

# SPECIAL MEETING

VIDEOCONFERENCE  
BOARD OF REGENTS  
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA  
Sites: Conference Room, System Administration  
2601 Enterprise Road, Reno  
5550 W. Flamingo, Suite C-1, Las Vegas  
Berg Hall Conference Room, Great Basin College, Elko  
Reynolds Bldg., Rm. 102, Western Nevada Comm. College, Carson City  
Friday, March 18, 2005

Members Present: Dr. Stavros S. Anthony, Chair {Las Vegas}  
Mr. Mark Alden {Las Vegas}  
Dr. Jill Derby {Reno}  
Mrs. Thalia M. Dondero {Las Vegas}  
Mrs. Dorothy S. G

Works Board Mr. Scott Nash, Johnson Consulting and Ms. Kendra Follett, PricewaterhouseCoopers.

Board Chair Stavros Anthony called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. on Friday, March 18, 2005, with all members present.

1. Approved-Minutes – The Board approved the minutes from the NSC Presidential Search Committee meeting held December 8, 2004, the Special Board meeting held January 7, 2005, and the Technology Task Force meeting held January 7, 2005.

Regent Alden moved approval of the minutes from the NSC Presidential Search Committee meeting held December 8, 2004, the Special Board meeting held January 7, 2005, and the Technology Task Force meeting held January 7, 2005. Regent Dondero seconded. Motion carried.





Chancellor Rogers stated that they were reluctant to do so, adding that he wanted to keep their options opened. He was unsure what the final legislative appropriation to the UCCSN would be in addition to the \$96-\$98 million. He was hopeful it would be substantial.

Vice Chancellor Klaich addressed the CIP list, noting the unfunded priorities that had not been recommended for funding by the Governor

necessary to adjust the schedule in the best interests of the System. Regent Hill agreed that Interim Chancellor Rogers and V



there was a place to locate the building. Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that the Knowledge Center was an extraordinarily ambitious project that was approved by the Board. The project funding was set forth in three tiers. One tier of funding was approved by the State of Nevada, which was contingent upon the students picking up a tier of funding through increased fees. The third tier of funding is comprised of private giving of approximately \$22 million. The Legislature required the money to be raised within five years. The students agreed to the increased fees. UNR's Foundation has been proceeding with raising the \$22 million. When all of that is complete, construction of the facility will proceed.

Chair Anthony established that Regent Whipple was no longer on the telephone.

Regent Alden stated that the Board of Regents is a policy-making board responsible for the budget, operating, and capital. The Board sends that to the Legislature. In between those steps, there is all this micromanagement by the Board. He noted that changes occur (i.e., interest rates, construction costs). It is like the Board becomes a moving target and does not deserve it. Ultimately, this world and this government are not perfect. He said they were coping with incredible System needs. The System population has tripled in twelve years. He said the same questions have been asked for twelve years and many years before that. He said it was not easy and that was why they had to put it in someone else's hands or else they would be meeting every other day. The capital request process is always painful and cumbersome. He encouraged the Board to move on.

Regent Leavitt noted that the Board and chancellor wanted every project on the list to be funded. It is extremely difficult to list and prioritize them. It was his understanding that all of the presidents had cooperated substantially to arrive at agreement. He said he supported giving the chancellor the power to change the list as needed to move the business forward, and not to add and delete from the list. He supported providing the chancellor with that power. He felt the presidents should be congratulated for their cooperation.

### 3. Approved-Additional Discretion for Chancellor in Negotiating Items with the Legislature/Governor and Unfunded Priorities-Legislative Update – (Cont'd.)

Regent Rosenberg said they had a fundamental policy issue that required addressing. UNLV built a fine arts building. Originally, it was a certain size. The money was put forth and then it was determined there was not enough money. They could either stop the building or reduce the size of the building. They elected to downsize the building. As a result, they now have studios approximately the size of telephone booths. They do not do the job. He felt the Board should tell the chancellor that these are the priorities. He acknowledged that they did want to wheel and deal within reason. UNR desperately needs its Knowledge Center. Compromises have already occurred that will prevent the building from providing what is ultimately required. He asked whether it was worth building something that would not do the job. He did not feel that it was. He felt it was more important to convey to the Legislature what the actual needs are. He felt the Board should make the decision if one project must be compromised for another, even if it entailed extra meetings.

