







- The entire NSC faculty and staff visited high schools, college fairs, and financial aid workshops throughout the valley with the intent to increase the percentage of high school graduates continuing into postsecondary education.đ aia

- High School Based Instruction – Developmental English (English A) taught by UNLV faculty was offered at Clark High during Spring 2003. This course will be offered at seven high schools Spring 2004 based on interest expressed by the principals.
- A New University College – UNLV plans to establish a University College that will focus upon meeting the needs of those students who are interested in an interdisciplinary focus and may not possess the GPA necessary for traditional majors.

4. Public Comment – Regent Hill introduced Mr. Matt Williams, Director of Jam on It Basketball Academy. Regent Hill related that Mr. Williams received a bachelor's and masters degrees from UNR, was a former basketball player at UNR, and is 10th on the all-time scoring list. Mr. Williams said that he hoped to provide some perspective regarding what goes through the mind of a student athlete. He felt there was a responsibility to ensure that student athletes are not provided too many advantages. He related that student athletes face a tremendous amount of pressure. With regard to the special admit program, Mr. Williams related that he struggled in his sophomore year and later discovered that he had a reading disability. He said that completing his college education required significant self motivation and an excellent support system. He advised the Board to look at recruitment, retention, and after eligibility retention. He said that student athletes were often forgotten after their eligibility expired. He related that the institutions were not providing a service by bringing a young athlete to campus and forgetting about them after their eligibility expired.

Regent Kirkpatrick suggested Mr. Williams speak with Mr. Lonnie Wright at CCSN who developed a program that assists student athletes after their eligibility expires. Mr. Williams felt that student athletes were due this service and that seminars should be provided that show students how to properly take advantage of the system.

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – The Board approved the Consent Agenda:

(1) Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the regular meeting held August 14-15, 2003 and the ad hoc Executive Evaluation & Compensation Committee meeting held August 1, 2003.

(2) Approved-Rehire of PERS Retiree, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request to rehire Michael S. Robison, a PERS retiree, as a one-year visiting professor due to a critical need shortage. Such hires are permitted, with Board approval, under legislation passed during the 2001 Legislature. The request was for a one-year appointment through June 30, 2004. (Ref. C-2 on file in the Board office)

(3) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's requests for granting tenure upon hire to Mr. Charles D. O'Connor, Full Professor and Chair in the Department of Theatre in the College of Fine Arts, effective July 1, 2003. This request was previously approved at the Board's August meeting, but the information incorrectly identified the department as the Department of Art. (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office)

(4) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's recommendation for tenure upon hire for Dr. Stanley J. Nelson, DDS, Full Professor of Clinical Lab Sciences in the UNLV School of Dental Medicine, effective September 1, 2003. The tenured faculty voted unanimously to recommend appointment with tenure. (Ref. C-4 on file in the Board office)

(5) Approved-Tenure Upon Hire, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request for approval of the tenure upon hire for the following individuals at the discretion of the Libs LeAsif

individual's background. Regent Sisolak noted a point of order, questioning whether Regent Alden's comments were out of order. General Counsel Ray related that the item should be separated from the Consent Agenda in order for discussion to ensue. Regent Alden discontinued his line of questioning.

Motion carried. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Whipple was absent.

6. Approved-Resolution 04-05, Concert Dance Company, CCSN – The Board approved Chair Stavros Anthony's request for a resolution in honor of the Community College of Southern Nevada Concert Dance Company for winning first prize for Contemporary Dance and first prize for Event Choreography at the international dance competition "Dance Grand Prix Italia." Under the direction of Professor Kelly Roth, the winning team included: Chelsie Adams, Christy Jeffers, Daniel Mendoza, Ann Pogozielski, Kelly Roth, Leslie Roth, James Varner, and Jaime Velilla. (Ref. Bár

would get the money to pay Dr. Hauger's salary. President Wells replied there was a commitment from DRI's Research Foundation for part of the salary because they felt strongly about the need for this position. The remainder will come from indirect cost recovery. Regent Sisolak asked about the amount being committed to by the Foundation. President Wells replied it amounted to approximately \$40,000/year for three years.

Regent Rosenberg observed that this position was essential for DRI, adding that the money would be well spent.

Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

9. Approved-Honorary Doctorate, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request to bestow the honorary Doctor of Laws degree upon Anthony M. Marlon, M.D., at UNLV's Winter Commencement on Wednesday, December 17, 2003. (Ref. D on file in the Board office)

Regent Dondero moved approval of the honorary doctorate for UNLV. Regent Hill seconded.

Regent Dondero observed that Dr. Marlon had been in the area for a number of years, adding that she was thrilled with the recommendation.

President Harter stated that Dr. Marlon started as a cardiologist. . . at d as

cases. Regent Derby related that, in both cases, more work was to be done, adding that further reports were expected in the future.

Regent Sisolak stated that Regent Seastrand's suggestion to bring forth the aforementioned study was extremely helpful. He also commended Committee Chair Derby and Vice Chancellor Curry for attempting to resolve the student's problem during the Committee meeting. Vice Chancellor Curry stated that approval would be forthcoming at the Board's December meeting.

Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

11. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations



13. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations - Chair Thalia Dondero reported the ad hoc Board Development Committee met October 7, 2003 to review their charge and various educational options. Members supported an open-ended survey of all Regents to determine their interests and concerns. The Committee examined an overview of the two workshops the Committee will co-sponsor with the Budget and Finance Committee. The Formula Funding Workshop will be held October 24th and the Operating Budget Process will be addressed January 10, 2004. General Counsel Tom Ray then advised the Committee about holding an ethics seminar. He introduced Dean Richard Morgan of UNLV's Boyd School of Law. Dean Morgan had chaired the Clark County Ethics Task Force and distributed a copy of the task force's report. Discussion followed regarding the impact of the report, with Dean Morgan recommending the Committee consider holding an ethics workshop on an annual basis, which was also one of the recommendations of the task force for Clark County elected officials. The Committee considered future meeting dates for an afternoon meeting on November 17th or 18th. Regent Dondero requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

- The Board Development Committee will sponsor an ethics workshop of 1-2 hours at the May 7, 2004 meeting in Mesquite.

Regent Dondero moved approval of the Committee recommendation and acceptance of the report. Regent Schofield seconded.

Regent Derby complimented Regent Dondero's idea for canvassing Board members about the issues they want to address. She encouraged Board members to provide their suggestions in a timely manner.

Regent Kirkpatrick established that the Board Development Committee would sponsor three workshops and their projected meeting dates.

Regent Hill entered the meeting.

Regent Howard asked whether Dean Morgan's appearance was in response to her request for the dean to speak with Board members about the Ethics Task Force's recommendations. Regent Dondero replied that the Committee had already planned on having the dean make an appearance. Chair Anthony stated there would be a discussion on ethics and policy. Regent Dondero related that either Dean Morgan or General Counsel Ray would conduct the ethics seminar. Chancellor Nichols related that Regent Howard had asked whether Dean Morgan could talk to the Board about the work done by the Clark County Task Force (reviewing the ethical standards and policies) that would be recommended to the Clark County Commission. Chancellor Nichols said that she forwarded that request to the Chair of the Board Development Committee, who in turn, asked Dean Morgan to speak before the Committee. A portion of time has also been set aside for the Board's May workshop to further discuss ethics and state law. Chancellor Nichols asked whether Regent Howard wanted Dean Morgan to address the full Board. Regent Howard indicated that had been her original request and found it interesting that he had not been given an opportunity to be heard. Regent Derby clarified that two hours of the Board's workshop had been devoted to ethics, which would not preclude Dean Morgan from addressing the Board at that time. Chair Anthony established that Regent Howard wanted Dean Morgan to address the full Board.

Motion carried. Regent Whipple was absent.

Chair Anthony related that the following agenda items were the result of work performed by the Executive Evaluation and Compensation Committee, which was chaired by Regent Sisolak. He thanked Regent Sisolak and the Committee for the good work they produced.

14. Approved-Evaluation Procedures, UCCSN Chancellor and Chief Administrative Officer -

As a result of the deliberations of the ad hoc Executive Evaluation and Compensation Committee, the Board approved revised procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty. Chair Anthony advised members of their one year evaluation process.





Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of removing the second sentence (Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Item 3), Page 5 of 9).  
Regent Alden seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the System could be sued if the Chancellor selected from the list for one president and not for another. General Counsel Ray acknowledged that disparity could be alleged. He noted that the policy was not part of the contract, so it would not constitute a breach of contract. If disparity were claimed, it would need to be based upon some discriminatory motive or it would not be actionable. Regent Sisolak felt that allegations could be made and that the System was setting itself up.

Regent Bandera stated that the position under discussion was simply the team leader of the group. There are other members of the group that would outnumber this particular person. The report is prepared, brought to the committee for review and accuracy. If the committee members felt that this person was going off in the wrong direction, they could fix that. The report is then brought to the Board as a whole. She felt that this one individual was of lesser significance than the full Board's consideration of the evaluation. She did not see a problem with the Chancellor having some discretion for whom she selected from a peer institution to be the team leader. Regent Sisolak observed that the team leader writes the report. Regent Bandera agreed, but felt that the Board would review it thoroughly and would correct any discrepancies.

Regent Seastrand observed that deleting the sentence would not preclude the Chancellor from requesting a list from the presidents. Regent [unclear] felt that this [unclear], Regent Kirkpatrick

- Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Item 8) – No anonymous materials will be accepted nor will the committee circulate questions that are completed by members of the various constituencies.

Regent Sisolak said that it did not seem fair that stakeholder groups accept anonymous input, but the Board committee could not. Chancellor Nichols explained that the faculty senate and student body officers are asked to facilitate the process. The Board committee has never been asked to do this. The Board committee has never been asked to do this.

a model for the current process, which has only been in place approximately 6 years. Regent Howard said that the information needs to get to the committee in some manner.

Regent Derby stated that the evaluation committee spent 2 days interviewing representatives from many different groups. Having the committee perform its own survey would be very time consuming and would encumber the committee. She did not feel it was necessary for the committee to undertake a survey given the wide range of constituencies who are asked to respond. She felt it would only add an extra burden.

Regent Sisolak asked whether an individual could speak to the committee. Chair Anthony replied that they could as part of Public Comment. Regent Sisolak asked whether an individual could participate in the interview portion and asked how they would be notified. General Counsel Ray replied that the public is notified via the normal public posting of the agendas. Regent Sisolak asked whether a member of the university community could come forward and talk to the committee. Chair Anthony again replied that they could do so during Public Comment. Regent Sisolak said that he was referring to the interview session. He observed that people had been squeezed in and asked how that had been accommodated. Chancellor Nichols replied that it was different for every evaluation and was often a reflection of the committee process and options on the campus. A letter is always sent to all campus employees explaining the two days of interviews. The letter allows for written comments to be submitted. Open time will be provided for the next evaluation at each of the three campuses. No one has ever been turned down.

