

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
Hall of Fame Room, Legacy Hall
University of Nevada, Reno
1664 North Virginia Street, Reno
Thursday-Friday, October 14-15, 2004

Members Present: Dr. Stavros Anthony, Chair

Ms. Marcia Bandera
Dr. Jill Derby
Mrs. Thalia Dondero
Mr. Douglas Roman Hill
Mrs. Linda Howard
Mr. Howard Rosenberg
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Douglas Seastrand
Mr. Steve Sisolak
Mr. Bret Whipple

Members Absent: Mr. Mark Alden

Dr. ThTer, M

President Harter introduced UNLV's new Vice President for Finance, Mr. Gerry Bomotti.

Regent Hill introduced Ms. Lauralei Ezra, Senator, College of Liberal Arts-UNR, and Mr. Jeff Champagne, Vice President, Programming, ASUN-UNR. He related that Mr. Champagne had exhibited great courage and integrity while dealing with the complaints that were received regarding Michael Moore's appearance on the UNR campus. Regent Hill recalled that in the 1970's the person that was in Mr. Champagne's position was Ms. Mary-Ellen McMullen, UNR's current Foundation president. She brought an issue to the Board of Regents and was replaced by the current Senator John Kerry.

Regent Derby acknowledged the students and President Lilley for standing up for freedom of speech in the face of considerable controversy over Michael Moore's campus visit.

~~Regent Hill introduced Ms. Lauralei Ezra, Senator, College of Liberal Arts-UNR, and Mr. Jeff Champagne, Vice President, Programming, ASUN-UNR. He related that Mr. Champagne had exhibited great courage and integrity while dealing with the complaints that were received regarding Michael Moore's appearance on the UNR campus. Regent Hill recalled that in the 1970's the person that was in Mr. Champagne's position was Ms. Mary-Ellen McMullen, UNR's current Foundation president. She brought an issue to the Board of Regents and was replaced by the current Senator John Kerry.~~

President Lilley acknowledged UNR's Vice President, Student Services, Dr. Shannon Ellis, and Ms. Sandy Rodriguez, Director, Associated Students-UNR, adding that they had devoted many hours and had been under tremendous pressure.

President Carpenter introduced Dr. Terry Jones, CCSN's new Faculty Senate Chair.

2. Chair's Report - Board Chair Stavros Anthony thanked President Lilley and UNR for hosting the Board's meeting.
3. Public Comment – UNR Student Body President, Mr. Erin Lankowsky, discussed a problem common to both universities in the state. He said that advising, class scheduling, and class offerings were negatively impacting the graduation rate. M_t knowle

4. Approved-Consent Agenda

academic year cycle.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the tenure upon hire for UNLV's recommendations. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent. Regent Rosenberg abstained.

5. Approved-Supplemental Presidential Compensation, UNLV – The Board approved the UNLV Foundation's request for a proposal to provide funds to the Board of Regents to be used to provide supplementary compensation to the President of UNLV *TghW"D"qp"hhkg kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkhkg+.

Board had opened up her contract. By that act, the Board must necessarily amend her contract. Regent Rosenberg asked whether they would be two separate contracts since it was an additional amount of money. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen replied it was one contract with the Board of Regents.

Regent Hill noted a point of order, stating that he felt that the motion was out of order in that there was nothing to decide upon. He said the Board did not have a valid motion to consider. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen agreed.

The motion was ruled out of order.

Regent Hill agreed that the presidents are under compensated. He also felt this was a reasonable package and proposal as presented within the terms of the contract presented. He observed that the Board could not separate the two issues and vote upon them separately because to do so would make any amendment to the contract at a future date invalid for lack of consideration. If the Board decides to incorporate these provisions in the contract, the only way they can incorporate them is by part of a motion conditional on acceptance of the money that the contract be signed. He said the Board could not unilaterally amend a contract at a later date. The only motion that the Board could act on that would contain the conditions in the proposal would be one conditioned upon signing the contract. Regent Hill said that if they voted for the compensation and not on the contract they would end it there and the contract could never be amended again without additional consideration because it would be a unilateral amendment. He did not agree with the Board approving a contract or moving forward on something without all of the details determined.

Regent Hill moved approval of the compensation package conditional upon the signing of the addendum to the employment agreement. Regent Schofield seconded.

Chair Anthony asked who would sign off on the contract. Regent Hill replied there were three parties: the Foundation and the System

5. Approved-Supplemental Presidential Compensation, UNLV – *Eqpvøf0+

hqt"y jke j"v j g{ "y km"dg"eqpvtcevwm{ "dqwpf"cpf"ecppqv"tgpg i g"wr qp"y kv j "v j g"gzegr vkqp"qh"v j g"etg f kv q t"r tqxkukqp+ and the System and President Harter *v j g"eqpvtcev"r tgugpv g f"v q"v j g"Dqct f+. Chair Anthony clarified that if the Board passed the motion this would become a contract negotiation between the chancellor and Dr. Harter and the Board will never see it again. Chancellor Rogers stated that, other than the one sentence that they had worked out *k0g0."y j cv"uj g"y qwn f"fq"v q"dtgcej "v j g"eqpvtcev"v j cv"y qwn f"ecwug"j g t"v q"nqug j g t"r c {" i qkp i "hqt y ctf+ there is weasel word “dishonesty”. That is a rather broad term. Chancellor Rogers said they had changed “dishonesty” to “intentional misrepresentation of a material fact that substantially impacts the System.” Regent Hill said he would have simply used “material dishonesty.” However, he found the language acceptable and offered to amend the motion. He said that would be the contract that he would conditionally approve the salary increase on based upon signature of the contract by all parties. Chair Anthony clarified that if the Board passed the motion, the chancellor and President Harter would sign the contract and it would not come before the Board again. Regent Hill agreed.

