



Regent Sisolak asked to hear from General Counsel Ray, adding that he did not have a problem with the practice but was concerned about the school board losing funding because of such a practice. General Counsel Ray said that he had reviewed the situation, which raises a church-state First Amendment issue. He related that the Clark County School Board engages in a similar practice. Research indicates that the courts hold educational boards to a stricter standard than legislative bodies (i.e., city council, county commission). General Counsel Ray felt that observing an invocation was permissible, but cautioned the Board to be careful to ensure it is of a non-sectarian nature. He stated that an invocation should not be a religious prayer, but rather a general commentary setting the tone for the serious nature of the business to be conducted. He said that not all religions worshiped in the same way and that lay people could also participate.

Regent Derby observed that the term "non-sectarian" was very broad. She noted that not all religious faiths recognized God, and asked for more information concerning the parameters. General Counsel Ray said that he would like to refrain from expressing an opinion on the matter that afternoon. He related that, in general, there should not be any religious reference.

1. ~~From Derby's text, she believed that the Board had not yet determined if it was recognizing a deity, religion, or faith in its invocation. She stated that she had not heard of any other religious groups that were recognized in this manner. She stated that she had not heard of any other religious groups that were recognized in this manner. She stated that she had not heard of any other religious groups that were recognized in this manner.~~  
Chair for TMCC, adding that Dr. Chang had served the college well.

President Lucey introduced WNCC's new Faculty Senate Chair, Dr. Michael Hardie.

President Remington announced that CCSN's new Student Body President, Ms. Evelyn Flores, was taking a final exam. He reported that the issues (brought up` s

of the goals of the project is to establish a more comprehensive model for grading states in the category of "Learning" in the Measuring Up 2004 report fo





6. Approved-Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Recommendations and Report – Chair Jill Derby reported the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee met May 8, 2003 and requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

- Administrative Reorganization of Health Sciences Programs and New Unit Proposal, Division of Health Sciences, UNLV – The Committee approved a proposal for an administrative reorganization of health and biomedical sciences. This new Division of Health Sciences will include the School of Dentistry, and restructuring of the current College of Health Sciences into the School of Nursing, and the School of Allied Health and Human Performance. This restructuring will improve the capability of the campus to address the broad range of health related issues, pre-professional student advising, enhance academic programs to meet professional workforce needs, coordinate campus interdisciplinary efforts to compete nationally for academic and research funding, and improve development of the Shadow Lane campus. (Ref. ARSA-2 on file in the Board office)
- New Program Proposals – The Committee reviewed the following new program proposals:
  - Executive Master's Degree in Crisis and Emergency Management, UNLV. (Ref. ARSA-3 on file in the Board office)
  - AAS, Agriculture, GBC. (Ref. ARSA-9 on file in the Board office)
  - BS, Business Administration, NSC. (Ref. ARSA-10 on file in the Board office)
  - BA/BS, Integrated Studies, NSC. (Ref. ARSA-11 on file in the Board office)
  - BS, Psychology, NSC. (Ref. ARSA-12 on file in the Board office)
- New Unit Proposals – The Committee reviewed the following new unit proposals:
  - Department of Professional Studies, UNLV. (Ref. ARSA-4 on file in the Board office)
  - Frank H. Rogers Center for Environmental Remediation and Monitoring (CERM), DRI. (Ref. ARSA-6 on file in the Board office)
- Program Elimination – The Committee reviewed elimination of the following programs:
  - Gaming Management Major and Gaming Management Academic Credential Program, UNR. (Ref. ARSA-7 on file in the Board office)
- Degree Name Changes – The Committee reviewed the following degree name change proposals:
  - Doctor of Dental Surgery, D.D.S., to Doctor of Dental Medicine, D.M.D, UNLV. (Ref. ARSA-5 on file in the Board office)
  - Ph.D. in Computer Engineering to Ph.D. in Computer Science and Engineering, UNR. (Ref. ARSA-8 on file in the Board office)

Provost Alden explained the administrative logic behind the major reorganization of Health Sciences programs at UNLV. He related that the reorganization allowed people from various colleges to work in a multidisciplinary area and removed disincentives from different colleges working together. It also brings the Dental School into the community of Health Sciences, allows UNLV to have a School of Nursing, and provides a School of Allied Health and a place for multidisciplinary research.

