

**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  
April 8, 2011

Members Present:     Mr. James Dean Leavitt, Chairman  
                           Dr. Jason Geddes, Vice Chairman  
                           Mr. Mark Alden  
                           Dr. Andrea Anderson  
                           Mr. Robert Blakely

Executive Vice Chancellor & CEO, HSS, Maurizio Trevisan  
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols  
Vice Chancellor, Administrative & Legal Affairs, Bart Patterson  
Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mark Stevens  
Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, Steven Zink  
CEO & Special Counsel to the Board, Scott Wasserman  
President Michael D. Richards, CSN  
President Stephen G. Wells, DRI  
President Carl Diekhans, GBC  
President Lesley Di Mare, NSC  
President Maria C. Sheehan, TMCC  
President Neal J. Smatresk, UNLV  
President Milton D. Glick, UNR  
President Carol A. Lucey, WNC

were faculty senate chairs Mr. Bill Kerney, CSN; Ms. Laura Edwards, DRI; Ms. [unclear], GBC; Ms. Robin Herlands, NSC; Mr. Fred Egenberger, NSHE; Dr. Sally Miller, [unclear]. Mr. Jim Strange, WNC. Mr. Brad Summerhill sat in for Mr. Scott Huber. Student leaders present included Mr. J.T. Creedon, ASCSN President, CSN; Mr. Steve [unclear] RAD President, DRI; Mr. Sebring Frehner, NSSA President, NSC; [unclear], UNLV; Mr. [unclear], GPSA President, UNLV; Mr. Charlie Jose, ASUN President, UNR; Mr. Matthew [unclear] A President, UNR; Mr. Cesar Benitez, ASTM Board Chair, TMCC; and Mr. Jason [unclear] VN President, WNC.





2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

faculty, for without faculty, there are no students, and with no faculty and students there is no need for an administration or a basketball team. He pled with the Board to save the universities. UNLV is losing the core of their being.

Ms. Velonie Williams, an alumnus of NSC and a first generation student, reported that in high school she suffered from a severe illness which kept her from attending school for two years. She returned during her junior year and worked very hard to complete requirements that would allow her to graduate with her class. Unfortunately, she still did not meet UNLV’s GPA requirements. Still determined, she needed little more one on one attention and discovered NSC where she felt immediately at home. The staff members were helpful and the faculty exceeded her expectations. At NSC the instructors are very good at pinpointing the best possible way to teach students. First generation students are very unfamiliar with academia, and she felt they needed to be in a place that would provide the guidance they need. She reported that at NSC she has completed two research projects that will help in her PhD program. She noted that she never could have completed without NSC, her peers and the faculty.

Mr. Peter LaChapelle, Associate Professor at NSC, thanked the Board for their time. One of the things he wanted to point out in all of this is that the plan for consolidation is causing infighting. He has treasured his relationships with others throughout the state’s institutions. Consolidation means the whole scale elimination of the middle tier of our System. There is a demand for the middle tiered institutions in Nevada. He was proud of the faculty that he works with and the work they have accomplished.

Mr. Kebret Kebede, Associate Professor at NSC, thanked the Board for their leadership in these troubled times in Nevada. He also wanted to thank them for their very brave and thoughtful vote that ended the vote for campus closures and consolidations. The Board clearly understood what closures and consolidations would do. It was clear that the Board knew they needed to serve all the students in NSHE and not just some. The faculty and students at NSC deeply appreciated this commitment. They are facing unprecedented financial strain. There have been many layoffs of talented faculty and colleagues. NSC has weathered the past budget cuts. NSC has an extraordinary commitment to shared governance. NSC students must be served and NSC must give better results with fewer resources. NSC has grown by 40% FTE in the past tw

p  
y the cuts. a

Mr. Mark Nichols, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) and a

budget and his misguided prior

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

expressed his appreciation and that of Nevada's social work community, including the clients, for UNR's decision to retain its two schools of social work and more recently, to UNLV for reinstating the social work program. However, any recommendation to eliminate any social work education program is viewed by NASW as a threat to the



2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Mr. Mark Fine, Chairman of the UNLV Foundation, realized early in the game that the educational infrastructure is what builds a great community. The quality of the community is

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

the community. This community needs an educated workforce, and because of this, along with all others, they do oppose the cuts and the higher tuitions that would be required as a result of these cuts. She urged the Board to seek alternative solutions to these severe budgets cuts that will have such a long term impact on the southern Nevada economy.



2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

departments are in danger of losing brilliant, junior faculty if the levels of cuts to UNLV are not significantly reduced.