Regent Hill amended the motion to include the language suggested by Chancellor Rogers. Regent Schofield agreed.

Regent Bandera found it interesting that the description for this item spoke about the UNLV Foundation request for approval of a proposal. She did not hear that the Foundation was bringing forward an addendum to the contract. She said the Board seemed to be moving rather quickly on something that had been modified multiple times. She was unsure whether all Board members were specifically clear on the details. She felt it was an interesting process.

Regent Howard said that she shared Regent Bandera’s concerns. She was concerned that this whole new idea that the Board was implementing did not go through a committee so the Board could set a standard for it. She mentioned the Board’s Executive Evaluation and Compensation Committee. If this was an issue that needed to be raised, she felt it should have gone through that committee. She thought there should be some type of evaluation or personnel session when a president gets a raise or a contract is amended so that if there are issues to be raised they can be addressed at that time. She observed that the Board had recently given the president a raise. Even though this does not come directly out of the UCCSN budget, it still raises those concerns. She asked how she could raise her concerns if the Board was not in a personnel session.

Chancellor Rogers stated that Dr. Harter presently has a binding contract lasting through June 2008. The Board cannot unilaterally change that contract in any way. It is a binding contract. The contract stipulates that if she performs certain services she gets paid. UNLV’s Foundation has requested that the contract be amended. The new contract will not be between the Foundation and Dr. Harter. The Board has prohibited the foundations from having contracts with the presidents. UNLV’s Foundation will provide the funds. At the moment, the Board has no legal capacity to review the present status of her contract. Chancellor Rogers told the Foundation that he felt there should be some performance standards in the contract for additional compensation. Legally he can only

5. Approved-Supplemental Presidential Compensation, UNLV – *Eqpvøf0+

do that when renegotiating her contract to provide her with additional compensation. He proposed to Dr. Harter that he would be more

than willing to support the proposal if the Foundation will provide the funds for additional compensation and the System gets something for that. If this is not done at this point and the Board increases her compensation it will create a new contract which cannot be modified during the remainder of the contract which will expire in 2008. He related that he and Dr. Harter had agreed that these terms are all reasonable. He said that Dr. Harter agreed with the modifications. He felt the Board should accept President Harter's willingness to sign the amended agreement. He felt it was fair to offer her more money with a requirement for certain performance standards. He related that the problems that he and Mr. Quirk had previously encountered had been resolved. He did not see any problem with the request.

Regent Howard stated that the Board was diillingn

the case if the [redacted] should [redacted]
have an agreement between [redacted]
included indicating that the [redacted]
the right to hire or fire her [redacted]
that contract through the [redacted]

5. Approved-Supplement
existing contract. He said [redacted]

Regent Rosenberg said he did [redacted]
Harter, adding that she should [redacted]
SEWASKEWAFROND/EDUW
inspired. He [redacted] that [redacted]
was also very concerned about [redacted] s
and asked to whom that president [redacted] w
difficult position. His first rea [redacted]
recognized that the chancellor [redacted]
first place. He questioned whether t [redacted]
indeed underpaid that the Board sh [redacted]
kind of situation.

Regent Williams thanked Mr. Quirk and the UNLV Foundation members for the proposal and congratulated President Harter on the vote of confidence. He said he was concerned about the precedent the Board might be setting. He thanked Ms. McMullen for expressing the concerns that she felt were necessary to be addressed before they implement any policies. He recognized the concerns expressed by Ms. McMullen and Regent Rosenberg. He said the time had come for private monies and agreed that UCCSN presidents are underpaid. Rather than a rush to judgment, he would vote against the motion and ask that it be tabled until the next meeting. He asked Mr. Quirk if it would create a problem for the Foundation to delay this for two months until the Board [redacted] Mske had co elat hae

not need to be determined solely by salary. She observed that coaches and athletic directors earn more than their presidents. She felt there was not necessarily a connection between what someone is paid and whether or not they have authority. She suggested the Board may need to reconsider its policy because the chancellor's salary comes from state funds. Regent Derby noted that the performance standards have been placed in the presidential evaluations. In this instance the Board is considering conditions of employment or non-employment. There are important changes that should be made to the presidential contracts with consultation. She indicated her support for the motion given that the chancellor and President Harter were in agreement with the terms.

Mr. Don Snyder, UNLV Foundation member, reported that he had served on the Executive Evaluation and Compensation Committee and thought that committee had already addressed these issues. He related that he had also participated in and understood the evaluation process. He has agreed to co-chair the capital campaign. He observed that

5. Approved-Supplemental Presidential Compensation, UNLV – *Eqpvøf0+

President Harter had been behind the success they had in raising money for UNLV and was fundamental to the success of raising \$400-\$54 Co e

Reputation for Excellence - P g x c f c a " k p u v k v w k q p u " q h " j k i j g t " g f w e c v k q p " y k n n " k p e t g c u g " v j g k t " p c v k q p c n . " t g i k q p c n . " c p f " u v c v g y k f g
t g r w v c v k q p " d c u g f " q p " v c t i g v g f . " q w v u v c p f k p i . " k p p q x c v k x g " r t q i t c o u " c p f " q v j g t " c e e q o r n k u j o g p v u 0
Principle - Excellence in a n

7. Denied-Handbook Revision, Executive Evaluation Procedures – *Eqp\øf0+

of openness espoused by Interim Chancellor Rogers. He felt this was a way of making it non-public. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that she felt the interviewing process and the gathering of information should be done on a one-to-one basis with no public present. Under current law, the consultant brings the report to the Board in a closed personnel session. Regent Sisolak recalled the public had been allowed to attend previous interviewing sessions. He felt the revision would deny the public'

the presidential evaluations and that the external evaluator should report to the chancellor. The Board should hold the chancellor responsible. If he were to modify the proposal, they would still have a committee of Regents for the chancellor evaluation with the encouragement to hire an external evaluator.

