

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
Foundation Building, Events Room
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas
Thursday-Friday, December 2-3, 2004

Members Present: Dr. Stavros Anthony, Chair

Mr. Mark Alden
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: Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick

Others Present: Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers

Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson
Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Buster Neel
Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Chris Chairsell
Interim Vice Chancellor, Technology, Becky Seibert
Chief Counsel Dan Klaich
Assistant Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen
President Richard Carpenter, CCSN
Special Assistant to the President, Dr. Rand Key, CCSN
President Stephen Wells, DRI
President Paul Killpatrick, GBC
Interim President Pat Miltenberger, NSC
President Philip Ringle, TMCC
President Carol Harter, UNLV
President John Lilley, UNR
President Carol Lucey, WNCC
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were faculty senate chairs Dr. Terry Jones, CCSN Dr. Vic Etyemezian, DRI Ms. Kathy Schwandt, GBC Dr. Edward Baldwin, NSC Ms. Bridgett Boulton, TMCC Dr. Jane McCarthy, UNLV Dr. Leah Wilds, UNR Mr. Richard Kloes, WNCC and Ms. Sara Velez Mallea, System Administration. Student government leaders present included Ms. Michelle Hammond Urain, GBC Ms. Nichole Shaffer, NSC Mr. Joel Gutierrez, TMCC Mr. Henry Schuck, UNLV Mr. Erin Lankowsky, UNR Mr. George Ambriz, UNLV-GPSA Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, UNR-GSA and Ms. Jenny Gentine, WNCC.

Vice Chair Jill Derby called the meeting to order at 7:40 a.m., on Thursday, December 2, 2004 with all members present except Regents Anthony, Hill, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak.

1. Information Only-Personnel Session, President Philip Ringle – The Board held a personnel session concerning President Philip Ringle.

1.1 Approved-Moving to Closed Session – The Board approved moving to a closed personnel session regarding President Philip Ringle, in compliance with and for the purposes set forth in NRS 241.030

Regent Bandera moved approval of moving to a closed personnel session. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Anthony, Hill, Kirkpatrick, and Sisolak were absent.

The

m. Chancellor
seven months prior.
eat

f oa
im
eadptio
ffort to realize the
th some
siness and cultural
ffe,elf oa

Campus-wide asbestos survey 185,000
TOTAL: \$621,000

- (7) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – ~~The Board~~ approved President Carol C. Harter's request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws to clarify who may vote on tenure applications _____
- (8) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws to establish standards and procedures for mid-tenure review for the campus _____
- (9) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws, which are non-substantive in content _____
- (10) ~~\$60,000~~ Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws Revision, UNLV – ~~The Board~~ approved President Carol C. Harter's request for revisions to the UNLV Bylaws, which are non-substantive in content _____

Mrs. Carla Henson, Director, Human Resources-System Administration, reported that the Board made the decision to adopt the 75th percentile case as the midpoint in April 2000 based on data provided by a consultant review and presented by former Vice President, Administration & Finance-UNR, Dr. Ashok Dhingra. She related that it was an oversight that the Handbook was never changed.

(6) Approved-Handbook Revision, Salary Schedule –

Regent Hill moved approval of the Handbook revision concerning the salary schedule. Regent Dondero seconded. Motion carried. Regent Sisolak voted no. Regent Rosenberg abstained. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

(11) Approved-Handbook Reorganization, Title IV, Chapters 8-14 –

The Board approved Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson's request for suggested organizational changes to the _____ with the exception of the section addressing periodic/annual reporting of diversity data _____. The proposed revisions remove certain provisions from the _____ and place them into the new _____. In addition, this revision will clarify language and correct obvious errors where necessary. During the October Board meeting, members approved the reorganization of Chapters 1 through 7. The reorganization of the final batch of chapters will be presented for approval at the February 2005 Board meeting _____

Relative to Title IV, Chapter 8, Page 4, Regent Sisolak asked whether the minority reporting would be conducted periodically. Senior

Respectfully,

Meadowood Center – full-service education center, student ce

Regent Rosenberg observed that the plans made it look like a real campus.

Chair Anthony entered the meeting.

6. Approved-Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR –

Phase III building.
Las Vegas Campus Horizon 2 -
230,000-gsf .
Structured parking.
Phase IVa.
Phase IVb.
Phase V.
Museum addition.