Ms. Leisl Childers, Nevada Test Site Oral History Project, stated that the project documented and preserved the memories of persons affiliated with and affected by the Nevada Test Site during the era of nuclear testing. Funded by \$1 million from the Department of Energy and Department of Education, the project interviewed more than 150 people, including scientists, engineers, miners, administrators, military personnel and protestors. They recorded more than 335 hours of interviews, published transcripts of the interviews, collected associated documents and photographs and created both a physical and on line presence for the archive. More than 40 graduate students participated in this large scale project; they contributed half the interviews in the collection and three students received funding for their graduate programs. She served as the Project Director from 2005-2008. The interviews that she conducted laid the foundation for her doctoral research in the Great Basin. Through interviewing ranchers who lived near the test site and radiation monitors that tracked radioactive fallout in the area out the Nevada Test Site, she developed a dissertation project that examined the historic impacts of federal land use programs on the region's rural populations. This project makes an important contribution to Nevada's history and will influence the future of public land management policy decisions. This is the kind of work being done at UNLV and the kind of work she hoped would be allowed to continue in the state.

Mr. Gregory Brown reported that in the past two years he has spent a lot of time on the topic of academic entrenchment for program review. He has the unfortunate responsibility to chair the UNLV program review committee, which recommended the elimination of five programs and the consolidation of several others. He voiced his concern that the past several meetings the discussion of terminating academic programs, including tenure earning faculty, through

04/08/11



2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

Mr. Dennis Bazylnski stated the one thing that had not yet been mentioned that day is the hidden benefit of research at universities. People know that research is linked to graduate and undergraduate education. If research faculty are looking for jobs, then the undergraduates will be hurt as well.

Mr. Brian Hedlund, Associate Professor in School of Life Sciences, stated that research allows them to give great opportunities to students. He currently funds three PhD's in his lab. He has brought in more than \$5 million in grants and greater than 90% of that money is competitive federal funding.

Mr. Martin Schiller, Associate Professor at UNLV, asked that the Board think about the longer term and not just the current cuts. If we delete massive programs at UNLV and wait for 15 years to build them back up, how is this going to impact society.

Mr. Kurt Regner, Assistant Professor at UNLV, asked that when considering the budget for both UNR and UNLV that it be kept in mind that research and education go hand in hand.

Mr. Dan Allen, Professor at UNLV, stated he came to UNLV in 1999 and took his first graduate students to a national conference that he attends regularly so they could present their research. Fast forward to 2011 he is on the ballot for president for that organization this year. He thought it was important to recognize that whatever your vision is for Las Vegas, the education that the students receive at UNLV and the research that happens shapes national perspectives of what the city is about and the value it has for the nation.

Mr. Adam Simon, Assistant Professor at UNLV, stated that seven years ago he applied for the job at UNLV. When he came out and interviewed he asked if the state of Nevada was committed to educating their citizens. He convinced his wife that they were. He now has four children. His children ask if they will be able to receive a higher education in Nevada and his answer to them is that he does not know, because money is taken from his institution and it is sent north.

Mr. Douglas Unger, Professor of English at UNLV, stated that as the Chair of the English Department he already administered a 15% cut in his department, eliminating four faculty and residents, not filling four other positions, and cutting 12 part time instructors. They have achieved 92% efficiency already in terms of classroom enrollment and they are still placing 52-60% of MA's and PhD's in full time jobs. They have already gone through this e

04/08/11

2. Information Only - Public Comment - (Agenda Item #2) – (Continued)

For one hundred years, higher education has been a primary gateway to a better life for Americans. People with college degrees make more money, divorce less, live longer and secure a better future for their children than people without a degree. In fact, despite flaws, the American system of higher education is the envy of the world, attracting students from every corner of the globe.

And yet today, when the state of Nevada already has the fewest students who go on to college in the nation, it stands on the precipice of limiting access, reducing the quality, and narrowing the breadth of higher education for Nevadans. If the Governor’s budget passes intact, consider the following:

- UNR will lose 2 colleges, including the teacher preparation function of the College of Education; 8 majors; and with reductions in the Department of Mathematics students will be unable to get classes needed for graduation and professional training.
- UNLV will lose 12 departments and 36 other degree programs, 325 positions including 135 faculty lines (102 occupied by tenure-earning faculty) and over 2000 currently enrolled students.
- NSC, who has lost 19% of its full-time faculty while growing 40% in student enrollment since 2008, will be forced to offer fewer sections of classes

