted to see Nevada succeed at diversifying its economy. However, he felt that expectations needed to be conditioned on the theory that many of the great successes nationwide have had nothing to do with central planning, noting the creation of the Microsoft Corporation. Although it is essential to have the research institutions and highe15 Td [(o002 Tc -0.002 Tw 8.4 0 T1.15 Td.5[(o0Tc -0et)]8t)-6 ihe1o Tc(e)6 (n)2 (tia)

20. Approved - Research, Technology and Workforce Development Report (Agenda Item #19) – (Cont'd.)

President Glick thanked the Board for embracing this report. In regard to Regent Knecht's comments that although serendipity may work, he recently attended a small meeting with Bill Gates Sr. in attendance and at which Mr. Gates had made clear that if the University of Washington had not been available, his son would not have started his company. In addition, he related that the investment in Utah has transformed Utah State as a research enterprise. Finally, President Glick related that he recently spent time on a study commission to San Diego, where it became clear that the establishment of UCSD was the anchor of that community. If critical mass is not developed in this state, it can be planned that nothing will happen.

Regent Alder felt that that too much politics and fear were the obstacles to the incredible opportunities that were available and that could bring much to the state of s

12. Information Only - Renewable Energy Report (Agenda Item #20) (Cont'd.)

geothermal energy. In the second year

21. Information Only -

21. Information Only - Washoe County School District Strategic Plan (Agenda Item #22) – (Cont'd.)

Nevada's Promise: Nevada has 436,000 students who are depending on us to deliver Nevada's Promise:

- Every school will be led by an effective principal.
- Every classroom will be led by an effective teacher.
- Every student will graduate.

Nevada's Promise: Objectives
By 2014, Nevada's Promise calls for: (Data based on 2009 results):

- Increasing the graduation rate to 85%
- Reducing the achievement gap by 50%
- Increasing graduates enrolling in post-secondary instructions by 50%
- Increasing the percentage of students proficient or advanced on the NAEP fourth-grade mathematics and reading

Plan of Entry Led to…

- Visits to every school, most multiple times
- Extended workshops and team building with the Board of Trustees
- 2,850 meetings with individuals or small groups to discuss WCSD
- Proactive outreach to diverse community members
- 160 presentations to Chambers, Rotaries, civic groups, etc.
- Collaboration with key local, state, and national political leaders

Key Design Principles of Reform:
The 4 A's

- Alignment
- Accountability
- Accessibility
- Achievement

Strategic Goals:

- Goal 1: Provide Continuous Academic Success for Every Student
- Goal 2: Recruit and Support Highly Effective Personnel
- Goal 3: Engage Families and Community Partners
- Goal 4: Value and Strengthen a Positive, Self-Renewing Culture
- Goal 5: Align Performance Management Systems

Overall Summary

- 80% of our schools improved in reading.
- 86% of our schools improved in math.
- Many of our schools had double digit gains
- WCSD is at 4 year record levels, with the exception of 8th grade math
- WCSD outperforms the state average in every grade in reading and math

21. Information Only - Washoe County School District Strategic Plan (Agenda Item #22) (Cont'd.)

Dr. Morrison related that education reform is about having a quality principle at each school, a quality teacher in each classroom, a commitment to partner with the community, parents and higher education institutions and having a safe and inviting culture. He stated that it was not hard to know what to do, simply hard to make it happen. It requires the courage to see the data reflecting that third, fourth and fifth graders are not meeting proficiency and that a 50% chance of not graduating from high school.

Key to School Reform:

- Inspiring, excellent teacher in every classroom
- Excellent principal in every school
- Quality support staff in each site
- Engaged parents and community
- Positive, safe, and engaging learning environments

22. Information - Update on Redistricting and Reapportionment (Agenda Item 21) (Cont'd.)

Summary of Legal Principles of Redistricting:

- Population of districts can withstand a constitutional challenge only if there are minor deviations in population between districts. The general rule is that a redistricting plan must have a maximum population deviation among districts of under 10%.
- A redistricting plan must not violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

22. Information - Update on Redistricting and Reapportionment (Agenda Item 21) – (Cont'd.)

2000 Population & 2009 Population Estimates

Regent / District	Pop.	Ideal Pop.	Percent Deviation from Ideal	Actual Deviation from Ideal	2009 Est. Pop.	2009 Ideal Pop.	2009 Percent Deviation from Ideal	2009 Actual Deviation from Ideal

23. Information Only - Farewell to Outgoing Regents (Agenda Item #23) (Cont'd.)

Regent Wixom related that Regents Gallagher and Rawson are extraordinary people that have enriched his life. Certainly they both could look back on their service and say they have contributed, adding that the state of Nevada is a much better, more enlightened and thoughtful place for their service.