Chair Anthony left the meeting.

Next steps include following the facilities master plan:
Construct Maxey Science Center addition.
Secure funding for visualization laboratory .

- Create the western half of the new east campus, including new buildings and new mall.
- Construct new buildings at the agricultural sciences campus.
- Expand private research affiliates.
- Construct new university and/or private sector residential development.
- Improve North Wells Avenue to a four-lane boulevard, including bike lanes.
- Widen selected sections of Highland Avenue to a four-lane boulevard.
- Improve selected sections of Valley Road, including bike lanes.

Horizon 3:

- Complete the east campus, including new buildings and new mall.
- Complete the agricultural sciences campus.
- Construct a new 20,000-seat arena with center parking lot available for outdoor events.
- Renovate and expand existing residential area as affordable housing for faculty and staff.
- Complete Highland Avenue as a four-lane boulevard.
- Construct pedestrian bridge crossing Interstate 80

Regent Sisolak said that the plans included garages. He said he had never approved any plan with a garage because he does not believe in them. He noted that other institutions locate their parking on the campus perimeter and shuttle the students into campus. He said he would be voting no symbolically because he believed that parking must be on the perimeter except for emergencies.

Chair Anthony entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak said he was a little concerned or troubled about the property acquisition maps, feeling that they could fuel price increases. He felt that they were driving up some of the prices with notification of perspective land acquisitions. Provost Frederick acknowledged that it was a good point, adding that UNR was already experiencing that.

60 Approved Facilities Master Plans, TMCC, DRI, & UNR –

Regent Sisolak felt that more conversation only encouraged sellers to increase their prices.

Regent Sisolak fel.

7. Approved-10-Year/No-Cost Elko Clinic Property Lease, GBC –

Mr. Troyo

married student apartments in the Stead complex. Regent Sisolak thought that a commitment had been made to replace those units. Mr. Zurek said he could not say that they had been specifically replaced. UNR meets on a regular basis with developers for both undergraduate and graduate student housing. The problem remains that they require a cost basis and will need to charge a rate that will amortize the project. To date, they have not been able to make the numbers. Regent Sisolak suggested tent ha

Regent Sisolak asked whether the offer was made prior to conducting an appraisal or vice versa. Mr. Zurek replied that they retain the appraisal first. Regent Sisolak asked whether the appraisal came first² prior to co

The meeting then recessed for the evening at 5:55 p.m. and reconvened at 8:04 a.m., on Friday, December 3, 2004 with all members present except Regents Kirkpatrick, Schofield, Sisolak, and Whipple.

Chair Anthony reminded those present that the Board would begin conducting one-day meetings on Friday in February 2005. He explained that the standing committees must meet prior to the Board meeting date and that the committee chairs were responsible for scheduling those meetings. An agenda item will be included on February's agenda to allow the Board to reconsider the meeting schedule. If one-day meetings are not feasible, the Board will return to a two-day meeting cycle.

Regent Alden asked the Board Chair and Vice Chair, the chancellor, and legal counsel to carefully review the agenda items to determine which items can be included on the Consent agenda. Chair Anthony agreed to do so.

Chair Anthony explained that the Board would accept the Board Development Committee report and entertain its first discussion about the relationship between the chancellor, the Board, and the presidents. Specifically, the Board would discuss the chancellor's role in the contract regarding discipline and contract termination. Since this could entail a Bylaw change, this would constitute the first reading of the request. Following this discussion, a Bylaw change will be drafted and brought forward to the Board for action

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Thalia Dondero reported the Board Development Committee met November 3, 2004 and recommended that the Regent orientation be held on December 16th at 1:00 p.m. with all Regents requested to attend. The Committee continued to review the proposed addendum to presidential contracts, which includes a mechanism for disciplining short of termination. The Committee asked to review it again at their December 1, 2004 meeting. The Committee then continued its discussion on Chancellor/Board relationships. Regent Derby submitted substitute language for consideration. Regent Rosenberg suggested substituting the word "discipline" for "terminate." The Committee agreed to recommend bringing the issue to the full Board in December with the reference material.