2(C)-3 Snrti and 36(e)4 (duc)4 (t)-2 (i)-12 (os)-1 ( )JTJ nrollment sg220 ( t)-2 nd 3  
N G t ( e ) 1

2. Information Only - Public Comment -







3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Do we have numbers for DRI?
  - Chancellor Klaich responded no, but there is a good reason. In discussion with President Wells and Dr. McDaniel, by in large, there was an acceptance that the numbers are what they are and they add up to the amount, but they do not tell the story. These numbers are intended to



3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

- Page three, paragraph one: “We no longer guarantee that every student who qualifies to transfer from our community colleges to the universities or to the state college will be able to do so.” If they don’t have a community college to begin with, the transfer is moot. If they have one crippled by the destructive options, it’s made more difficult.
  - Chancellor Klaich stated that if there are no students to transfer, they cannot transfer. We will be creating a major disconnect in the three tier system.
- Page three, paragraph (ve)maj78>Tj /TT0 1f -8.03 ged(. f)2 T1 1 Tf 1. 1 Tf 002 Tc 0.0w 1.5 rd



3. Action Taken -

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

closures, or mergers. Chancellor Klaich responded they had not, but if the Board wants to pursue these options, there definitely would be a breakdown of the savings and costs associated. Regent Knecht could not see why we would consider these options, given the little amount they may generate, how much damage they would do to the core mission and especially the damage they would do to the morale and productivity in the coming months.

Regent Anderson agreed with what has been said and she was opposed to any consolidations or closures because of the damage it would cause. However, she did not think it was a good idea to make the Legislative leadership mad at the System. They are the only ones that can give the System more money. We are not being asked to do the closures, we are being asked to talk about them. She thought they wanted it back on the table to see what the worst case scenario was. Regent Anderson stated she would be in favor, just to talk about the options.

Regent Geddes would support the motion. As a person of facts, he just wanted to gather all the data. He thought it was premature to make decisions in March and even now. He also thinks it is premature to take anything off the table at this point. A lot of the examples that Regent Knecht referenced to as closures and access are in these plans that they received without closure and consolidation. He did not think they ever talked about closing, but instead consolidating administrative functions to redirect more dollars to education. Regent Geddes disagreed with Regent Knecht as ho3bney th( one)4 (s)-1 ( t)-2ack on tcl

cl (a)4 (y)22 (u)3 (e)4 ( a)4 (nd c(e)-6)-6 ( R)-7 (eg)6 (en)-4 (t)C4o ree-6 (n)4 ( t)-6 (o) Kra(s).





3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

those things they have worked so hard to build up. He felt that the Board needed to be very careful in the political stance that they take as a Board. He fully appreciated Senator Horsford's support for education and has agreed with most things he has done. The legislature has their job to do and the Board has theirs. The System has provided the information that was requested, so they can make their informed decisions. That information is also available to the Board for future decisions as well. He believed he was doing what was best for higher education access throughout Nevada service areas. He thought they needed to be extremely careful what political message they send and

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

along the str3MCID 108itgH3MC8s)-1 bgenit along andno(t)-2 (ofr3MCIf)-3 (e)4 (ndKa)]TJ 8.925 0  
dS



3.

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report -

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

addition, to the impact on staff and the students, they are seeing for the first time program elimination. They are eliminating a mental health technical substance abuse counselor and departmental disabilities technician. The process has worked as a shared governance process, but it certainly has not been easy and it is having a negative impact on both the students and staff.

President Lucey gave an overview of the WNC cuts. They began a freeze on positions in 2007. This year they were unable to avoid layoffs. In the context of curricular and support reviews, they have now presented to the college community the recommendations. A rural community college has three distinct missions - support access and graduation degree seeking students, support workforce and economic development, and quality of life enhancements. In going forward they had to keep these important factors in mind. WNC has determined they can no longer support the quality of life effort. WNC will continue to provide a route to college for rural high school students. All rural high schools have agreed to host interactive video equipment, which they will maintain in all the rural high schools. In many respects WNC will not be able to provide access to students that come in at Math or English 95 or lower. They are looking for ways to mitigate that. WNC has an application with the other community college

s Attye t4 V -0.( t)-2u

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report -

3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

Board they had expressed concern about cutting the same programs at both institutions and asked that Presidents Glick and Smatresk get together and go through the programs to make sure that programs are not completely eliminated from the state of Nevada.