Regent Derby moved approval of the ü



Motion carried.

9. Accepted-Board Orientation Committee Report - Chair Howard Rosenberg reported the Board Orientation Committee met April 11, 2003.

- Chancellor Nichols explained her duties, her role as System Executive Officer, and her responsibilities (as opposed to the Board of Regents and the UCCSN Presidents) by describing the Chancellor's Cabinet and the Council of Presidents. She also explained the structure of the Chancellor's Office with specific concentration on the Vice Chancellors, her Deputy and support staff and their duties, roles, and responsibilities.
- General Counsel Tom Ray gave a brief summary of legal staff and its role, noting that they work directly with the institutions and that most of their work involves litigation or actions designed to avoid litigation, personnel cases, and contract review. The General Counsel's staff also advises the Board and System on policy, Code interpretations, the Open Meeting Law, and Robert's Rules of Order.
- Chief Administrative Officer Ernst explained her duties as both Board Secretary and External Relations Officer. She explained the structure of the Board Office with specific concentration on members of the Board staff in both offices and External Relations responsibilities, noting all services available to Board members in both Las Vegas and Reno, as well as her staff's responsibilities with regard to assembling and disseminating agenda and reference materials, preparations for Board meetings, maintaining the Board Handbook, etc.
- Regent Derby gave a presentation, which she uses nationally with Boards of Regents and Trustees, focusing on Board members and their relationships with one another as well as with the Chancellor, what the Board can expect from the Chancellor, and what the Chancellor should be able to expect from individual Board members as well as from the Board as a whole. This presentation stimulated lively discussion about goals and priorities, when they are set, how often they should be revisited, and the lines of communication between Board members and the Chancellor and the individual campuses. As with many such discussions, a number of points of concern were voiced. The Chancellor noted these concerns as she explained that the current master plan took well over two years to create and, while it is the centerpiece influencing Board action, it can be revised as time and changing conditions may dictate. Everyone agreed that individual items brought to the Board should be cross-referenced with the master plan and the Plan itself should be revisited fairly regularly.
- Regent Rosenberg recognized the Board's staff: Ms. Haynes, Ms. Dobyms, Ms. Martinovic, Ms. Palmer, and Mr. Kuhlman for their invaluable support.

Regent Rosenberg moved acceptance of the report. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded. Motion carried.

10. Approved-Ad Hoc Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Steve Sisolak reported the ad hoc Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee met April 24, 2003. He and Chancellor Nichols reviewed the Committee's charge and led a discussion on the proposed parameters and procedures for the Committee's work. The Chancellor presented an overview of the existing Board of Regents' policies and procedures relating to executive compensation and evaluation, including how executive salary schedules are currently set, the current perquisites offered, and the procedures for the annual and periodic evaluation of the presidents and Chancellor. The Committee determined that it would like to review the evaluation criteria used in other systems of higher education and discuss the reporting line of the presidents at its next meeting. The Committee also reviewed national data on presidential salaries and perquisites, including supplements to a compensation provided from private sources. Committee members expressed a desire to have a more in-depth conversation about these issues at the next meeting, with additional data requested from national and regional sources. Regent Sisolak requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

Next Steps – The Committee recommended that the Chancellor request customized salary data from the College and University Personnel Association, taking into account institutional size and budget. Committee members Mr. Don Snyder and Mr. Keith Lee graciously agreed to split the costs for obtaining the survey data. The Committee also requested additional data on outside compensation policies as well as data on the practices used by other higher education systems to determine the length of contracts offered to executives.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Alden established that Chair Seastrand had discussed the issue of the Board hiring, firing, and evaluating the presidents and Chancellor with the Chancellor supervising the presidents. He felt the Board's current method of operation was structurally faulty.

Motion carried.

11. Approved-Handbook Revision, Sexual Harassment Policy – The Board approved General Counsel Tom Ray's request for an addition to the Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 8), to create a sexual harassment policy separate from Title IV, Chapter 8,









Chancellor Nichols suggested that, in light of the concerns raised about the potential impact, the policy be implemented with a period of time to see how the campuses live with it and a report to the Board at a future date if there are any problems in a year or two.