Regent Schofield stated that he served in the Legislature for 8 years. It was said that no one was safe as long as the Legislature was in session because it is so uncertain what will happen from day to day. He observed that the Board could depend upon this chancellor and could support his judgment. If his judgment is questioned in any manner, the Board can always meet. He felt the Board should provide him with the necessary latitude to achieve the System's needs.

Regent Derby observed that what the Board was proposing was not that radical. It was her understanding that the chancellor had that authority and the Board was simply clarifying that.

Regent Gallagher felt it was important for everyone to understand that the priority list would not come out in the same way it was presented. She observed that one institution's priority could change from one place to another at the whim of the Legislature. She did not want anyone to be disappointed if the priority list was not followed in the absolute order presented.

Vice Chancellor Klaich clarified that there really isn't any wheeling and dealing. He assured the Board that Chancellor Rogers is not trying to reorder the priorities and that he was fighting to get each of the projects



funded in their order of priority. As an example, during the last budget hearing Assemblywoman Giunchigliani



building this structure. He again asked the Board to move the project up in priority to ensure that students are being taught at a higher level.

Ms. Ezra related that the current space was inadequate, which prevented Nevada's students from gaining an enhanced level of learning. Because of the outdated labs that exist, some high schools in the area are better equipped than the current chemistry building on the UNR campus. The storage facilities for the chemicals are placed in overstocked rooms without sprinklers. To simply add a sprinkler system would cost more than \$40,000. Flammable chemicals are placed on wooden shelves, causing an unavoidable hazard without sprinklers. Approximately twice per year, classes must be evacuated for carbon monoxide problems. Aging science facilities do not provide an adequate environment for instruction and there is a concern for the safety and security of students. Laboratories are marginally compliant. She related that the new facility would relieve space constraints in the basic sciences that presently limit enrollments in these subjects. She said the students felt that this facility would be one step in the

### 3.1 Approved-Budget/CIP Reconsideration – (Cont'd.)

direction of developing UNR and UNLV as first-class research universities, as intended by Interim Chancellor Rogers.

Mr. Lankowsky related that this project has been listed, in some form or another, on the Regents' list for thirteen years. Pre-planning funds have been provided three times. Thirteen years ago, there were 11, 890 students on the UNR campus. This year, there are 15,469 students. The student population is growing and UNR's ability to serve the students is not. The project has been identified as a critical need on the campus.

Ms. Ezra related that the current facilities were constructed over twenty years ago, before many of the current federal, state, and local regulations for laboratory safety and waste disposal were enacted.

Chair Anthony said that Interim Chancellor Rogers and Vice Chancellor Klaich would take their remarks into consideration.

Regent Howard observed that UNR was already receiving half of the state funds in the budget (\$33.5 million out of \$67 million). She was concerned what would happen to other projects if this building was moved up in priority. Chair Anthony related that the Board had already approved this list, adding that the chancellor would take this into consideration.

Regent Sisolak asked whether t            V

Vice Chancellor Klaich replied that he sent each Regent a listing of each of the votes by the members of the Senate on this bill from the previous session. Last time, this bill passed the Senate with an 11-10 vote. Since then, there are three new members in the Senate. If everyone voted the same way as they did in the previous session, this would put the margin of passage back in play. He felt they should consider the three new members of the Senate. He indicated that Regent Howard had already spoken with Senator Lee. He felt they should focus on how this bill will go in the Senate. He did not foresee a substantial probability that the bill would be defeated in the Assembly. He felt they should focus on the Senate, and particularly on the newer members.

Ms. Ernst noted there were four new members in the Senate.

Regent Howard stated that she provided a memo regarding AJR 11, which discussed the resolution to reduce the

Officer Ernst have discussed the inclusion of an agenda item for the April Board meeting that will address the policy issues before the Board. In April, they plan to address all of the policy issues that the Legislature will consider in the next twenty-eight days (i.e., Open Meeting Law, bills imposing additional reporting requirements on the Board, etc.).

Regent Leavitt felt that he had not done enough to influence this outcome. He was disturbed that there was not a single vote in support of keeping an elected Board. He said he would begin his efforts that day and hoped that other Regents would join him. He said they would not function as an existing board if this legislation was passed. He said he was willing to testify in front of the Assembly and that he would call everyone on the list. He urged others to do the same, adding that the Board had been far too passive.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst  
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board