Dr. Mike Hardie, Faculty Senate Chair-WNCC, related that he participated in the periodic review for WNCC's president. He requested time to speak to the committee and was permitted 10 minutes. He felt it was an excellent process.

Regent Howard expressed concern for those people who do not appear in public out of fear of retribution. Chair Anthony said that he wanted to table the item to the next meeting and asked the Board's cooperation.

Chancellor Nichols continued her review of the changes:

- Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Items 1-17, Page 6 of 9 – New language provided reflecting current practice.
- Ref. H Performance Criteria, Page 9 of 9 - Substantive change made to the criteria for the periodic evaluation of presidents requiring evidence of progress toward the master plan goals as recommended by the Committee.

Regent Hill moved approval of the annual and periodic evaluation procedures for UCCSN presidents with the changes noted and the exception of (Ref. H., Periodic Evaluation, Item 3)'s second sentence and Item 9), Page 5 of 9). Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Derby noted a point of order, establishing that the Board had already voted to take no action on removing the second sentence (Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Item 3), Page 5 of 9). Regent Hill explained that his motion intended to adopt the entire proposal, include both options (Ref. H., Annual Evaluation Item 4), Page 3 of 9), delete the second sentence included in (Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Item 3), Page 5 of 9), with the intent to address it at the December meeting when the Board addresses (Ref. H., Periodic Evaluation, Item 9), Page 5 of 9). He thought that at the next meeting, with 13 Regents present, the Board may be able to agree upon action that it was unable to at this meeting.

General Counsel Ray stated that Regent Hill wanted to delete the sentence (Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Item 3), Page 5 of 9), which the Board already voted upon and failed. To remove the sentence would require a motion to reconsider made by someone on the prevailing side. Regent Hill noted a point of order, stating that the Board was in the process of adopting the entire matter at this time. General Counsel clarified that a specific motion was made to address that specific question, indicating that it had been addressed. Without a motion to reconsider, General Counsel Ray felt it would be inappropriate to remove the sentence. Regent Hill respectfully disagreed since the Board had never voted on passing the entire proposal. He felt the previous vote constituted a straw vote on whether or not to include the sentence.

Regent Sisolak agreed with Regent Hill, adding that the first motion was specific to that sentence alone. The current motion encompassed the entire proposal. Regent Anthony agreed with General Counsel Ray who indicated that the sentence had already been voted upon. Chair Anthony indicated that the sentence in question could not be part of the current motion. Regent Hill stated that the Board had never voted to put the sentence in or take it out. Chancellor Nichols stated that the sentence was part of the whole proposal.

Regent Hill amended his motion to accept the proposal with both options, changes to the number of committee participants, and the exception of (Ref. H, Periodic Evaluation, Item 9), Page 5 of 9). Regent Derby seconded.

Regent Seastrand suggested changing "Academic Administration" (Ref. H, Challenges and Opportunities, Item 2)) to "Academic Advancement". Chancellor Nichols did not object to the suggestion. Regent Hill accepted the change. Regent Derby asked whether the change would omit anything critical. Chancellor Nichols said that academic administration would fall under academic advancement. Regent Seastrand felt that "administration" related more to budgetary and personnel management. Ms. Nancy Flagg, Deputy to the Chancellor-System Administration, clarified that the terminology proposed for

the annual evaluation was parallel to the areas under review for the periodic evaluation. It was an attempt to draw the two evaluations closer together.

Regent Alden requested clarification of the motion and a roll call vote. He established that the second sentence in Periodic Evaluation Item 3) would remain intact.

President Harter stated that academic administration represented the duties of the provosts and deans (i.e., elaborately creating the curriculum and programs, taking it through the entire academic review process, and working with the faculty senate on graduation criteria and prerequisites). She said there was a great deal of administration involved with mounting academic programs in addition to academic advancement and vision, to which she felt Regent Seastrand was referring. She said the two terms were not mutually exclusive and did not want to underestimate what it takes to perform first-rate academic administration

President Lilley observed that page 7 of 9 made reference to academic administration and academic planning, indicating an attempt to link the two functions. He suggested using that language instead. Regent Seastrand said that he wanted to see more about what the presidents are planning to do and what they have accomplished. Chair Anthony suggested adding "academic advancement" to the list of Challenges and Opportunities, which was agreed to by the makers of the motion

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

16. Approved-Handbook Revision, Executive Salaries and Perquisites – The Board approved amendments to the Board of Regents' Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 3, Sections 18-23), resulting from the deliberations of the ad hoc Executive Evaluation and Compensation Committee. The proposed changes seek to revise and clarify the procedures for the ongoing revision and approval of executive salaries and perquisites. In addition, the amendments propose a new Handbook section that sets guidelines for executive salary increases and a new Handbook salary schedule and guidelines for the end of the fiscal year.

Regent Sisolak said he was not comfortable with having the Chancellor address issues the Board really should be and did not support the motion. He felt the Board should award merit and be willing to accept the responsibility and possible criticism associated with it.

Regent Kirkpatrick observed that UCCSN was often criticized for the large salaries paid to presidents, adding that the media influenced the public a great deal. He felt the Board should be involved whenever a presidential salary change or approval was addressed in order to send a message to the community. He said he would not support Option 2.