### 3. Chancellor's Report – (Cont'd.)

Chancellor Nichols reported that former Regent and TMCC President, Dr. Jim Eardley, was in critical condition. She asked those present to keep him in their thoughts.

### 1. Introductions – (Cont'd.)

President Remington introduced CCSN's new Student Body President, Ms. Evelyn Flores and treasurer, Ms. Ariel Davis.

On behalf of the Board of Regents, Regent Bandera presented Ms. Martinovic with a bouquet of flowers and a birthday cake in honor of her birthday.

The meeting recessed at 3:04 p.m. and reconvened at 3:15 p.m. with all members present except Regents Derby, Hill, and Schofield.

12. Approved-Handbook Revision, Board Bylaws, Duties of President – The Board approved Chancellor Jane Nichols' and General Counsel Tom Ray's request for final action on an amendment to the Board of Regents' Bylaws (Title I, Article VII, Section 4) to expand the description of the duties of the presidents. Per Board policy, this item was presented for information at the March 2003 meeting. (Ref. C on file in the Board office)

Regent Hill entered the meeting.

Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning duties of president. Regent Anthony seconded. Motion carried. Regents Derby and Schofield were absent.

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, School of Law Tuition & Fees, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol Harter's request for final action on an amendment to the Board of Regents' Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 17, Section 4.3) to increase tuition and registration fees for the 2003-2005 biennium for the William S. Boyd School of Law. Per Board policy, this item was presented for information at the March 2003 meeting. (Ref. D on file in the Board office)

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning tuition and fees for the UNLV School of Law. Regent Alden seconded.

President Harter reported that it was a 3½% increase in law school tuition that had been overlooked during the normal tuition review process.

Motion carried. Regents Derby and Schofield were absent.

Regent Derby entered the meeting.

14. Approved-Handbook Revision, Search Waiver Policy – The Board approved the UCCSN Human Resource Advisory Committee's recommendation for approval of an amendment to the Board of Regents' Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 8, Section 6) to establish a System-wide policy for employment search waivers. (Ref. E on file in the Board office)

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning a search waiver policy. Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick requested that the report referenced in item #2 on page 3 of 4 be changed from "may be required" to "will be required annually" and that a copy be provided to the Chancellor and each Board member.

Chancellor Nichols did not object to the change.

Regents Hill and Alden accepted the amendment. Motion as amended carried. Regent Schofield was absent.

15. Approved-Handbook Revision, Procedures for Informational Requests by Regents – The Board approved General Counsel Tom Ray's and Chancellor Jane Nichols' revised recommendation for procedures by which informational requests may be made by Regents (Title IV, Chapter 1, New Section 4). The recommendation reflects the Board's discussion of a proposed policy at the March 2003 meeting and preserves the Regents' right to seek information within their constitutional role. (Ref. F on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols reported that this version of the policy reflected suggestions from previous meetings. She noted that the policy would be in addition to existing policy concerning personnel files and student records. She clarified that the policy stated that Regents have the right to all information that exists and that inquiries should be directed to the institution presidents, vice presidents, Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, General Counsel, Chief Administrative Officer, or the Director of

Internal Audit. The institution president(s) and Chancellor will receive a copy of each request, and the response will be sent to all Regents.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Chancellor Nichols related that the second par

He did not agree with forfeiting the evaluations for another year. He felt it was critical not to delay the periodic evaluations and urged them to be done as soon as possible.

Regent Alden agreed with Regent Hill's comments. He felt it was a bad policy decision and that it obligated the Board to an additional year for both presidents. He felt the Board should do its job and that they should not extend contracts until the evaluations were completed. He said it would not matter which president was affected and indicated he would not support the motion.