Regent Geddes also asked for a better explanation from the Law School as to why there are no cuts, but they are tripling fees. Dean White noted that this exercise was about vertical cuts, and the Law School has no vertical cuts to make, so in order to make no horizontal cuts they had to raise fees. The Law School is doing an efficiency study and looking at places where they can make cuts and reduce the fee increases that they would have to make. But absent the conclusion of that process, the Law School does not know how much savings there will be, and he guessed that there would not be that much because they are a single unit and don't have appendages that they can remove. He added they can get smaller, but then they have to think about ending some of the programs that they have. Regent Geddes asked whether they were going to lose students if they raised tuition and fees as high as is proposed. Dean White related there is a substantial risk of losing the better students. There is a lot of competition among law schools for students and that is where the battle will lay. The Law School is extremely concerned with the proposal that they have put forward, but he did not think that raising fees to \$30,000 is at all sustainable. In the meantime, they are working on ways to keep those fees down. They are all watching their "marker schools" and their tuition is the same as UNLV's right now and they think they will go up slightly. They are hoping that there will be a little bit of room for a tuition increase. The plan for this year is to take some funds from state lines and cover it in other places. That way they can reduce any increases they may have. In year two, it was his guess they would have to do the same, but also take some substantial horizontal cuts to suppress the amounts. If the cut amounts are not reduced there will be substantial harm, such as becoming less competitive to students between law schools.





3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)

Wixom understood the process by design had to be administrative, but he did not want the process to prevent innovation. He just wanted to make sure that people had an



3. Action Taken - Discussion of 2011-2013 NSHE Biennial Budget and Legislative Report - (Agenda Item #3)-(Continued)
4. Besides fund balances, we have land assets. The System needs to be looking at some of the hard assets. He recognized that going forward things may be different and we should respond to the circumstances with initiatives and considerations in this area.
  5. Bridging Plan –When you bring in national class scholars for open positions, there are substantial salary costs plus three to eight times the salary costs in startup research funding. While we must build for the future, at this point the universities may have to take a breather from this approach. The universities may have to consider a bridging strategy for two to three years of using a lecturer's services at 2/3 the salary and overhead cost and with no startup funding for the research laboratory.

Regent Knecht believed they had reached a point that some triage has to be done to find a way to get through the next few years. These are five substantive ways that should be considered.

4. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Differential Program Fee Proposals - (Agenda Item #7) - The Board of Regents approved the Differential Program Fee proposals of UNLV President Neal J. Smatresk and UNR President Milton D. Glick for their respective graduate level Business programs. (Ref. BOR-7 on file in the Board office).

Regent Geddes moved to approve the UNR and UNLV Differential Program Fee Proposals. Regent Page seconded.

Dr. Michael Bowers, Executive Vice President and Provost at UNLV, and Dr. Marc Johnson, Executive Vice President and Provost at UNR, jointly requested the Board's approval to charge a differential fee of \$100 per credit hour in the MBA programs at both universities. The fee is consistent with Board policy as it is a high cost and high demand program at both universities.

Regent Alden asked if the universities keep this money. Dr. Bowers stated the money stays on campus in the programs themselves. Chancellor Klaich added there is a bill before the legislature that clarifies this. Regent Wixom asked if the Board had the authority to do this. Chancellor Klaich believed the Board was in good shape to approve and to keep the fees for the programs.

Regent Schofield asked about tuition going to general fund. Chancellor Klaich reported there are two bills that have been introduced by Senate Finance that pertain to retaining fees, which will be heard on Monday and he will be there to testify in favor of those measures. Chancellor Klaich stated he met with the Senate Majority Leader and told him just how critical these were to the agenda as well as the overall study of the formula that is integral to these. He was confident that these bills would be processed satisfactorily.

In response to Regent Crear, Dr. Bowers indicated that this is a permanent change.

Motion carried.

5. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees - (Agenda Item #8) - The Board approved a revision to the language in the Procedures & Guidelines Manual (*Chapter 7, Section 7E*) to base summer registration fees on the amounts charged in the following fall rather than the previous spring (Ref. BOR-8 on file in the Board office).

Regent Alden moved to approve the Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees. Regent Geddes seconded.

Vice Chancellor Stevens noted that summer school fees are self-supporting fees and are not placed into the state general fund, except for a few of the nursing enrollment dollars. Chancellor Klaich stated they do keep all the money, except for some nursing fees because the System is partially funded for those. Vice Chancellor Stevens noted that the summer term was utilized in meeting the doubled nursing enrollments. Regent Alden

5. Approved - Procedures & Guidelines Manual Revision, Summer School Registration Fees - (Agenda Item #8) – (Continued)

stated the System wants to keep all of the tuition dollars. Chancellor Klaich stated that normally the state does not subsidize any summer school education, but with the double nursing mandate, it was determined that the System would be able to count the enrollments for state funding. Chancellor Klaich stated it was a net gain for the System.