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

Chancellor Nichols continued her review of the new language:

- Ref. I, New Section 21, Page 6 of 8 – New guidelines for executive salary increases.
- Ref. I, New Section 21, Item 3, Page 6 of 8 - Option included preventing the award of increases in salary for meritorious performance across the board to executives governed by this section.

Chair Anthony requested a motion to determine inclusion/exclusion of the option presented (Ref. I, New Section 21, Item 3).

Regent Alden entered the meeting

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of including the option in the proposed language (Ref. I, New Section 21, Item 3). Regent Dondero seconded.

Regent Seastrand did not like the language used. He felt it did not make sense to require that not everyone could receive a bonus. He felt the executives should be evaluated on their own performance and not in comparison to one another. He suggested omitting the statement.

Regent Hill objected to the requirement in Item 3 because he felt the Chancellor would then be forced to choose which executive would not receive an increase. He felt the Board should determine which executives should receive merit if there was a preclusion for across the board awards. He felt it was unfair to saddle the Chancellor with that option. He acknowledged that across the board merit increases might not occur, but felt the Board should either give the Chancellor the right to hire and fire without Board input or the Board should handle such matters.

Regent Sisolak stated that the Committee had struggled with this issue, adding that it had been quite controversial. Community members of the Committee had very strong feelings about merit. They felt there is a perception that merit is awarded without benefit of meritorious performance. Merit was intended for outstanding, meritorious service. The community impression is that the presidents are already well paid and receive merit for no additional effort. He agreed that it would put the Chancellor in a difficult position.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked if Regent Hill thought that eliminating Item 3 would allow everyone to be awarded merit. Regent Hill said he did not. He felt that leaving the sentence in meant that at least one would not receive merit, possibly more. Regent Kirkpatrick did not object to such a restriction. He observed that only two-thirds of the faculty received merit and that it was fair to treat administrators similarly. He observed that the Board pays the Chancellor well to make such decisions.

Regent Derby agreed with Regent Hill and suggested eliminating the sentence in Item 3. She agreed with allowing the Chancellor to make the decision. To be truly based upon merit, the requirements would need to be left open-ended. While she could appreciate the public's perception, she could not agree with making the process unworkable for the Chancellor.

Regent Sisolak asked whether all faculty qualified for merit. Chancellor Nichols replied that merit was granted via multiple methods. The community colleges provide merit to everyone below the salary cap unless they receive an unsatisfactory evaluation. There are two different systems in place at the universities. UNLV faculty apply for merit, while all UNR faculty are considered for merit. The percentage of recipients varies each year and is not 100%. Regent Sisolak asked whether merit could be awarded across the board. Chancellor Nichols said there was no rule preventing it, but it never happens.

President Harter clarified that the dollar amounts for merit are on a sliding scale up to \$4,500. The legislature funds merit at 2.5% of the salary pool for the total merit pool. Allowing awards of up to \$4,500 does not allow every person to receive an award. If the merit awards were smaller, everyone could receive one. UNLV's faculty and staff have created a sliding scale system that makes it impossible for everyone to receive an award. Regent Sisolak asked whether all administrators receive merit. President Harter replied they did not, adding that they too have the same \$4,500 maximum. Approximately the same number of administrators receive merit as faculty. Regent Sisolak asked why it should be different for presidents. Chair Anthony replied that the Board was in the process of deciding that.

Regent Seastrand noted that the Board had added language changing the conditions for awarding merit. With these new requirements, not everyone will qualify. He did not feel the Board should pit the presidents against one another. Rather, they



should compete against themselves and the goals the Board has outlined. He did not see a need for Item 3 since the new requirements would limit the number of recipients.

Regent Hill said that, since the Chancellor is supervising the presidents to some degree with some Regent interaction, it was unfair to have her decide which president would not receive merit. He did not have a problem with the Chancellor limiting the number of recipients, but felt that she should be totally in charge of the presidents, with no end runs to or from Board members.

Regent Kirkpatrick reminded the Board that the Committee had been adamant about not allowing all presidents to receive merit. He felt that following the recommendations in Item 1 would ensure that not all presidents would qualify for merit.

Regent Rosenberg noted that, as a department chair, he does not have enough money to award merit to all faculty in the department. He did not believe that only one president would be singled out to not receive merit. He felt it was a decision for the Chancellor to make. He said that care needed to be taken when considering meritorious performance, noting that employees are paid for doing their jobs.

Regent Howard felt that merit was unfair and questioned why it exists. Chair Anthony stated that many organizations employ merit increases for those employees who go above and beyond normal expectations. He felt it was more a matter of who should receive merit. Regent Howard asked whether there were other ways to reward meritorious performance. Chancellor Nichols replied there was not. Chair Anthony stated that merit increases were part of the Board's standard protocol and it would not be eliminated. He reminded the Board that the issue was to determine who would provide the merit increase. Regent Howard asked why the System uses merit. Chair Anthony replied that merit was used to reward people for outstanding service. Regent Howard said that she hears a lot of complaints about the same people receiving merit each year. She felt that it also reduced morale.