Regent Kirkpatrick questioned the Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee's connection with extending presidential contracts. He also asked how many presidential evaluations would be due simultaneously as a result of the extension. Chancellor Nichols replied that the Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee was scheduled to begin their work in early January and potentially complete their work by this Summer. The Committee decided that a more thorough study was needed for background, so the work did not begin until later. The Committee will likely finish its work at the end of Summer and after the start of the new fiscal year. The Committee will review presidential contracts and the potential for handling contracts in a different manner. One of the considerations is whether contracts should include more performance evaluation. When awarding a new contract, the issue of salary arises. With those issues in mind, she suggested to Committee Chair Sisolak that it would be better to delay salary considerations until the Committee had completed its work. It was also determined that it would be difficult to set aside the necessary time for a periodic evaluation during the legislative session. She stated that six presidents would be due for periodic evaluations in the following fiscal year. She has been considering how to accomplish this in a reasonable time frame. Periodic evaluations would be due on Presidents Lilley, Romesburg, Ringle, and Killpatrick. She said that it would be a very busy year and that the work of the Committee would become especially critical because they would be considering new contracts for each of those presidents.

Regent Derby said that the request was not unprecedented. It has been done in the past because the Board wanted to treat the presidents with respect and not conduct their periodic evaluation in the final year of their contract. She was in favor of the proposal.

Regent Sisolak agreed with Regent Derby. He asked whether contract extensions had been provided for other presidents. Chancellor Nichols replied that this had been done since she had been in the Chancellor's office. Regent Sisolak asked how it would not be construed as personal if extensions were not approved for these two presidents. Regent Alden said that he did not remember doing this, adding that it was nothing personal. Regent Hill said that he had no recollection of voting upon something like this. He too said that it was not personal.

Regent Whipple did not want it to appear that the Board was shirking their duties, but felt the circumstances justified the request.

Regent Bandera observed that the Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee had been asked to review changes to ensure consistent new contracts that are fair and equitable. By extending the two presidential contracts, six out of eight presidents would immediately reap the benefits of the new policy.

Chair Seastrand said that he was initially opposed to the extensions, but felt there were extenuating circumstances. Based upon the Chancellor's recommendation (who also evaluates the presidents) he agreed with the 1-year extension knowing that UCCSN would have consistent contracts when the work was completed.

Regent Kirkpatrick acknowledged that extensions had been granted in the past, though not routinely. He observed that six presidents would require periodic evaluations in academic year 2004, which is a lot of work. He did not want further requests for extensions due to the number of presidents requiring evaluations.

Regent Alden felt that extending the contracts was bad public policy.

Upon a roll call vote the motion carried. Regents Anthony, Bandera, Derby, Dondero, Howard, Rosenberg, Schofield, Seastrand, Sisolak, and Whipple voted yes. Regents Alden, Hill, and Kirkpatrick voted no.

17. Approved-Response to Operation Iraqi Freedom (Iraq War) – The Board approved Regents Marcia Bandera, Douglas R. Hill, Tom Kirkpatrick, and Jack Lund Schofield's request to honor the families of the following individuals by providing scholarships or waivers for registration and fees associated with attending any UCCSN institution by their surviving spouse and dependent children: (Ref. 1 on file in the Board office)

- First Lieutenant Frederick Pokorney Jr., USMC, Tonopah, Nevada.
- Lance Corporal Donald J. Cline Jr., USMC, Sparks, Nevada.

Regent Alden moved approval of providing scholarships or waivers for registration and fees associated with attending any UCCSN institution for the surviving spouse and dependent children of two Nevadans killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Regent Bandera seconded.

Regent Kirkpatrick noted that Regent Hill had expressed concern about people receiving double benefits in these circumstances. He related that Chief Administrative Officer Ernst had provided a list of the type of compensation that has been granted to someone killed in action in the past (Ref. 1 on file in the Board office). He observed that most of the benefits expire if the surviving spouse remarries. He felt that it almost forced a spouse to live with someone rather than marry. He noted that approximately 150 people were killed in the Iraqi War, yet only two were from Nevada. He felt that granting this benefit was the least the Board could do for those who gave so much.

Regent Hill asked whether the benefit included tuition and fees for an undergraduate degree only. Ms. Ernst referred him to the briefing paper. Regent Hill asked whether other scholarships and/or fees were available that could be used first so that this benefit would only bridge the gap. Regents Kirkpatrick and Seastrand replied that the motion did not include that restriction.

Regent Hill proposed a friendly amendment that other scholarships and/or fees available to the student(s) be used prior to the Regents' proposed benefit.