Regent Seastrand offered a friendly amendment to continue to have a committee of Regents to evaluate the chancellor with the encouragement to hire an external evaluator. Regent Hill accepted the friendly amendment with the requirement that there be an external evaluator for the chancellor. Regent

7. Denied-Handbook Revision, Executive Evaluation Procedures – *Eqpvøf0+
Seastrand agreed. Regent Schofield accepted the conditions of the friendly amendment.

Assistant Chancellor Larson clarified that the current procedure for the periodic evaluation of the chancellor includes the use of only an external evaluator. Constituents to be interviewed includes Regents.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of order, observing that this was the second reading of the item and now everything was being changed. He asked whether the Board was back to a first reading. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen replied that every time these procedures are presented to the Board, they can be adopted, rejected or revised. She said the Board could either accept or revise the proposal.

Assistant Chancellor Larson clarified that the change involved the use of only an external consultant for the chancellor. Board as n ect

Regent Sisolak asked to return to the point of order. He th²o Òto the ked secon ae requikedy E laomh with thpø

ÅBoar en cyngñat thit , hadi al, the Boardy an either adæd, reber, or revise the ab] osa

8A 1 /H/MKH EOPITHE /KDVW D B HCG HTO /K /MOEDVBO EBXCH EKDO I /WKHEKDC E HCGH /K /DOXD /VBI /K /K A2 H1 HCCDC E B B /VMH

Regent Sisolak said that he did not want to approve the proposal just to get around the Open Meeting Law. He felt the Board should comply with the law. He noted that the consultants hired were usually other presidents. Assistant Chancellor Larson agreed, adding that they could also have served as one in the past. Regent Sisolak observed that most of these people know one another. He stated that the presidents would be evaluated by one of their peers and nobody else would hear what was said. He questioned the Board basing its decision on that. He asked whether the president had input to the selection of the evaluator. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that the presidents were asked for recommendations. The chancellor or his designee selects the evaluator. Potential evaluators are asked questions about personal friendships and reporting lines. Regent Sisolak asked whether the president's list was used. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that it was a starting point. She clarified there would be some one-on-one conversations, as well as group conversations. Open sessions will be held for the public to speak with the evaluator. Regent Sisolak established that one person would prepare the evaluation who had also been recommended by the president being evaluated. Assistant Chancellor Larson said they would be selected after their relationship had been discussed. She felt that occasional contact did not constitute a personal or professional relationship. Regent Sisolak felt there could be a situation where someone might not be so candid. He felt that the presidents would only recommend people whom they believed would provide a good recommendation.

Regent Derby stated that the principle of evaluation by one's peers is widely imbedded in our society as the most appropriate kind of evaluation. She agreed that no one was more qualified than someone who fully understands the range, breadth, and challenges of the

7. Denied-Handbook Revision, Executive Evaluation Procedures – *Eqpv0f0+
position. With regard to Regent Howard's concern about the Board delegating its authority, she noted that as a lay board of citizen trustees, the Board often delegates its authority to professionals. She felt this was another form of delegation to a professional who would bring the results back to the Board for a decision.

Regent Rosenberg asked the presidents how they would feel if the chancellor disliked them and selected someone who would torpedo them. He felt that one person conducting the evaluation was dangerous and did not make any sense. He felt this was one of the Board's responsibilities.

President Killpatrick stated that he made a recommendation for Dr. Huddleston, the president of Dixie College, whom he has never met before. President Killpatrick was looking for someone from a comparable institution offering 4-year and 2-year degrees. Former President Kerry Romesburg had made the recommendation to him. He said he was not stacking the deck or looking for someone with whom he worked. Regent Sisolak said he was not implying that he was doing so. President Killpatrick related that all of the presidents tried to be professionals and look for colleagues who can provide objective information.

President Carpenter stated that a board typically has a two-stage evaluation process. Comments are solicited from the campus constituent groups and the community regarding the president's performance. An equally important aspect is that a board typically works in coordination with a president to establish the objectives to be met. He felt the proposal ignored that aspect.

Regent Seastrand suggested that it made sense for the Board to have the same process for presidents and the chancellor with a committee. He suggested the Board may need to outline how that is done. He felt it was important for the Board to have goals. He asked how the evaluator would know who to contact regarding the goals. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that the goals, objectives, and the president's self-evaluation are provided to the evaluator so they have a clear sense of the terms.

Regent Derby noted the Board was considering the president's evaluation of a kind that is annual, with the focus primarily on goals. She said there was nothing to preclude the establishment of those goals during that session with the president.

Regents Anthony, Derby, Hill, Schofield, Seastrand, and Whipple voted in favor of the proposal. Regent nout yes. es_n e no gsosi jt ithig

to shorten the period of time between notification and termination of these faculty. Because Code amendments require two hearings, final action on the proposed amendment would take place at the December 2004 Board meeting.