President Romesburg asked when the presidents last received merit. He was under the impression that merit just did not happen for presidents. Chancellor Nichols replied that the presidents had not received merit in a very long time. Due to budgetary woes, it has been difficult for the Board to grant merit to the presidents. She approximated that it was 3-4 years ago when presidents last received merit. She related that merit was tied to the public perception of available dollars which must also be considered. She noted that presidents also suffer loss of morale when not receiving merit pay. She related that System staff had attempted to set very clear criteria on which to base merit. The UCCSN would be unable to keep its salaries competitive nationally if the state did not provide funding for merit. She related that merit was equivalent to the classified step increases and that presidential and executive merit is not paid for by the state.

Regent Schofield observed that merit is awarded to employees who take the time to be nice to people.

Regent Bandera clarified that the group of executives under discussion included other executives besides the presidents, adding that they too would be precluded from receiving merit. She agreed with Regent Rosenberg that if the criteria for awarding merit was causing the problem it should be addressed and fixed instead of denying everyone merit.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that when the legislature allocated money for merit they did not include administrators. Administrators receive merit by using money from unfilled positions. Chancellor Nichols said there was no money included in the merit pool for administrators above the dean's position.

Regent Sisolak observed that merit awards were then rolled into the base pay. He related that Mr. Keith Lee convinced the Committee that not providing merit to the presidents was a good idea. He observed that merit criteria was subjective and unquantifiable, which was one of the arguments he used against providing merit. Regent Sisolak asked about the last time a president was not recommended for merit in spite of merit not being funded. He felt that most presidents received recommendations for merit.

Regent Derby said that deleting Item 3 would not infer that all presidents should receive merit. It would instead provide the Chancellor some flexibility in case each president met the criteria for merit.

Regent Sisolak noted a portion of order, asking where it stated that the Chancellor would make that determination. Chair Anthony stated that the Board had agreed to allowing the Chancellor to grant merit increases. He felt that putting a restraint on the number of merit recipients defeated the purpose after the Board agreed to allow the Chancellor to award merit. He felt there was no reason for the sentence.

Regent Alden stated that the Board hires, fires, and determines the salary of the Chancellor and the presidents. He felt the Board should have ultimate control over deciding merit both periodically and annually for the presidents not of

Chancellor Nichols said that the Board would only want to give this authority to the Chancellor if clear, measurable criteria had been established. She said the process would be phased in over time.

Upon a roll call vote the motion to include item 3 carried. Regents Alden, Dondero, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Rosenberg, Schofield, and Sisolak voted yes. Regents Anthony, Bandera, Derby, Hill, and Seastrand voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

Chancellor Nichols continued her review of the changes:

- Ref. I, Section 21, Item 4 – Due to previous Board action, the option provided was no longer viable. The Chancellor will approve salary increases in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 20 of the chapter.
- Ref. I, Section 22, Executive Perquisites – Chancellor Nichols asked the Board to consider the options provided in Section 22 as a whole. All dealt with a Committee recommendation that the Board have some flexibility in the perquisites offered upon hire and on a case-by-case basis.

Regent Rosenberg moved to amend the Board's recommendation to add in or delete the following language: "The Board shall have the authority to approve salary increases for the Chancellor in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 20 of the chapter."

Upon a role call vote the motion for approval of Section 23 carried. Regents Anthony, Bandera, Derby, Dondero, Hill, Kirkpatrick, Schofield, Seastrand, and Sisolak voted yes. Regents Alden, Howard, and Rosenberg voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

The motion to accept the entire package carried. Regent Alden voted no. Regent Whipple was absent.

17. Information Only-Handbook Revision, Board Bylaws, Officers of the Board and Officers of the University – The Board considered amendments to the Board Bylaws (Title I, Article IV and Article VII) resulting from the deliberations of the ad hoc Executive Evaluation and Compensation Committee. The purpose of the proposed changes is to clarify in the Board Bylaws the general contract terms and evaluation procedures for the Chief Administrative Officer, the Chancellor, and the Presidents. The changes mirror more detailed language and procedures that are proposed for the Board Policy Statements (Title IV) in other items on the Board's agenda. Because Bylaw amendments require two hearings, final action on this proposal would be taken at the December 2003 meeting. (Ref. J on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols reported that the proposed changes represented codification of current practices. Any changes to the proposed material resulting from Board action will be reflected at the next Board meeting when the Board will take action on the item.

The meeting recessed at 5:34 p.m. and reconvened at 8:12 a~~m~~<sup>m</sup> and nsid f tho HB

Regent Kirkpatrick noted a point of order, asking whether Regent Sisolak could make the motion since he had not been on the prevailing side. General Counsel Ray replied that was the difference between reconsideration and rescission. The Bylaws require notice be given prior to the meeting, which was done by written memorandum. He said that it did not matter, anybody could make the motion.

Regent Hill noted a point of information, asking a question of procedure. He noted the Board had a motion to rescind. He asked whether a motion for reconsideration was necessary prior to a motion to rescind. General Counsel Ray replied that one was not necessary. Regent Hill established that this was the correct motion. Regent Hill said that he assumed there were people present to speak on the issue and asked whether they would be allowed to speak now or whether it was a matter that must be taken up, and if it were voted up, then it was rescinded, or if it were voted down, then it was over. General Counsel Ray replied that would be within the discretion of the Chairman as to how he wants to handle it.

Regent Alden thought the proper way to do it would be to go ahead and rescind and then enter in, so the Board does not discuss it twice, and then enter into discussion on the item in a diplomatic way. Chair Anthony said that, if there were no objections from the Board, and then recognized Regent Howard.

