





work-study positions. The college and community programs provided the guidance, support and assistance that enabled her to focus on school and receive her degree. She was recently recognized with some prestigious awards from the American Advertising Federation and her work has been forwarded to the national competition.

Ms. Murray said it was an honor speaking to the Board and thanked everyone for listening.Á

Á

President Ringle introduced the Director of the Re-Entry Center, Ms. Barbara Twitchell.

Á

President Ringle introduced Mr. Ric Licata, TMCC professor of Architecture, as a person who exemplified all of the characteristics that make the career and technical faculty so exceptional. Mr. Licata was an award winning architect, active in the profession and serves as President of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), Northern Nevada Chapter. He contributes to his profession through numerous publications and is committed to environmental issues. He recently authored a thesis entitled “Sustainability and Urbanism – A Methodology to Create Regenerative Urban Systems”. Mr. Licata’s students have been honored nationally and locally. Two of his students’ teams placed second and fifth in a countrywide competition, challenging students from nationally accredited baccalaureate and masters degree programs.Á

Á

Regent Derby entered the meeting.Á

Á

Mr. Licata stated he would give a brief overview about the program, the course content and some processes in the learning environment in the architectural program. He would discuss the community learning process where students were encouraged to work with the urban environment, other architectural relationships, including UNLV, trends, opportunities and challenges.Á

Á

Mr. Licata said some degrees of

Mr. Licata stated that students do approximately four to six design projects per semester, and in that process, they present in a skilled environment, their solutions to professionals. The beauty of the program was immediate assessment and feedback. Consequently, they learn to present well, in a professional manner.Á

Á

Mr. Licata said the studio learning environment was special because it gave an opportunity to do theoretical lectures, studies, writing, analytical skills, public speaking skills and research, along with one-on-one contact with the students. It was a time to share ideas, excitement and enthusiasm between the students together with the professor.Á

Á

Mr. Licata said the focus was on topical information regarding the design process, but to also be sensitive to the community and the pristine environment in northern Nevada. At TMCC there was an opportunity to take advantage of space and expand into the facilities. Mr. Licata then showed some graphics' techniques and past and present projects in a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á

## 2. Chair's Report – (Cont'd.)Á

Mr. Licata said TMCC was working vigorously with community leaders to introduce them to the programs and to introduce the students to the real world processes, showing them there was a link between creativity and the real world. Mr. Licata thanked the Board for allowing him to make his presentation.Á

Á

Chair Whipple presented gifts to outgoing presidents Dr. Carol C. Harter and Dr. Joseph Crowley. President Harter thanked the Board for the limited edition of William Faulkner's Absalom, Absalom! , adding that it had been a wonderful 11 years of service and she thanked the Board for their support. Interim President Joseph Crowley expressed his appreciation to the Board for the Lucite over bronze statue of a wolf, adding that he had performed the job as long as he did because he loved it.Á

Á

Chair Whipple asked Mrs. Fini Dobyms to come forward and accept the engraved desk clock and personalized pen in gratitude for her services as Board Secretary.Á

Á

Chair Whipple complimented the Regents on their attendance at the commencement ceremonies, stressed the importance of their presence, and encouraged their attendance to continue.Á

Á

Chair Whipple suggested, with the induction of the two new presidents of UNR and UNLV, to have two special evenings with both presidents in attendance, one in Reno and one in Las Vegas, where they will be introduced to various communities and lawmakers. Chair Whipple requested that the System's office follow-up on this request.Á

Á

Chair Whipple said he recently met the commanding officer of the ROTC programs for UNLV and UNR. The officer complimented the outstanding students from Nevada. He had just returned from an ROTC competition where a UNR cadet placed second among 3,000. He mentioned that when he was at West Point he was on a committee to identify scholars and to assist and support Rhodes Scholars and Fullbright Scholarships. Chair Whipple directed Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols to research a means for identifying outstanding scholars so they may be given advice and guidance. Other institutions actually give them practice interviews before committees. This was an opportunity to take the System to the next level and there was no better way than to produce a Rhodes Scholar and Fullbright Scholarships. It was also a good opportunity for UNR and UNLV to work together. There should be a Millennium Scholarship Committee which would oversee this effort and supervise the work between the two universities.Á

Á

## 3. Chancellor's Report - Chancellor James E. Rogers discussed the NSHE's future as an education system instead of eight separate institutions and all that that implied.Á

Á

Chancellor Rogers announced that Dr. Lee Alley would be leaving at the end of the month and thanked him for his guidance and leadership.Á

Á

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

Chancellor Rogers said it was important for him to continue to drive the System to operate as a System. He stated the NSC community college system relationship has been pushed and pushed. The various presidents of these institutions have been cooperative and have led the way by entering into various agreements between themselves so that this coming year, even though NSC was focused in Henderson, it will be taking courses