The Committee also met on December 1, 2004, with all Committee members present in addition to Regent Alden. The Committee set dates for new Regent orientation on December 16, 2004 and for a Board workshop on March 10, 2005. The Committee reviewed proposals for changes to the Regents' Bylaws dealing with the role of the chancellor and the discipline of presidents, and also reviewed a proposed standard addendum to presidential contracts dealing with discipline. The Committee noted that there was overlap between the two documents and directed counsel to prepare a proposed Bylaw change, which incorporated the provisions of the contract addendum into the Bylaws thereby delegating the power to discipline presidents to the chancellor. The Committee directed counsel in preparing the Bylaw change that the decision of the chancellor to terminate a president under the serious circumstances set forth should be final. With this change, the Committee approved sending the proposed Bylaw change to the full Board. The Chair noted that this referral to the Board would constitute notice of intent to change the Regents' Bylaws, which could be discussed at the next meeting, but which could not be voted upon until the next succeeding meeting. Copies of the Committee's proposed Bylaw change were provided to each Board member. Regent Dondero noted that the provisions of the Bylaw change are the identical provisions of the contract addendum, which all Board members received as Reference I in the agenda packet, with the changes she mentioned.

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report –

Regent Dondero moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report, understanding that the Bylaw change is forwarded to the Board not for acceptance at this time but for review, discussion, and to give notice of a proposed change to the Bylaws which can be acted upon at the next Board meeting. Regent Alden seconded.

Chair Anthony referred to a handout regarding the Bylaws of the Board of Regents

Regent Alden referred to a 2003 LCB position paper that discussed higher education governance in the state.

Regent Sisolak entered the meeting.

Regent Alden reported that the position paper referred to a 1917 report on higher education governance. At that time there was only one institution of higher learning in Nevada. The issue addressed in that paper warned about the meaning of higher education governance, and constituted the same issue under discussion that day. He read two paragraphs from Background Paper 03-05, background information education governance that was published by the LCB research division:

Regent Alden observed that the 1917 report warned against a meticulous attention to detail of administration by the Board of Regents. The report cited three main activities: 1) Determination of general policies of the institution in consultation with executive officers 2) The appropriation of monies and the approval of distribution of the appropriations made by the proper appropriating bodies 3) The appointment of institutional employees on the recommendation of the institution executives. He related that if the Board attempted to obscure executive functions they would have a lot of problems. He stated that the chief executive officer was the chancellor. The Board sets policy, but the chancellor runs the System.

Chair Anthony asked Chief Counsel Klaich or Regent Dondero to walk the Board through the handout document pointing out the important issues.

14. Approved-Board Development Committee Recommendations and Report –

Regent Seastrand noted a point of order. He observed that the motion was to make a recommendation that the Board would not be voting upon at this time. He suggested the Board accept the report and then address the item that covers this material. Chair Anthony replied that if the Board voted they would be done with that particular agenda item, which would preclude discussion. Regent Seastrand asked whether other items on the agenda would allow such discussion.

Chief Counsel Klaich reported that Board members had all received Reference I, which was a recommendation for a standard addendum to presidential contracts for discipline for cause to be included in presidential contracts. The Board discussed this item at its last Board meeting, prior to the Board Development Committee meeting. Simultaneously, the Committee was considering a proposed Bylaw change, which set forth a new and different role for the chancellor under the Code

, which discussed delegating the right to discipline presidents to the chancellor and to terminate presidents in extraordinary circumstances. The Bylaw change dealt with extraordinary circumstances and provisions in the University Code for extraordinary circumstances for removing a faculty member from their position. The Committee realized there is overlap between these two. They seem to define different things “for cause”. The Committee determined the more appropriate method of proceeding would be to refer the matter to the Board for discussion to review the substance of the addenda for dealing with discipline of presidents. Committee recommended that the chancellor be given the authority to discipline and directed counsel to make the necessary changes to the Bylaws. The Board referred the question of whether or not the chancellor’s decision should be final. Reference I, Section 4.d. indicates that the chancellor’s decision could be reviewed by the Board. The Committee recommended in the Bylaw change that the decision be final. Those are the two changes referred to in 2 ntia changes reCommit² a fopeci Board fohe

support that. He said that he was told that the reason that the Board was contemplating this kind of language and action was to give the chancellor "teeth". The Board currently gives the chancellor authority but no teeth. He felt that a good chancellor leads by respect and trust, and not by fangs and a baseball bat. He said he was growing exceedingly nervous the more he saw of this kind of thing. He recalled that Interim Chancellor Rogers had said that, "I trust the Board more than I trust the Governor." He said that as long as it was Governor Guinn, he had no problem, but one never knows what one is apt to get. He observed that the Board was in the same situation. The Board sejeex

authority were delegated at the head, it would not work well and could discourage institutions from being entrepreneurial and creative. That is the balance with which the Committee has been struggling. The Board is trying to determine just the right balance so that the chancellor's hand is strengthened and has adequate authority to make the system work. She agreed it was not an easy conversation.