Assistant Chancellor Larson reported this was the first reading for the proposal to shorten the notice of termination for non-tenured academic and administrative faculty as requested by the Board of Regents and the institution presidents. The only change: Administrative, non-tenured faculty would have a shortened period of time after their notice of non-reappointment dependent upon the number of years worked. During the first full or partial year of employment – 60 days Second year of employment – 90 days Third and subsequent years – 120 days after notice of non-reappointment. Currently the period can last for up to 23 months.

Regent Rosenberg agreed, adding that currently employees who have worked for the System for three years as non-tenured faculty are entitled to a full year's notice that the contract will not be renewed. Regent Rosenberg felt that non-teaching faculty/administrative faculty needed to have the same requirements/qualifications as teaching faculty in many cases, but were not allowed to earn tenure. The year was provided to complete the work and to discuss the situation with the System. President Harter stated that administrative faculty at most institutions now do not have lengthy notice provisions. He said that the current policy was inflexible when there was poor performance by an administrative staff member. Regent Rosenberg could not believe that someone would be terminated without everyone knowing well in advance that the performance was so bad that the employee should have been notified before July 1st. He felt that at least two or three meetings would have been conducted to discuss the lack of performance in any

which she viewed as an important property right of the institutions which controls the way in which faculty and students are able to interact with one another. She did not perceiv

respective vice presidents. Regent Sisolak asked who would determine the length of professional leave. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that the president would decide. Regent Sisolak established this would be done without the need for Board approval. Assistant Chancellor Larson agreed, adding that the presidents now have the ability to hire the vice presidents.

Motion carried. Regents Howard, Rosenberg, and Sisolak voted no. Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick were absent.

12. Approved-Handbook Reorganization, Chapters 1-7 – The Board approved Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson’s presentation of a reorganization of the Handbook and place them into a newly created structure. This revision edits each chapter making clarifying corrections where necessary and policy changes previously approved by the Board. In addition, any procedures removed from the Handbook and placed in the new structure are done so under the Board’s delegation of such authority to the chancellor. A similar revision of later chapters will be brought before the Board at the December 2004 and February 2005 Board meetings.

12. Approved-Handbook Reorganization, Chapters 1-7 –

Assistant Chancellor Larson credited the large amount of staff from the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs’ office. She related that the Handbook is very large. As revisions have been added over the years, it has become more and more complicated. The proposal creates a more user-friendly Handbook, removes procedures from the policy manual, and frees the Board from overseeing certain tasks, thereby delegating oversight of such tasks to the chancellor’s office. The reorganization of the Handbook will occur in phases:

- Chapters 1-7 – October 2004 Board meeting
- Chapters 8-14 – December 2004 Board meeting
- Chapters 15-20 – February 2005 Board meeting

The revision/reorganization corrects obvious errors and removes procedural provisions from the Handbook and places them in the parallel structure of the new Handbook. Section within the Handbook have not been moved, as numerous specific provisions within chapter and section. Procedures that do not appear in the Handbook are added to the new structure. A draft of the revisions was provided to the Board for review and comment. The Board has an opportunity to provide input on the Handbook and the reorganization. The Board will be asked to approve the reorganization of the Handbook at the October 2004 Board meeting. The Board will be asked to approve the reorganization of the Handbook at the December 2004 and February 2005 Board meetings.

Regent Banderet
revising the re

Regent Seastrom
Chancellor,
reorganization

Motion carried

Chair Anthony announced that the meeting will be held at 8:00 a.m. the following day so as not to delay the meeting.

Friday, December 2, 2005.

Chair Anthony recalled the Board had approved holding one-day meetings in 2005. Committees could either meet the day before the Board meeting or at another time. Chair Anthony said he had no preference.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether the Board could continue on the following day if they did not finish its business in one day. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen replied that they could if it was noted on the meeting agenda so that the public was on notice that the meeting could continue from one day to another until concluded. Regent Rosenberg asked what happens to business the Board fails to address. Chair Anthony replied that items not considered by the Board prior to adjournment would be put off until the next meeting. Regent Rosenberg asked whether the Board could schedule Thursday and Friday meetings and adjourn on Thursday if the business was completed. He observed that some items take more time than others. The only way to shorten the agenda is to put more items on the Consent Agenda, which further erodes the power of the Board and its responsibility. He was greatly disturbed by this. He suggested the Board think this over carefully. If the majority of the Board felt that one day was sufficient, they could reaffirm their decision. If not, he suggested they leave things the way they are.

Regent Derby observed that the Academic, Research, and Student Affairs Committee had decided to schedule meetings the afternoon before the Board meeting. She agreed that the timing required some consideration. She observed the Board was scheduling only five meetings in 2005. The concern is that the time between meetings could create problems and could mean more special meetings.

Regent Rosenberg felt the Board was allowing itself to be run as if it were a private business. While he did not object to good business practices, he felt that playing as though they were a private business was wrong. He felt the Board owed it to their constituents to take the necessary time to discuss the issues. He said it was dangerous to shorten the time allotted for meetings and that he would vote against the proposed schedule. He felt the Board should at least leave things the way they are and possibly even expand them.

13. Information Only-Notice of Intent to Repeal or Rescind Prior Board Item – *Eqvøf0+

Regent Sisolak said his only concern was that he personally would have trouble with possible two-day meetings causing difficulty with family issues.