Regent Rosenberg clarified that the language specified "scholarships or waivers". He felt the benefit would provide the student(s) access to the information required for financial aid (that is also provided to other students) and would ensure they get the best possible arrangement so they do not go into debt. He felt the motion was fine as stated.

Regent Kirkpatrick noted that the Board had approved the same benefit for the astronaut killed in the Challenger disaster and for the NE Dispatches several years ago. He felt the Board should do anything helpful for students, not just provide individuals.

Regent Schofield said that he was a veteran of WWII and the Korean Conflict. When tragedies occur, people want to do anything they can to help. With time, those emotions subside. He felt that this benefit represented the spirit of giving to someone who sacrificed their life.

Regent Hill stated that the Board had expressed the intention for tuition and fees to be paid for these individuals. She related that many scenarios existed for financial aid packages that would not involve Board expense. She related there were circumstances where a better financial package would not require this benefit. She said that the Millennium Scholarship was designed to be used for the total cost of attending college/university. It is not designed just for fees. She assumed that if those individuals came forward they would get the full \$10,000 scholarship and the Board would still provide the basic fees. She noted that the money to Block Course or other expenses would be provided by the Board.

Regent Bandera said that the Chancellor had clarified the benefit.

Regent Bandera said that the Chancellor had clarified the benefit.

Regent Kirkpatrick cautioned against provid...



Regent Rosenberg asked whether UNR was selling some of its vehicles. Mr. Ron Zurek, Special Assistant to the President for Finance-UNR, replied that UNR was disposing of 24-25 fleet vehicles. They have signed a contract with Enterprise Car Rental, so the number of vehicles will be reduced.

Regent Dondero asked about maintaining the fleet of vehicles. Mr. Zurek replied that UNR has an in-house motor pool that provides fuel and maintenance. All repair rates were included in the material provided.

Regent Howard asked whether there were gas pumps at UNR. Mr. Zurek replied that there are.

Regent Anthony left the meeting.

Regent Howard asked who provided the maintenance. Mr. Zurek replied that UNR has an auto shop for the standard maintenance. Larger repairs are outsourced and charged back to the departments. Regent Howard asked whether using Enterprise vehicles would save money. Mr. Zurek replied there were 5,000 potential automobile users on campus. UNR could not provide cost effective service to the campus community. Other institutions across the country have employed this method. UNR released an RFP and Enterprise was selected. UNR also has agreements in place with other rental agencies and employees can also continue to use the state motor pool. Regent Howard asked what Enterprise would provide. Mr. Zurek replied that anyone requiring a vehicle can access a webpage or contact Enterprise, who will deliver the vehicle to campus. He related that the vehicles would not be stored on campus and that UNR would avoid the maintenance and a number of other operating costs. Regent Howard asked what happened to the vehicles. Mr. Zurek replied that UNR was in the process of a public auction process. They have also been offered to a number of departments in need of replacement vehicles.

Regent Anthony entered the meeting.

Regent Dondero asked whether the vehicles remained on campus or whether they were taken home. Mr. Zurek replied that the rented fleet vehicles would not remain on campus and would be returned to Enterprise. The service vehicles are impounded on campus (for security).

Regent Sisolak asked how many vehicles were taken home. President Harter replied that very few were taken home with the exception of key police officers (2). Mr. Zurek replied that four vehicles were taken home. Regent Sisolak asked about the security and the State Dept. legal issues related to the vehicles. He also asked if the vehicles were taken home by the police and if they were taken home by the police.

Regent Alden said that he did not want to micromanage. He said he would be surprised if the costs were large when compared with other System costs. He felt it was time to move on.

Regent Howard said that the discussion was relevant since they were looking for ways to

Chancellor Nichols reported that future agendas would include references to the master plan. Tuition and fees were set within the context of the master plan. The biennial budget was also created with reference to the master plan. Every enhancement references back to the master plan. The budget process for the next biennium begins again in January 2004. The P-16 Council is developing new cooperative projects. The Millennium Scholarship bill would allow the Board to require certain courses for eligibility. UCCSN institutions were charged with developing a plan to increase seat utilization and improve class scheduling based upon the needs of students (rather than faculty convenience). A study of the business centers' (north and south) operations has been launched to review mission, scope, efficiencies, centralization vs. decentralization, and staffing levels. This request has not been funded by the legislature. The Board Chair requested a study of cost efficiencies throughout the System, which has been assigned to the business officers. The "Go to College" poster has been distributed with positive community reception. The presidents have been charged with working on joint, regional planning efforts for mission differentiation, research emphases, academic program planning, and campus sites. The Board will then consider the directions in January 2003, the Board approved guidelines for select community college baccalaureate degrees as provided in the master plan. Remedial/developmental education reforms are underway.