Regent Whipple entered the meeting.

Regent Derby observed that, currently, the presidents serve at the pleasure of the Board and there is no appeal process. She felt it was important for the Board to retain the authority in case something goes awry and the health and vitality of an institution is at stake. The Board has to retain the authority to make a quick decision and to remove a president. The issue of the Board having the authority and choosing to delegate it to the chancellor is the primary issue. Normally, the relationship between a board and a chancellor is very close. It would be very unusual for a chancellor to take action that was inconsistent with the will of a board. She noted that the wording specified "extraordinary circumstances" when action needs to be taken quickly. Under normal circumstances, the chancellor would approach the Board. She felt the recommendation appropriately strengthens the chancellor's hand in managing a system.

Regent Rosenberg said that he understood that presently there is no appeal. He observed that was the Board's decision and not an individual's. He noted that the Board has had chancellors in the past that they would not trust with this kind of power.

Regent Whipple said that she had a slight difference between the presidents currently not having an appeal to the Board and a situation that would allow the president to approach the Board and make their case in a full-blown manner. She stated that the Board would be taking the opportunity in some instances to present a full-case to the Board. She was slightly confused about the purpose of this change in the board for this is not delegating authority, but rather deletion and a change of authority. The Bylaw change gives the authority away to the chancellor. She asked whether the Board was doing this because it is more effective or efficient. She asked whether there was a closer relationship providing a better observation and comprehension of the circumstances.

Regent Alden thanked Regent Hill for his thoughtful comments. He acknowledged that this was not easy. He has always felt that the Board should not hire or fire presidents, but he

anyone being denied the right to appeal. All he was asking is that the presidents have the right to appeal.

Chair Anthony said that Board members had a couple of months to consider the matter and that it would be included on the next meeting agenda.

Motion to approve the Board Development Committee recommendations carried. Regent Kirkpatrick was absent.

The meeting recessed at 9:27 a.m. on Friday, December 3, 2004, and the Board convened as Members of the Corporation for the UCCSN institution Foundations' reports with all members present except Regents Bandera, and Kirkpatrick.

15. Information Only-Foundation Reports - The Board reviewed presentations from the institution foundations.

The meeting reconvened at 10:58 a.m. on Friday, December 3, 2004, with all members present except Regents Derby, Kirkpatrick, Schofield, and Seastrand.

Chair Anthony noted that the item regarding "Standard Addendum to Presidents' Contracts" had been withdrawn.

Regents Derby and Schofield entered the meeting.

16. Approved-President's Contract, TMCC – The Board approved the employment terms and conditions for TMCC President Philip Ringle.

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the presidential contract for TMCC President Philip Ringle. Regent Hill seconded.

Chair Anthony reported that the terms of the contract had been distributed to the Regents _____ :

Commencing January 1, 2005, President Ringle's base salary will be \$180,000.

President Ringle shall be granted tenure at Truckee Meadows Community College upon approval of this Second Addendum by the UCCSN Board of Regents.

The term of the Employment Agreement is extended for a period which shall commence on January 1, 2005 and run through June 30, 2009.

Fringe benefits _____ shall be the same as provided to other professional UCCSN employees.

Chair Anthony asked General Counsel Klaich to explain the attached addendum.