Regent Hill expanded on Regent Rosenberg's comments, observing that the people of the state were also a constituency the Board should remember.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of reconsidering the vote. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Derby said it was not something that could not be reconsidered as the Board went forward with an opportunity to see how the proposed schedule works. She observed the Board had not tried one-day meetings yet and that it would be obvious if it was not working next year. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen agreed that the item could be brought forward on a future agenda. a e o p o d t a t

Chair Anthony asked whether the Board Chair could add a Thursday meeting after meeting on February 4th and discovering that one-day meetings do not work in April. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen replied that he would need to provide notice of Intent to Repeal and the item could be added to the April agenda.

Regent Seastrand suggested including such an item on the February agenda in case such a determination was made. It was agreed to do so.

Regent Rosenberg withdrew his motion.

Regent Rosenberg noted that the students, staff, and faculty of the University System are taxpayers of the state whom he would never forget.

Chair Anthony stated that the Board would keep the schedule as is. He noted that the committee c\$ld d d ke

Regent Sisolak withdrew his second. No action taken.

14. Approved-Strategic Plan, TMCC – The Board approved President Philip M. Ringle’s request for approval of TMCC’s Strategic Plan.

14. Approved-Strategic Plan, TMCC –

President Ringle reported that TMCC embarked on a large planning effort that will guide the development of the college over the next decade. A continuous effort requiring the involvement of the campus community in the process, it must be shared by each constituency. Each planning effort will be informed by and will inform all of the planning efforts. Over 200 campus members volunteered to be part of the process, President Ringle felt it was testimony to the campus’ desire to own the process and guide the college’s direction in the future. Five major planning initiatives are now taking place: Academic Master Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Institutional Self-Study, and a Marketing Plan. Northwest accreditation will occur next October. A recent marketing and branding study resulted in a new logo for TMCC, as well as a new advertising and marketing campaign.

TMCC’s Mission – TMCC creates a supportive intellectually and culturally dynamic environment by offering the following:

- General education programs.
- Transfer degree programs.
- Developmental education programs.
- Occupational/technical degrees and programs.
- Customized job training.
- Continuing education and recreational programs.
- Student and academic support services.

The college anticipates and responds to educational needs of individuals to achieve their goals, aspirations, and dreams.

Strategic Goals:

Academic Excellence – To foster an institutional culture that values, demands, and supports excellence in teaching and learning.

Sample activities:

- Implement a comprehensive, ongoing, college-wide assessment and validation of academic integrity and effectiveness in all programs.
- Develop and implement a college-wide mandatory program for assessment, advisement, and placement for new and continuing students consistent with their course of study.
- Develop and implement an Academic Master Plan.

Diversity – To foster an academic community that welcomes the opportunity to experience, examine, and learn from diverse physical, cultural, and ideological backgrounds while nurturing mutual respect.

Sample activities:

- Expand on current recruitment and retention practices for underrepresented students.
- Expand on current recruitment and retention practices for underrepresented faculty and staff.

14. Approved-Strategic Plan, TMCC –

Create curricula to help prepare students to live, work, and interact in a culturally pluralistic society.
Establish an office of Equity and Diversity to handle affirmative action, mentoring, orientation, and curricular integration projects.

Facilities – To provide effective and efficient development and use of facilities that is aesthetically pleasing, safe, environmentally friendly, and enhances the learning experience.

Sample activities:

- Develop and implement a Space Utilization Plan, maximizing efficiency.
- Implementation of System Space Study recommendations.
- Develop and Implement a TMCC Emergency Response Plan.
- Develop a Facilities Master Plan.

Finance and Institutional Effectiveness – To achieve college goals through responsible human and fiscal resource development and management.

Sample activities:

- Improve institutional finance management practices.
- Develop a comprehensive budget development system to ensure fiscal health of the institution.
- Improve institutional management practices.
- Develop a management system to facilitate decision-making.
- Ensure workload policies are fiscally sound and effective.
- Raise increased levels of alternative funding.
- Increase efforts to obtain alternative funding

Strategic Partnerships – To expand and to forge new, mutually beneficial partnerships, ensuring the vitality and relevance of or curriculum and programs, distinguishing TMCC as an integra_

about existing articulation agreements. President Ringle replied that TMCC has an articulation agreement with UNR. He said there had been a real change in the last few years since President Lilley had come to the university. Faculty are working better with one another in different areas. TMCC students transfer to other institutions besides those in Nevada. TMCC works out articulation programs with those institutions as well. Work is also done with the public schools and a nursing pipeline project was recently developed which accepts 11th grade students. Regent Whipple asked whether common course numbering uniformity had

14. Approved-Strategic Plan, TMCC – *Eqvøf0+

assisted these efforts. He also asked about articulation agreements outside the state. President Ringle replied that TMCC tries to work out articulation agreements with any university to which TMCC students may transfer. Regent Whipple asked whether the common course numbering had been of assistance. President Ringle replied that it had. He observed there were still areas where a department could skirt common course numbering by renumbering courses, though there were less examples of that.

Ms. Bridgett Boulton, Faculty Senate Chair-TMCC, stated that common course numbering had helped a lot. It has enabled faculty from different disciplines at the institutions to talk to one another. Issues still exist regarding how degree requirements are configured. Few 200-level requirements apply to the degree and are mainly elective. Community college faculty senses they are pushed out of a complete transfer. She said they were addressing it on a discipline-by-discipline and course-by-course basis. She felt the students benefited from a smoother transition process. Regent Whipple asked whether to quantify students. Ms. Boulton replied that it had increased a lot.