Regent Howard said that she thought the whole purpose for Regent Sisolak initially proposing that this be added to the agenda was to allow the students in southern Nevada to be able to be heard. That was her understanding. Otherwise, she did not feel that it served any purpose for the Board to even have it on the agenda.

Regent Alden called for the vote.

Chair Anthony said that he would like to vote on the matter and, depending upon the outcome of the vote, the Board could then have further discussion. Chair Anthony then asked whether any Board member objected to taking the vote and no objections were noted. Chair Anthony said that he noted no objections.

Regent Hill clarified that a “no” vote would not rescind action. General Counsel Ray verified that was correct.

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

Regent Alden said that he was in total shock. He said it was a travesty of justice. He said he would bring the matter back again to have the discussion. He said he would keep bringing it back. He said there were students present and the Chair had ignored them. He said it was absolutely undemocratic and wrong. He said, “We are not in Russia, this is not a Communist state.” Regent Hill noted a point of order.

Chair Anthony said there was a podium present and he did not see anybody walk up to the podium to speak, so he assumed that nobody wanted to speak on the motion.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of order, stating that no one was given the opportunity to speak. Regents Alden and Howard agreed. Chair Anthony said that he also did not see anybody walk up there. He noted that the motion failed and that ended item number 19.

Regent Alden left the meeting.

4. Public Comment (Cont’d.) – Mr. Michael Schaffer suggested the Board consider adding a student Regent as practiced by the University of California system. He observed there is no policy governing the naming of streets that abut System property. He related there are numerous opportunities to memorialize someone that affect property held by both “town and gown”. He asked the Board to consider a policy, governing all campuses and System property whenever a memorial involving both public and System property occurs, that the System defer to the wishes of the City and County.

3. Presidents’ Reports - (Cont’d.) President John Lilley, UNR – Due to the university’s land-grant mission, statewide outreach is very important. Last year, over 7,000 Nevadans were served by UNR’s professional development programs (i.e., gaming management, paralegal studies, human resources management, and medical administration). Approximately 70% of all incoming freshmen at the university come from Washoe or Clark Counties. The number of high school graduates attending the university as freshmen has increased:

- Washoe County – by 11% since 2000.
- Clark County – by 14% since 2000.
- All other Nevada Counties – by 16% since 2000.

The university is attempting to increase the percentage of Nevada’s general population who participate in some form of higher education, whether through coursework, workforce training, certificate programs, lifelong learning, or degree programs. From January 2001 to December 2002, enrollments in Extended Studies programs increased by 10% (35,687 to 39,248). The



District Relations, which is helping to create a more seamless process for students transitioning from high school to college. The highly successful community college high school is an example of effective collaboration between the school board and the college. The Office of School District Relations has also been instrumental in bringing about key counterparts in the school district and the college for constructive dialogue, policy review, and program collaboration. A Counselor to Counselor collaboration has been formed that is making the high school-to-college transition easier for students. The collaboration ensures that both high school and college counselors have accurate and up-to-date information as well as develop professional working relationships necessary to facilitate high school-to-college access for graduating seniors.

CCSN's dual credit programs and Tech Centers located on high school campuses also help to ensure progress for first-time college students. Specific scholarship programs are now being aimed at students registering in college for the first time. These efforts specifically enhance progress toward dual credit for students.

President Ringle then highlighted three progr

then consist entirely of numbers pertaining to the single semester under consideration. Mid-semester enrollment counts would still be made available. Vice Chancellor Curry related there were no negative consequences of the proposed changes to either federal enrollment reporting processes or to the System's utilization of the enrollment information in the state budgeting process.

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning carryover enrollment reporting. Regent Rosenberg seconded.

Regent Seastrand asked about the consequences for delaying approval and whether preliminary numbers would be available. Vice Chancellor Curry replied that UCCSN would continue to use the October 15th and March 15th dates to produce preliminary numbers.

Motion carried. Regents Alden and Bandera were absent.

22. Approved-Handbook Revision, Part-Time Faculty Salary Schedules – The Board approved Chancellor Jane Nichols' request for an amendment to the Board of Regents' Handbook (Title IV, Chapter 3, Section 28) to include the salary schedule for part-time faculty that was recommended by the UCCSN part-time Faculty Task Force in 2002. Although the Board approved the Task Force final report at its April 2002 meeting, the recommended salary schedule contained in the report was not added to the Handbook at the time, pending action by the Legislature on the UCCSN's request for enhancement funding to cover the additional salary costs. Because separate funding was not provided by the Legislature, the Chancellor is recommending that the salary schedule be added to the Handbook to reinforce the UCCSN's commitment to reaching the target salaries over an established time period. (Ref. M on file in the Board office)

Chancellor Nichols reported that one of the recommendations was to create a unified, System-wide salary schedule that would reflect the COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment) to be given to faculty. The schedule was approved, but was never added to the Handbook because it was contingent upon funding, which was not received. The salary model is indexed to the salary for a full-time university instructor and establishes a minimum part-time faculty salary for each type of institution. It will reflect future COLA increases. Targets have been established (minimum per credit figures for the universities, state college and community colleges). The presidents have made a commitment to begin working on that salary schedule. She related that the targets would increase with each COLA.

Regent Bandera entered the meeting.

Chancellor Nichols requested Board approval for adding the part-time faculty salary schedule into the Handbook as a

ac



number one issue for part-time faculty) was access to health insurance. UCCSN's personnel officers made a commitment to locate a group package for them. They have been successful in getting the company to offer that coverage.