General Counsel Klaich noted that the actions of the Board in bringing forth a Bylaw change were out of sync with the renegotiation of these contracts. He noted that Board members had expressed concern for sending any negative message to the campuses with respect to the outstanding performance of these two presidents by withdrawing their contracts from this agenda. He suggested to the chancellor, and discussed with Presidents Ringle and Killpatrick, that the more appropriate avenue to follow would be to attach the standard language with no changes. Regarding the item that provides for presidential discipline, in this addendum there is no delegation of discipline from the Board to the chancellor. It includes the language, "or to the chancellor if delegated." There are appeal rights in the standard addendum exactly as the Board has previously seen. With the review and approval of both President Ringle and President Killpatrick, the contract provides that if the Board should not adopt a Bylaw change with respect to presidential discipline that this addendum will drop from their contracts in its entirety. The contract further provides that if the Bylaw change is adopted _____ that the appeal rights in the contract would be deleted. The intent is not to usurp the Board's power to discuss this item fully and to bring these two contracts into line, as much as possible, with the other presidential contracts. The two critical items in this standard addenda language are: 1) the delegation and 2) the appeal. There is no delegation in this contract and there are appeal rights. If the Board subsequently determines that either of those should be changed, it has been discussed with the two

16. Approved-President's Contract, TMCC –

presidents in advance and they are prepared to live by the subsequent decision of the Board.

Regent Alden thanked Chief Counsel Klaich and Assistant Chief Counsel Nielsen for providing clarity and urged the Board to approve the agenda item as presented.

Regent Rosenberg clarified that they were essentially signing a blind contract because it could go either way. Chief Counsel Klaich replied that he would not characterize it in that fashion. At the last Board meeting, the question was raised whether the Board could bifurcate its decision on compensation and presidential discipline. Counsel advised that it could not be done because once the decision is made there is no consideration for changing the contract. Hence, staff is recommending this technical legal avenue. He did

not feel they were signing a blank check. There are two possible ultimate outcomes. The presidents have agreed that there will be a provision in their contract for discipline for cause. Should the Board determine that no such provision will be included in their Bylaws, it will be deleted in its entirety from their contracts. With respect to the appeal rights, the proposed addenda to the contract stipulates that any decision of the chancellor is appealable to the Board if the authority to discipline presidents is delegated to the chancellor. Presidents Ringle and Killpatrick have graciously indicated that should the Board determine otherwise that they are prepared to bring their contracts into conformity with the other presidential contracts.

Regent Sisolak observed that the first contract from June 1, 2001 through June 30, 2005. This contract begins January 1st. He asked if that had been done before. Chancellor Rogers replied that the contracts had been extended for one year with no evaluation. President Ringle indicated that he had not received a raise in the past few years because his evaluation had not been performed. He requested a four-year contract commencing on January 1, 2005. The Bylaws require that the contracts expire on a fiscal year. So a four-year contract commencing in January and ending in December.

~~CONFIDENTIAL - UNLV BOARD OF REGENTS~~

President Killpatrick thanked Regents Bandera and Howard for taking time out of their busy schedules to participate in his evaluation. He also thanked the Board for their support and for supporting the terms of his contract. He said it was still his pleasure to continue to serve as the president of Great Basin College. ~~CONFIDENTIAL - UNLV BOARD OF REGENTS~~

18. Approved-Final Form of Addendum to President's Contract, UNLV – The Board approved Interim Chancellor Jim R'm C

impacted. As the university invests in new buildings, new technologies, and new parking garages are built, will their incomes and lifestyles be diminished as the grand plan unfolds. Thus far, this appears to be what is happening. He said that their people were not very happy. In speaking with classified employees, they have discovered that students also feel somewhat impacted by this and are also unhappy. Mr. McKenzie suggested that it would be smart public policy to try to deal with this in a manner where classified employees are part of the vision and the grand scheme, so there is no negative impact when a new building displaces their parking for which they now must pay more. He said that this type

20. Information Only-SNEA Presentation on UNR Parking –

of growth policy was not helping to bring the classified employees to share the grand vision. Mr. McKenzie stated that SNEA's door is open for discussion. They have research resources for determining a better way to do this. They do not want to just complain, they would like to be part of the solution. Thus far, the meetings have not been meaningful discussions, and have been somewhat discouraging. Mr. McKenzie related that they had asked two of the workers representing classified employees to come forward to relate their stories. He said they were speaking from the perspective of their co-workers and had been asked by their co-workers to approach the Board. He introduced Mr. Dennis Meredith from UNR and Mr. Samuel Phillips from UNLV.