Dr. Jowel Laguerre, Vice President, Academic Affairs-TMCC, replied that discussion and cooperation between the institutional and the public schools had increased. He said that programs had been developed at NSU and GBC, TMCC could take these programs to offer its students. He said there was a new environment for cooperation. Regent Whipple asked how the new environment developed. Dr. Laguerre replied that it had increased.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Bandera, Howard, and Kirkpatrick were absent.

17. Information Only-Enrollments for Fall 2004 Semester - The presidents

17. Information Only-Enrollments for Fall 2004 Semester - *Eqpv0f0+

Interim President Patricia ME

18. Information Only-New Research Facility, Cancer Institute, UNR - President John M. Lilley presented information about the potential development of a new basic science medical research facility on the Reno campus, which involves a partnership between the University of Nevada, Reno's School of Medicine and the Nevada Cancer Institute.

President Lilley introduced Vice President, Health Sciences, and Dean, School of Medicine, Dr. John McDonald and Dr. Bill Murphy, formerly with the School of Medicine and now with the Nevada Cancer Institute.

Dean McDonald reported on an important opportunity in the next step of the evolution of the University of Nevada School of Medicine. He noted that the capital budget is severely limited in a rapidly growing state and that it was important to be parsimonious with the state dollars entrusted to the institution. Biomedical research is the bedrock upon which the foundation of modern medicine rests. It also attracts the best and brightest students, faculty and physicians and acts as an economic engine. The American

18. Information Only-New Research Facility, Cancer Institute, UNR - Association of Medical Colleges estimated that the direct economic benefit of biomedical research and health sciences institutions is approximately equivalent to one-half of all internet-related business. The University of Nevada, Reno is very highly ranked for its research efforts. Considering its small size, funding in terms of dollars per square foot or dollars per investigator in some departments ranges up to three times over the national average.

Dean McDonald stated this was an opportunity to take advantage of a novel private/public partnership. The Nevada Cancer Institute took a leadership role in devoting dollars to a developmental project to create a model for a new biomedical research building on the UNR campus. The model is a shared facility with investigators from the Nevada Cancer Institute working side-by-side with investigators from UNR on important biomedical questions. The funding is somewhat unique. The plan is to utilize indirect cost recovery from grants to offset the bond payment to build the building. Indirect cost recovered from grants would be totally committed to hiring new investigators, supporting graduate programs, and taking care of research from this point forward. Currently, space is extremely limited. There is no ability to expand. Dean McDonald requested Board support in recovering the 25% indirect cost recovery which currently goes into the general fund, and apply it specifically towards the purpose of building a new biomedical research structure on the UNR campus.

Dr. Murphy reported that the Nevada Cancer Institute's mission comprised bench to bedside, promoting research, and promoting cures. To achieve this requires partnerships and tapping into existing infrastructures. The Nevada Cancer Institute is committed to be the state cancer emphasis, which will require a north and south presence. This will allow the Institute to tap into existing research and academic infrastructures providing a logical partnership. He related that current National Institute of Health funding is reaching all-time lows, which is anticipated to continue until 2008-09. This creates a very competitive environment for grants. NIH wants the research conducted in the most efficient manner possible. Nevada will only grow and succeed in research by exhibiting synergy. A Reno presence will provide more accessibility to the northern Nevada Cancer Institute. Biotechnology investment is already starting to occur. He related that both the Institute and UNR would benefit from recruiting more talented faculty to educate students and graduate students. Dr. Murphy reported that the Nevada Cancer Institute was committed to having a Reno presence and a research program in Reno. He related that he heads the cancer immunology program. He felt that having a north-south interaction would benefit everyone. He related that UNLV, UNR, and the Nevada Cancer Institute would all work together in a true partnership. In order to maintain this support, it is intended that Dr. Murphy's research brings in \$1.3 million per year, paying for thirteen people in a small lab. This will only grow by having the Nevada Cancer Research Institute establish a Reno research presence. He said it would establish a true private/academic partnership. Most of the leading research institutes in the United States are devoted to cancer. Cancer provides a unifying force that will tie together many different disciplines. He felt it was imperative to show support at a state level and that the partnership would be important for the state.

18. Information Only-New Research Facility, Cancer Institute, UNR - that he related information only can't identify it, so you should contact the Regent Director of Health Services, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR))

Interim Vice Chancellor Seibert reported that challenges such as Nevada faces require reliable information. The System's current information system does not have the capability of managing UCCSN. The management information systems are 10-15 years old and are housed in silos. Financial, student, and personnel information reside in different databases, working under different software programs, and do not exchange information. In order to make management decisions, one must extract data from the silos, assemble it, and conduct an analysis. This requires money and time, and is so awkward, that often it does not occur. Additionally, the System is missing vital functionalities. The Legislature has noticed these inadequacies. A report from the ,tdget

Chair Anthony asked whether the search for a vice chancellor had started. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied they had not. Since a search is also being conducted for a chancellor, it was felt that, often, it can be beneficial for the chancellor to have input into the hiring of their vice chancellors. She felt that an

Recommend actions to the Board of Regents and Legislature.

A consortium of well-known consultants was hired to perform an analysis of the state's current situation and future directions for the higher education system to support the state's goals for economic development and progress.

Issues facing Nevada:

Accommodating Growth – the state has a large potential for growth in the age cohort that would be attending college if capacity was available.

20. Approved Report on Legislative Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs

*CD425+ – *Eqpvøf0+

The Education Pipeline – getting more students through the system starting in the 9th grade and completing through high school and college.

Workforce for the Future – technology information to workers and adult literacy will affect the economy of the state as the state becomes more diversified, especially considering the population of young people who do not graduate from high school.