Ms. Carla Henson, Director, Human Resources-System Administration, stated that the policy secured allows for dependent coverage and can also be converted into a private policy if/when they leave. Fees are paid directly to the company, which also handles all of the paperwork.

Regent Sisolak questioned how UNR was able to secure a higher percentage increase than the other institutions. President Lilley explained that, during the planning process, the salary increase was made a high priority and funds were reallocated. Regent Sisolak was pleased that UNR was able to find the money, adding that he wished it had been as large a priority for the other institutions. He felt that part-time faculty is grossly underpaid. President Lilley related that most part-time faculty in engineering, computer science, and other areas were well in advance of this recommendation. UNR did not have a large cohort that required the increase like UNLV has. Regent Sisolak commended President Lilley for identifying a 15% increase for part-time faculty.

President Romesburg reported that NSC was on a shorter schedule for meeting the targets. Since faculty had been told about the schedule, the college honored the commitment. Because NSC is small, the cost was not unbearable.

President Romesburg reported that UNLV had a \$9 million increase in part-time faculty. A 4% increase equates to \$200,000, which is equivalent to four full-time positions. With each 4% increase, UNLV does not fill full-time positions that were allocated by the legislature. Part-time faculty teach 35% of the course work because historic underfunding has not permitted hiring the number of full-time faculty UNLV desires. She said it was a high priority, but that it was also a huge number compared to any institution except CCSN. Regent Sisolak gave credit to UNR for recognizing the value of part-time faculty.

Regent Kirkpatrick asked whether UNLV would reduce the number of part-time faculty and increase the number of full-time faculty now that UNLV was better funded. President Harter replied that UNLV was attempting to develop a model that would allow them to do so. UNLV grew 18% in the last biennium and had no new faculty positions allocated. UNLV still does not have enough full-time faculty to teach all of the students enrolled.

with a 4% increase in part-time faculty has been addressed. The Board of Regents will continue to monitor the situation and will report back to the Board of Regents at the next meeting.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Dr. Maples will provide the crucial leadership internally overseeing hiring strategies for the institution as a whole. DRI strives to improve its interaction with the corporate world and research activities. Last year, DRI grew from slightly over \$1 million to \$5 million of corporate activity. This is viewed as a major target area for growth. Dr. Hauger will develop fundamental corporate relationships for the Institute.

- Initiating a New Center of Integrated Sciences – Part of DRI's vision was to have the Institute bring together interdisciplinary or interdisciplinary





Mr. Mike Hamrick, Director, Intercollegiate Athletics-UNLV, related that not many people realize what student athletes encounter. He felt the athletic directors should inform the Board and the presidents about the challenges they face in trying to graduate athletes. He acknowledged that he had an outstanding record for graduating athletes at a previous institution. He has assembled a Graduation Rates Task Force that is trying to develop a strategy for improving graduation rates at UNLV. He felt it was important to have a high rate of graduation for those athletes who have exhausted their eligibility (after 4 years). UNLV's graduation rate is currently 77%, while UNR's is close to 70%. He felt those figures indicated that the institutions are not just using student athletes to compete and win championships. They are also graduating. He suggested the chair of UNLV's Task Force could report to the Board on its progress. He also suggested having a student athlete share the trials and tribulations of being a student athlete with the Board. He affirmed that student athletes at UNLV do graduate, adding that he would like to see the graduation rate improve to 100%.

Regent Hill expressed concern for recruiting people who do not stand a chance of making it through to graduation. He felt the institutions have the responsibility for not recruiting them or ensuring that they make it through to graduation. He felt the issue was important enough to justify the Board knowing more about the matter.

Regent Howard agreed with Regent Hill that it is a critical issue. She noted that athletes bring prominence to the university and make it more attractive for all students. She felt that counseling should be provided to athletes and that something was necessary to hold someone accountable for graduation rates. She acknowledged that the percentages sounded good, but felt the issue required further review. She said that she was aware of many former UCCSN and professional athletes who have no relationship with their institution. She felt those athletes could be good friends to the institution and that student athletes should not be exploited.

Regent Dondero suggested the Board hear a report from UNLV's Task Force prior to determining the need for a special committee.

Regent Kirkpatrick felt that success was dependent upon the emphasis that the presidents, athletic directors, and coaches placed on graduation rates. He observed that the university presidents had served in high-ranking NCAA positions. He felt the majority of the changes made had been to move in the direction of increasing graduation rates.

Regent Schofield observed that the Board had just reviewed the core values. He noted that one was "Accountability" and one was "Excellence". He said that each Board member was accountable to their constituents. He felt the Board could not ignore the constituents' desire to have UCCSN teams playing at a "glory days" level, adding that the Board could set the tone.

Chair Anthony thanked Regent Schofield for bringing the matter before the Board. He agreed the Board needs to stay on top of the issue. He said he would take the matter under advisement to determine what, if any, committee charge was necessary. If at some time in the future the need for such a committee should arise, the Board will be ready to take action.