Chancellor Nichols related that a large part of the plan is accountability. The public wants to know how their dollars are spent. A baseline report based upon available data and the master plan will be given to the legislature. The report discusses key elements in the master plan (headcount enrollment, high school college-going rate, capturing Millennium Scholars, student diversity, degrees and certificates awarded, tuition and fees, research progress, financial aid, remedial education, and distance education). She expressed her gratitude to Ms. Ernst, Mr. John Kuhlman and Vice Chancellor Dick Curry for compiling the data. She felt it was a very descriptive report. The Academic Affairs officers and System staff are developing accountability measures and the underlying driving components. Each institution will set goals working with the master plan. Chancellor Nichols presented the baseline report based upon the legislature's part of the plan.

level of funding remain the same and asked System Administration to recalculate the budgets, which resulted in a formula funding of 84.45%. (first year of biennium) and 84.0



Regent Bandera said that she was concerned about the guidelines for the prison education program. Historically, there have been problems with how people qualified and how rules were met, which has caused suspicion about the program.

Chancellor Nichols related that the young woman's name was Trina Leonard and that her father watched her testify before legislature. It was quite movinä nä s t

President Lilley reported that UNR had intended to conduct a full-scale campus master plan. Due to budget cuts, they were unable to do so. A campus master plan will be conducted in 2004. Due to impending projects, a consultant was hired to assist with the mid-campus master plan. 1,000 asphalt parking spaces will be removed for the new library and student union. UNR also needs to add 1,000 parking spaces.

Regent Howard asked about the source of funds. Mr. Zurek, Special Assistant to the President for Finance-UNR, replied that bonds would be issued. A revenue stream from increased parking fees will service the debt. He related that the same method financed the first two structures.

Regent Sisolak was confused with the number of spaces required. Mr. Zurek replied that a 5-year parking plan identified the need for 2,500 new parking spaces by 2005. 1,000 spaces will be lost to accommodate the new library and student union. UNR requires 3,500 parking spaces by 2005. The proposed garage will provide 1,950 spaces (still need 1,550 spaces). The remaining acreage will be paved for surface parking, yielding 1,100 spaces (still need 450 spaces). UNR's Transportation Demand Management Program will try to accommodate those spaces by working with the rapid transit district to encourage carpooling. The new garage will include increased handicap parking spaces and greater accessibility for Lawlor Events Center and Mackay Stadium. Regent Sisolak asked about an ADA (American Disabilities Act) issue. Mr. Zurek replied that an ADA settlement asked UNR to enhance the number of handicap spaces. Regent Sisolak asked whether the 1,950 spaces would be provided in a 10-story building. Mr. Zurek replied that the building would be 10 stories tall. Regent Sisolak asked about the number of stories. Mr. Zurek replied there would be four stories above ground and two below. Regent Sisolak asked about the maximum height. Mr. Zurek replied that it was more a financial issue than an engineering one. Regent Sisolak asked how

raising priority. A new development and alumni relations team is working on that priority. UNR knows that a deadline to match state funds is approaching June 30, 2005. Regent Rosenberg observed that \$30 million was owed on the Fire Science Academy, for which the students were paying. He asked about student parking fees for the new garage as well as for existing facilities. Ms. Bayfield replied that the current cost was \$285/year for the parking structure. In 2005-06 those fees will increase to \$340. Mr. Zurek observed that students could choose to park in the garage or pay less (\$45) by parking at the north end of campus. Regent Rosenberg said he could support the project if part of it were converted to classroom space. He acknowledged that the funding came from different sources, adding that he would not support the project.