Workforce Needs – responding to the needs of the state's workforce *vgcejgtu."pwtugu."cpf"qvjgt"jgcnvj"ectg"rtqhgaukqpcnu+.

Economic diversification – increasing capacity and competitiveness in research.

Peer institution comparison findings of the consultant:

Nevada institutions are generally funded at appropriate levels *gzegrV"EEUP+.

UCCSN institutions appear to be allocating funds in appropriate ways.

Faculty salaries are very competitive, especially at UNR and UNLV.

Faculty are not tenured at abnormally high levels.

Student/teacher ratios are relatively low, and each campus has an inventory of small programs that can be reviewed.

Of the students enrolling in higher education as freshmen, particularly at the community colleges, relatively low percentages exit with credentials.

Nevada has efficient campuses, but a high-cost system.

Summary of adopted recommendations:

24 formal recommendations adopted and one bill draft requested.

Bill draft requested – establish a new interim committee, the Committee to Advance Higher Education in Nevada, to assist in the promulgation of the adopted recommendations.

Limit enrollment at the universities and create four-year program capacity at baccalaureate institutions.

As a general rule, avoid four-year programs at community colleges. Recognizing that there may be circumstances where such four-year programs could be justifiable

Develop and reach agreement on a strategic-level financing plan for Nevada's higher education system.

The UCCSN should develop internal reallocation recommendations prior to the 2005-07 interim for further consideration and address high priority areas such as the health care and teaching professions.

~~Regent Dallas to prepare initial recommendations for the financing plan. Recommendations developed by consultant. Report Committee to the Board of Regents and the Legislature, under the leadership of the chancellor's office, develop and reach agreement on a strategic level financing plan for the higher education system of Nevada. The financing plan should address several issues, including devising a strategy for accommodating growth creating a performance funding pool to provide incentives to address the leaky K-16 pipeline establish minimum funding levels to fulfill institutional missions evaluating shares of institutional budgets that will be born by the state.~~

20. Approved Report on Legislative Committee to Evaluate Higher Education Programs

*CD425+ – *Eqpvøf0+

levels. She did

Regent Seastrand observed that the money that is spent at the end of the year could potentially be saved to start a statewide needs-based program.

Regent Hill asked whether there were other aspects contributing to a high-cost system other than enrollment in research institutions. Regent Derby replied there were none that she recalled. She noted that it included all the costs associated with it. Senior Research Analyst, Ms. Crystal McGee, replied there may be, however, the consultant focused his research on enrollment patterns at the System level.

Regent Dondero observed that many states with need-based scholarships require the students to remain in the state to work.

Motion carried. Regents Alden, Bandera, Howard, and Kirkpatrick were absent.

The meeting recessed at 11:18 a.m. on Friday, October 15, 2004, and reconvened at 11:33 a.m. with all members present except Regents Alden, Bandera, Howard, and Kirkpatrick.

Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen acknowledged and introduced Deputy Attorney General Neil Lombardo, who was asked to participate in the two personnel sessions scheduled. The first personnel session was withdrawn. It was noted on the agenda that this personnel session may be held in open session if a motion is not made to go into closed session. She related that the chancellor had suggested this occur in open session. If no motion is made to go into closed session, the Board would proceed in open session. Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen then discussed the scope of the item. Under Nevada law, a meeting can be held to consider the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual. The focus of this session must address the performance of the chancellor.

21. Information Only-Personnel Session, Chancellor James Rogers - Regents Marcia Bandera, Linda Howard, Tom Kirkpatrick, and Brett Whipple requested that a personnel session be held concerning Chancellor Rogers.

~~with the of s of Howard as well as Uippo~~

21.1 Open Session - An open personnel session was held regarding Chancellor Rogers, in compliance with and for the purposes set forth in the Board Policy Manual. The session was held in open session. The agenda item was removed from the agenda. The agenda item was removed from the agenda. The agenda item was removed from the agenda.

21.1 Open Session - *Eqvøf0+

Regent Whipple recalled that when Chancellor Rogers first took office, a major concern was private financing. He noted that Chancellor Rogers had been very involved in UNLV and NSC, even serving as NSC's first Foundation chairman. He said he was well aware of what was supposed to have been done over a period of years, the problem had been in the area of private financing. He asked the Chancellor's input regarding where the System is now and where they should go for the remainder of his term. Chancellor Rogers replied that he had been very involved at UNLV and NSC, even serving as NSC's first Foundation chairman. He said he was well aware of what was supposed to have been done over a period of years, the problem had been in the area of private financing. He asked the Chancellor's input regarding where the System is now and where they should go for the remainder of his term.

Governor and legislative committees regarding this. He said that NSC is central to the future success of the

21.1 Open Session – *Eqvøf0+

System. He said he was constantly reminded that he tends to talk more about the universities and state college and to omit the community colleges. He felt the community colleges were also important. He views no difference amongst any of the institutions, adding that they were all necessary in order to make this a first-class system.