Mr. Dennis Meredith, Principal Development, Physics Dept-UNR, said that he was speaking on behalf of the UNR Parking Committee and the members of UNR's classified staff, faculty, and students who have expressed similar concerns. He said they have a legitimate grievance. He said they are the only state employees who have to pay the state to park on state property while working for the state. DMV is puzzled by this. When \$320 payment system was implemented, the parking department are capricious and arbitrary. As an example, at UNR employees pay \$320/year to park. The space in which he parks originally cost \$7.50/year in 1983 when his employment began. It is now \$320- to do this. This

Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, GSA Student Body President-UNR, reported that the least expensive parking on the UNR campus is \$65/year and is open to everyone. She said that no one is forced to pay for parking. As a community, students, faculty, and staff are all paying for growth on the campus. The employees are not singled out. She wondered why classified staff did not attend meetings where community issues are discussed. She suggested that this could be one of the reasons why classified staff are not feeling a part of the community and why parking has become such an issue. She said that growth is occurring on the campuses. The state cannot pay for it all, neither can the students. It needs to be shared as a community.

Mr. Erin Lankowsky, Student Body President-UNR, suggested a way for providing free parking. Currently, there is a Sierra Spirit shuttle that runs through downtown Reno. It is a free shuttle offered in partnership with UNR, the RTC, and some of the casinos. If employees would utilize free parking on the casino lots they could ride the free shuttle to the university. He said there is also parking available in the communities near his home – a five-minute walk to the campus. He observed that if the Board allowed classified staff to be exempt from paying for parking it would raise the price for the students. He strongly suggested that everyone should share the burden.

20. Information O t u,iStesid eStesid eStesid e dve

Regent Hill was concerned that anything moving forward from the Steering Committee be reviewed by the institutional financial officers in order to provide an idea of costs in these matters. He said they could not afford to be penny wise and pound foolish. He said that he was concerned about the financial implications, adding that some of the green concepts did not make financial sense. Regent Derby assured him that the Steering Committee will consider all of the issues and will include financial people and wide consultation throughout the System.

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

22. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the Audit Committee met December 2, 2004 and received follow-up responses for thirteen internal audit reports that were presented at the Committee's June 2004 meeting. Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Assistant Vice Chancellor-System Administration, reported on the current status of the Legislative Counsel Bureau audit. The LCB auditors have reported on their work on the Statewide Programs, Enrollment Data, and Investment Income portions of the audit. The auditors will report on their review of Hosting Activity, Intercollegiate Athletics, Faculty Workload, Administrative Costs, and Construction in January 2005. This will conclude the audit.

taken from bond

from UNLV must drive to the campus to pick it up. He related that daily deliveries are made from the library exchange. Dr. Conquest complained about this to UNLV and the chancellor's office and was told they would look into it. The letter he received indicated that UNLV would do it the way they wanted to because they are UNLV. He related that people want to use these videos in their classes. They can get books delivered, but not videos. In some cases, they can get them from the public library. UNLV has some of the older videos and are the sole source. He asked

28. New Business –

the Board to review the matter so that all of the campuses can take advantage of the material that has been purchased.

3. When Dr. Carpenter arrived, he requested information and help about raising money, promoting the school, and helping the community get more involved in the school. One of the options that Dr. Conquest suggested was for CCSN to have an online mall in which the Foundation would receive referral fees from community businesses. President Carpenter told Dr. Conquest to move forward on the project. He spent three months aligning over 200 businesses. It was designed to take advantage of the Christmas season. He then received an email from Mr. Eric Garner with the CCSN Foundation stating that they could not do this. Dr. Conquest observed it would be totally free for the school and would raise between \$20,000-\$50,000 per month. He said that he has previous experience with fundraising. He felt that his ideas were ignored. The problem is that CCSN needs cash and nobody wants to do anything to raise any money. His problem is that it is all lip service. The faculty and those who want to help receive no respect for trying to help.

4. Hiring practices presently being debated at CCSN. Over the last semester, a consultant was hired to recommend hiring practices. The recommendations look like they came from a Soviet, bureaucratic organization. Faculty's main objection is that the president and his assistant can override the hiring practices at any time, a problem which occurred with a different administration. Another problem is that the consultant recommended that people from different disciplines participate on the selection committee for different departments, things about which they know nothing. There is no guarantee that people from the affected departments will participate on the committee. According to the consultant, it will take 97 working days to interview candidates for a position, which does not include the advertising period. They are facing an entire semester in time to hire new employees. Candidates are turning down CCSN's offers because it is taking too long to complete a recruitment. He said the key was to work on maintaining the credibility of the hiring process, which takes so long that it is not a hiring process. At a recent meeting, a

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board