Regent Schofield agreed with Regent Sisolak about providing ample parking now, rather than revisiting the issue in the future. Mr. Zurek stated that it could be done, but it would substantially increase the parking fees already proposed. He said that when the new library is built the old library will be converted into classroom space, though it will take some time.

Regent Bandera called for the question. Regent Alden seconded. Upon a role call vote the motion failed. Regents Alden, Anthony, Bandera, Dondero, Hill, Schofield, and Seastrand voted yes. Regents Derby, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Rosenberg, Sisolak, and Whipple voted no.

Regent Sisolak was concerned about ending up with another Fire Science Academy. He felt it was important to cast an intelligent vote. He asked about the cost per space. Mr. Zurek replied the cost per parking space was \$10,700 based upon construction costs of \$21 million. Regent Sisolak said that costs could be reduced by adding 3,000 spaces. Mr. Zurek stated that adding three floors would be another set of circumstances. Regent Sisolak clarified that UNR was not building the facility with the idea of adding floors later. Mr. Zurek agreed. Regent Sisolak asked about the cost for a 10-story facility. Mr. Zurek replied that taller buildings changed the dynamics of the design. UNR considered the optimal mix that could be afforded with the proposed fees. The balance of surface and tower parking made the most sense. Regent Sisolak said that more fees could be collected by providing additional spaces. Chair Seastrand stated that Regent Sisolak had made his point. Mr. Nelson said that a balance must be achieved between the demand for parking and the cost of construction. Building three more floors would force students to pay additional fees. Students usually prefer paying the lower fees and parking at a greater distance. If the garage is not filled, the cost cannot be amortized. He said that if the cost estimates indicate that a 7th story could be afforded within the requested bonding they would seriously consider it.

Chair Seastrand said that he would like to bring the matter to a vote.

Regent Hill agreed that insufficient classroom space was a valid complaint. He observed a 66% enrollment growth at the community colleges and a 29% increase at the universities. He observed that parking must be provided in order to offer more classes. The situation exists because a larger portion of land was not initially requested for the university. He said that no new construction would be approved, initially requested





















with information about the requirements for admission to higher education, the opportunities for financial aid, the need for a pupil to make informed decisions about curricula in middle school, junior high school, and high school for success in college. UCCSN will likely work with K-12 colleagues to define what courses are necessary to predict success in higher education. Additionally, the bill requires each school district and each charter school to prepare a similar plan to improve the achievement of pupils enrolled in public schools. Most importantly, the bill requires certification of paraprofessionals in public and charter schools. Current paraprofessionals in schools receiving Title I funding must be certified by January 2006. All new hires must be certified immediately. SB 191 would extend the certification requirements to all paraprofessionals in every school, and not just those receiving Title I funds. Senator Raggio asked UCCSN to review its efforts to assist with the education and certification of paraprofessionals and to report back to the legislature.

The Board Chair responded on the Board's behalf saying that UCCSN would be engaged in partnering on that effort and would provide a report to the legislature and Board of Regents. A paraprofessional is anyone in K-12 providing one-on-one tutoring, assisting with classroom management, assisting in a computer lab, providing support in a library or media center, or providing instructional services under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher. Under the legislation, certification requires that paraprofessionals must either get a 2-year degree or pass an examination prescribed by the State Board of Education. UCCSN targeted paraprofessionals as a key audience for teacher education recruitment. This requirement provides UCCSN the opportunity to open a pathway for teacher certification, should they desire to do so.

UCCSN has been working with the State Board of Education and the State Board of Professional Standards and Practices to determine the extent of the need and the preferred methods for addressing the certification requirements. A survey was sent to all teacher aids and generic courses were offered last Fall and this Spring to paraprofessionals interested in starting to work for the State. UCCSN's most immediate priority has been to develop a curriculum that can be assessed by Title I teacher aids (over 500 in Clark County). When the Americans with Disabilities Act is reenacted it is likely that those 1,200 teacher aids in Clark County will have to be certified. This presents an enormous responsibility for UCCSN community colleges to step forward and assist in this effort. UCCSN has established a steering committee to ensure college-wide participation and dissemination of information, and is developing a degree program for all paraprofessionals in education. UCCSN will hire an interim state director and is working rapidly to create a curriculum for the National Association of State Boards of Education.



The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst  
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board