With respect to CCSN, which sorely lacks facilities, Chancellor Rogers and Vice Chancellor Neel have met with several private contractors in Las Vegas trying to develop public/private partnerships where a private company would build a building to be repaid over time. He related they need to develop an income stream. Thus far, they have been unable to identify an income stream that is adequate to amortize a project of this magnitude. He said that he talks with at least one major contractor every week who has a proposal and an idea for doing the same. While in Tucson, he met with a former U.S. senator who offered to arrange a meeting with the Arizona chancellor to discuss the development of separate financing sources. The City of Phoenix is preparing to issue \$100 million in bonds to pay for construction of new buildings. In discussing this model with President Harter, she related that the state of New York employs a ratio for providing funds: one-third from the students, one-third from the local cities, and one-third from the state legislature. He acknowledged a general reluctance by any elected official to discuss taxing individuals or students. Chancellor Rogers said that he has no political aspirations. He, Chair Anthony, and Vice Chair Derby will meet with the chancellor of the Maricopa County System in Phoenix to see what can be accomplished. He said he was very comfortable at this point with where the System is. He hoped that 95% of his time in the future would be spent raising money. The previous day's vote by the Board to allow the Foundation to supplement President Harter's salary will create a new wave of participation by foundations in the state. State University of New York, Binghamton, previously known as Binghamton State University, has announced that it will become an independent, private law school. Chancellor Rogers said that more contact with the private sector was required. They will need to make the private sector feel comfortable with what we do, without abdicating the operation of the UCCSN.

Upon leaving the chancellor's office, Chancellor Rogers hopes to continue raising funds for the System. He anticipates participating in both UNLV's and UNR's capital campaigns.

Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen stated that Chancellor Rogers' comments were in the nature of a self-evaluation and a report of his performance.

Regent Whipple commended and thanked Chancellor Rogers. He expressed his appreciation for the chancellor always making time to speak to each of the Regents, adding that his share of time was so important. Chancellor Rogers related that he has shared his home telephone number with the Board and the System and pledged that he is a bit of the "Lone Ranger" type and apologized. He said

21.1 jletumber Cdnber_f r; jld capital campn apita rsn, gertcommgertiiiiiwiz- t t t of_rs#n e fa bapfel tyas

Regent Seastrand moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Hill seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Sisolak, and Whipple were absent.

23. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the Audit Committee met October 14, 2004 and received a follow-up response for one internal audit report presented at the March 2004 meeting. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Assistant Vice Chancellor, reported that the institution bank reconciliations are up-to-date. The Committee received an update on the Legislative Counsel Bureau audit. The Validity and

23. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations – *Eqpvøf0+

Reliability of Enrollment Data and Investment Policies audit reports that were presented to the Legislative Commission's Audit Subcommittee on September 22, 2004 were reviewed. The remaining audits of Construction, Hosting, Intercollegiate Athletics, Administrative Costs, and Faculty Workload will presented to the Legislative Commission's Audit Subcommittee on December 7, 2004. Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mr. Buster Neel, reviewed reports received from Moody's and Standards & Poor's related to the UCCSN bond rating. The Committee requested three follow-up items for the December Audit Committee meeting. System Computing Services will report on the current status of the Disaster Recovery Plan. The LCB auditors will be requested to report on the total cost of the audit they performed under AB 148. A review of the request for an internal audit of UNR Parking Services during the Budget and Finance Committee meeting will be performed by the Internal Audit Department. Regent Hill requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

Internal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended approval of the following Internal Audit Reports *Tgh0"Q"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg Dqctf"qhkeg+:

Center for Academic Enrichment & Outreach, UNLV *Tgh0"C/4"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

Student Health Center, UNLV *Tgh0"C/5"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

Office of International Students & Scholars, UNLV *Tgh0"C/6"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

Office of International Students & Scholars, UNR *Tgh0"C/7"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

International Student Services, CCSN *Tgh0"C/8"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

UCCSN South File Server *Tgh0"C/9"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

Audit Department Work Plan – The Committee recommended approval of the Internal Audit Department work plan for the year ending June 30, 2005 *Tgh0"C/:"qp"hnkg"kp"vjg"Dqctf"qhkeg+.

DRI Exemption – The Committee recommended approval of an exemption for the year ended June 30, 2004 from the audit requirements stated in Title IV, Chapter 10, Section 10, B1 for the DRI Research Parks, Ltd. Foundation.

Regent Hill observed that the uncertainty in personnel noted by Moody's was directly responsible for their unwillingness to upgrade the bonds.

Regent Hill moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Seastrand seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden, Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Sisolak, and Whipple were absent.

24. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations – Regent Douglas Roman Hill reported the Budget & Finance Committee met October 14, 2004 and heard the following reports:

History of the University of Nevada, Reno and University of Nevada, Las Vegas parking services self-supporting budgets for the past six years and discussion of

24. Approved-Budget & Finance Committee Recommendations – *Eqpvøf0+

related issues raised by representatives of the State of Nevada Employees Association *UPGC+.

~~Regent Seastrand moved approval of the Board of Regents' Approved Budget to Actual – The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2003-04 Accountability Report reconciling the Board of Regent-approved budget to the fiscal year-end actual revenues and expenditures.~~

D

State accountability, reconciling the fiscal year 2003-04 Board of Regents-approved state operating budget to the fiscal year-end actual revenues and expenditures.

UCCSN Fiscal Exceptions of self-supporting budgets for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2003-04.

Self-supporting budget revisions for the first quarter of fiscal year 2004-05.

State supported operating budget transfers between functions for the first quarter of fiscal year 2004-05.

Institutional operational efficiencies implemented by the UCCSN campuses through fiscal year 2003-04 to increase productivity and thereby reduce waste and cost.

Regent Hill requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:

Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Accountability Report – Board of Regents' Approved Budget to Actual – The Committee recommended approval of the fiscal year 2003-04 Accountability Report reconciling the Board of Regent-approved budget to the fiscal year-end actual revenues and dard of Reg r he fisc, pportirang 0p le

Regent Hi