Motion carried.

6. Approved - Proposed Sale of S-Bar-S Ranch Wadsworth, Nevada - (Agenda Item #9) - -  
The Board approved UNR President Milton D. Glick's requests for approval of Amendment 3 of the Option Agreement which reduces the sale price of the S-Bar-S Ranch and related water rights by \$250,000 to \$3,466,880. In exchange, NSHE would receive a full release with Buyer assuming all liability for any and all future environmental remediation at the S-Bar-S Ranch. (Ref. BOR-9 and Handout on file in the Board office.)

Regent Alden moved to approve the Proposed Sale of S-Bar-S Ranch Wadsworth, Nevada. Regent Geddes seconded.

Regent Wixom clarified the Board had already approved this, but now they are in the process of adjusting the price to address environmental impact issues. Mr. Zurek noted there is some ground water contamination that still has to be dealt with, so the deal that has been negotiated is that UNR is walking away with no further liabilities at a lower price.

Motion carried.

Regent Cobb asked that the supplemental email from Mr. Zurek, that clarifies some of the issues, be included as part of the record (*on file in the Board office*).

7. Approved - Regents' Scholar Award, CSN - (Agenda Item #10) – The Board approved a Regents' Scholar Award to CSN student Ms. Maryknoll Palisoc. Policy: Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15 and Procedures & Guidelines Manual, Chapter 8, Section 2.5 (Ref. BOR-10a and BOR-10b on file in the Board office).

Regent Knecht moved to approve the CSN Regent's Scholar Award. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Page asked about the source of the \$5,000. Regent Knecht stated it was coming from the President's office at CSN. In response to an inquiry by Regent Page, President Richards confirmed that this was the result of a miscommunication.

Regent Doubrava saw the emails and understood how the error had been made, but then asked if CSN should not be allowed to have a Regent's Scholar Award the following year. Chairman Leavitt noted that was not an agenda item for discussion.

7. Approved - Regents' Scholar Award, CSN - (Agenda Item #10) – (Continued)

Regent Knecht stated that there is a \$5,000 cost for this Regent Scholar, but the institution is paying that cost and he believed that this was incentive to not making this mistake again.

Motion carried.

8. Approved - Chancellor's Task Force to Review PEBP Recommendations and Reform - (Agenda Item #5) - The Board approved

04/08/11 – B/R Special M





10. Approved - Board of Regents Special Meeting Dates - Calendar Year 2011 and 2012 - (Agenda Item #13) -The Board approved tentative special meeting dates for Board of Regents' meetings in calendar years 2011 and 2012 to supplement the regularly scheduled Board meetings. (*Ref. BOR-13 on file in the Board office*):

May 6, 2011  
 May 18, 2011 @ 1:00 p.m.  
 July 29, 2011  
 October 21, 2011  
 January 20, 2012  
 April 20, 2012  
 July 20, 2012  
 October 19, 2012

Regent Cobb requested that the special meeting for May 20<sup>th</sup> be considered for May 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Wasserman noted that the item is partly a result from the request at the last Board meeting to schedule potential special meetings between the quarterly meetings so they could be added to calendars. The first two schedules meetings are outside of that scope. They were put on the calendar to take care of any issues that may arise as the legislative session is closing. There also may be a need to meet by the end of April if the Legislature wants to hear the Board's recommendation on redistricting in that time frame.

Chairman Leavitt asked if there was any opposition to moving the proposed May 20<sup>th</sup> date to May 19<sup>th</sup>. Regent Page and Regent Anderson had conflicts on May 19<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Wasserman offered that

Ma 20.4 (ur)-4 (8)JTJ EMC /Span <</MCID 67 >>BDC 0.006 Tc -0.006 Tc

11. Information Only - Report on ACCT 2011 Governance Leadership Institute - (Agenda Item #11) – (Continued)

be emphasizing. Colleges throughout are now focusing on core values. The extras are going away because of budget concerns. Access and community education are hurting. In dealing with faculty, it came out that the “petty” things really matter. There is nothing too little to talk about when dealing with faculty. The presidents made it very clear that they wanted everything referred back to them. They also suggested that we invite legislators to commencement for advocacy. They talked about developmental education and unfortunately only 15% are successful. B Tw 2 (or)3(u).004 Tc 00040 ( c)6 3(u).004 Tc 00040d a