26. Information Only-Student-Athletes' Graduation Data - UNLV President Carol Harter and UNR President John Lilley reviewed data on graduation rates for student-athletes at UNLV and UNR for the period 2001-2003. (Ref. X on file in the Board office)

President Harter reported that she is and has been a member of the NCAA Board of Directors in two different conferences in Division I, as well as one conference in Division III. She related that she has entertained exhaustive discussions of these issues with leaders from major U.S. institutions. As the NCAA board becomes more focused upon trying to ensure student success in educational programs, they are also recognizing the flaw in the federal methodology of calculating graduation rates. She related that it was a major problem. Transfer students are not counted as successful graduates for an institution. The same is true with the federal rate for any student who leaves an institution in good academic standing to attend elsewhere and graduate. Nevada has students who attend both universities and observed



—

President Harter reported that the company chairman was dedicated to bringing more people into the profession than ever before. Dental school graduates typically have fairly significant debt. People from modest means and minority groups are rarely able to go on to a residency training program. This company tries to provide the support for students in the orthodontics residency program by providing the tuition as well as a reasonable living stipend. In exchange, the student would work for the company as an orthodontist upon graduation. Such a practice on the UNLV campus would make services available to low-income people that they cannot now afford. The total commitment to the university would represent the largest gift/commitment over a 30-year period in UNLV's history, well in excess of \$40 million. The program would fulfill significant needs of the university and community. The company would give UNLV \$3 million to start by hiring a director and a couple of faculty members. The company then pledges \$1,250,000/year for thirty years, which includes the stipend and tuition for eight of the twelve students to be enrolled in the program. Four of the twelve students would pay their own fees. The remainder of the gift would be dedicated to building a facility to house the students and faculty of the residency program. UNLV's commitment is to provide the land on which the facility would be built. President Harter reported there are 8 hospital residencies in dentistry. This program would provide an additional residency for the School of Dental Medicine as well as an enhanced clinical and research facility. The program would fulfill many of the UCCSN Master Plan goals and provide service to the community. She assured the Board that the university would control all of the academic issues of the program.

UNLV Provost, Dr. Ray Alden, reported that UNLV would maintain sole control over admissions criteria faculty hiring and retention the curriculum who is admitted how they are graded who remains in the program who graduates as well as which vendors, suppliers, and equipment are used. Students face a 7-year commitment working for the company in return for full tuition, fees, and stipends. Graduates are guaranteed a salary of \$150,000/year for the first several years, as well as profit sharing. Students utilizing the opt-out provisions would be required to repay the fees invested. The ADA Commission on Dental Accreditation has validated this particular partnership at the first university, Jacksonville University. Colorado's accreditation is expected in the near future. Tuition of \$30,000/year for the self-supporting programs is quite expensive. The gift represents a 30-year commitment of over \$40 million. The initial gift would be used to set up the endowment which would pay for the Phase I building. The revenue stream from the program would be assigned to a Phase I building plan encompassing 20,000-sq.ft. of clinical and research facility. The yearly pledge would be used for a separate endowment to pay for a Phase II building and/or faculty chairs for the program. A revenue stream including tuition and fees, endowment income, clinic revenues, as well as the net gift commitment (not including fellowships), totals an anticipated \$2 million. Expenses, based upon best practices elsewhere, total \$1.5 million, for a yearly net gain of approximately \$375,000, which could be put towards an endowment for long-term advancement of the program. UNLV also explored the possibility of the corporation withdrawing the gift after a few years. Once the \$3 million gift establishe a 3% be useses, bor a yearly e issu f 3%





none, adding that this would be a matter of public record. President Harter said



Regent Hill said that he still had concerns about the contract, adding that he was not particularly concerned about complaints



Scholarships. The high school had the highest percentage of all county high schools in the number of students enrolled in advanced science and math classes. In 2001, 100% of the students passed the reading, writing, and math proficiency exam. They had the least number of student suspensions and expulsions for violence, drugs, alcohol, or weapons violations. They also had the least number of graduates enrolled in remediation courses when they transferred to the college. They had a slightly higher retention rate in courses compared to the campus average and a higher persistence rate than other students. TMCC's capture rate for all of the county high schools is about 24%. For TMCC High School, 52% go on to attend TMCC. Another 14% went on to UNR. Over three-quarters of the students received A's, B's, or C's in their college-level courses. He encouraged Board members to attend the graduations.

Regent Howard asked whether the employees were also a separate entity from TMCC. President Ringle replied that employees of the high school are school district employees.

Regent Kirkpatrick encouraged board members to attend the graduations, adding that they were very impressive.

Vice President Robert Palinchak, CCSN – The CCSN High School opened in January 1996. The stated mission was to facilitate the successful transition of students from high school to postsecondary education. The unique program accepts juniors and seniors. Students schedule their high school classes in the format of either Monday-Wednesday-Friday or Tuesday-Thursday-Friday. Students are permitted to take 2-4 college classes for dual credit. The high school and college classes are free to the student with the proviso that Clark County School District pay for up to 12 credits per semester for each student taking college courses. The students buy their own text books and the college pays all utilities and custodial services in buildings currently provided by the school district. Most students take general education courses, but many also pursue certificates in culinary arts, automotive technology, air conditioning, and other transfer areas. All students have access to high school and college counselors for personal, academic, and career counseling. Students also provide their own transportation and are eligible to join any club or student organization on the college campus. They have their own year book, prom, and graduation ceremony. Many students belong to the National Honor Society and also have representation on the college student government association. Courses are taught at three locations. There are 221 students at the Charleston Campus, 191 students at the Cheyenne Campus, and 122 students at the Henderson Campus for a total of 534 students currently enrolled in the high school.









Motion carried. Regents Alden, Sisolak and Wh