Regent Crea stated that it [illegible]

24. Approved - Audit Committee (Agenda Item #24) – Committee Vice Chair Kevin J. Page reported that the Audit Committee met on December 2, 2010, and heard the following

The Committee requested updates from institutions on the following items at a future meeting:

- Report on Internal Control Matters (NSHE, UNSOM)
- Automotive Department, CSN
- Child Development Center, WNC

Action items

Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Audit Committee.

- Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the September 9, 2010, meeting (Ref. A-1 on file in the Board office).
- Office of Management & Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 Report – The Committee recommended approval of the OMB Circular A-133 Audit Report for the year ended June 30, 2010 (Ref. A-2 on file in0 0 12 1.9 (n0 0 12 1.9TT1 1 Tf 0 01.1(6)2(1-1.1506

25. Approved -Investment & Facilities Committee (Agenda Item #25) – (Cont'd.)

Action Items - (Cont'd.)

The Committee recommended approval of the establishment of a Market Fluctuation Account to be funded by the reserve balance in the operating pool or from a portion of the monthly distribution allocated to institutions from the operating pool. Proposed modifications to the Board of Regents Handbook will be developed for review and approval at the committee's meeting in March 2011 (Ref. IF-12 on file in the Board office).

Regent Wixom moved acceptance of the report and approval of committee recommendations with the notation that due to his relationship with Bank of America, he recused himself from consideration of IF-11. Regent Knecht seconded. Regent Page abstained. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

26. Approved -Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee (Agenda Item #26) – Chair William G. Cobb reported an (ch)11 offic .6

26. Approved -Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee (Agenda Item #26) (Cont'd.)

Action items - (Cont'd.)

The Committee recommended elimination of the Associate of Applied Science in Drafting Technology, at WNC (Ref. ARSA-3 on file in the Board office).

27. Approved - Business & Finance Committee (Agenda Item #27) - Chair Ron Knecht

State of Nevada's Prepaid Tuition Plan.
Budget and spending review of the last decade for the NSHE compared to other state agencies and outlook for tax, budget, and spending matters in the coming Legislative session.

Action items:
Board action was requested to approve the following recommendations of the Business and Finance Committee:

The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the September 9, 2010, Committee meeting (Ref.BF-1 on file in the Board office).
The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2009-2010 Accountability Report reconciling the Board of Regents approved budget to the fiscal year-end actual revenues and expenditures (Ref.BF-3a and BF-3b on file in the Board office).
The Committee recommended approval for the Nevada System of Higher Education to expend excess student registration fee revenues for the purpose of funding additional adjunct faculty and to seek Interim Finance Committee authorization to expend any additional student fee revenues not utilized for adjunct faculty costs, within the state operating budgets for fiscal year 2010-2011 (Ref.BF-9 on file in the Board office).
The Committee recommended approval of a resolution, on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to issue fixed rate revenue bonds up to $177M to fund various projects and to refinance existing debt for interest savings. In addition the Committee recommended approval of a resolution, on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno to expend $4M of the Mill and McCarran land sales proceeds as part of this financing transaction (Ref.BF-10 on file in the Board office).

Regent Knecht moved acceptance of the report and approval of the committee recommendations. Regent Wixom seconded. Motion carried. Regent Alden was absent.

28. Approved - Cultural Diversity Committee (Agenda Item #28) - Chair Cedric Crear reported that the Cultural Diversity Committee met on December 3, 2010, and heard the following:

Institutional representatives from WNC, DRI and System Administration, including presidents and faculty senate chairs, presented their Faculty Diversity Plans that have been developed over the past year at the direction of the Cultural Diversity Committee. The reports included information on the new efforts that will be put in place to recruit, hire, retain and promote faculty and staff members from diverse backgrounds and the unique challenges faced in meeting diversity goals for faculty. In addition, the reports included various current statistics such as the number of tenure and non-tenure track faculty by sex and race and ethnicity in order to define the problem and set goals.

28. Approved -Cultural Diversity Committee (Agenda Item #28) (Cont'd.)