March 9, 2006 (Ref. C-1d, C-1e on file in the Board office) and the Technology Task Force meeting held March 8, 2006 (Ref. C-1f on file in the Board office) and the Board Secretary Search Committee meetings held March 9 and 23, 2006 (Ref. C-1g, C-1h on file in the Board office)

(2) Approved-Summer 2006 Salary Schedule, NSC – In accordance with Board policy (Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 33) the Board approved President Fred Maryanski’s request for the summer salary schedule for Nevada State College for the 2006 Summer Session. The proposed revisions will be incorporated into the Procedures and Guidelines Manual (Ref. C- on file in the Board office)

5. Approved-Consent Agenda – (Confidential)

(3) Approved-Summer 2006 Salary Schedule, UNLV – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request to update the Board of Regents’ Procedures and Guidelines Manual (Chapter 3, Section 5.1) in order to increase summer term salaries for the Summer 2006 term (Ref. C-3 on file in the Board office)

(7) Approved-Capital Improvement Request, CCSN – The Board approved President Richard Carpenter’s request for the use of \$143,200 in Capital Improvement Fee funds. The proceeds from this distribution will be utilized for projects that cannot be funded from other institutional funds (Ref. C-7 on file in the Board office)

Upgrade, reconfigure, and improve Room 2649 and its furniture at Cheyenne Campus to better utilize the room as an intake, advising, and testing center, as well as to provide more effective and usable Multimedia International Language Learning Center and classroom space.

ADA modifications mandated by changes to the ADA regulations.

(9) Approved-Handbook Revision, Community College Specific Provisions – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols’ request for an amendment proposal concerning the community college specific sections of Title 4, Chapter 16 that address student admission, registration, grades and examinations. In general, the proposed amendment will eliminate the institution specific sections of Chapter 16 and replace them with provisions that are applicable to NSHE community colleges in general (Ref. C-9 on file in the Board office)

(10) Approved-Handbook Revision, Extension of Temporary Policy, Military Leave for Professional Employees – The Board approved staff’s recommendation for the extension of the temporary policy to allow members of the professional staff to be compensated for the difference in their NSHE pay and their military pay through the end of the 2006-2007 employment contracts (Ref. C-10 on file in the Board office)

(11) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, CCSN – The Board approved President Richard Carpenter’s request for a revision to CCSN’s institutional bylaws (Title 5, Chapters 1-3). Revisions include updating policies to align with current practice, deleting obsolete provisions, and additional technical changes as necessary (Ref. C-11 on file in the Board office)

(12) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, DRI – The Board approved President Stephen G. Wells’ request for new bylaws for the Desert Research Institute (Title 5, Chapter 2). The proposed new bylaws will replace its existing bylaws and Faculty Personnel Manual and achieve consistency with the Board of Regents’ Handbook and current DRI policies (Ref. C-12 on file in the Board office)

(13) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNLV, Selection of Department Chairs and School Directors – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for a change to the UNLV Bylaws, Board of Regents’ Handbook (Title 5, Chapter 6, Chapter II, Section 10.8) (Ref. C-13 on file in the file)

Á

Regent Gallagher moved approval of the Consent Agenda except (4) (Student Health Insurance, Rates, Special Student Fees) (5) (Tenure Upon Hire, College of Fine Arts, UNLV) (6) (Tenure Upon Hire, School of Nursing, UNLV) (8) (Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Policy) (Title 4, Chapter 18, Section 18) and (15) (Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNLV, Workload) Chapter 18, F



without it he would not accept a position at UNLV.Á

Á

Regent Sisolak moved for approval for tenure upon hire at UNLV for Mr. Clarence A. Gilyard, College of Fine Arts and for Dr. Barbara St. Pierre Schneider, School of Nursing. Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried.Á

Á

(15) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNLV, Workload Policy – The Board approved President Carol C. Harter’s request for an addition to the UNLV Bylaws, Board of Regents’ HandbookÁÁ(Title 5, Chapter 6, Chapter III, Section 2) (Ref. C-15 on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á

Regent Sisolak said there was a committee that dealt with faculty workload and asked if this was in addition to what was done. President Harter said this was within

the framework already established. Dr. Robinson said it was a clarification of policy based on what the Regents set forth. There were different deans performing workload

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY: Á(Cont’d.)Á

(15) Approved-Handbook Revision, Bylaws, UNLV, Workload Policy (Cont’d.)Á

policies different ways. This was to standardize the policy across the campus consistent with what the Board put forward.Á

Á

Regent Sisolak moved for approval of HandbookÁRevision, Bylaws, UNLV, Workload Policy (Title 5, Chapter 6, Chapter III, Section 2)Á Regent Derby seconded. Motion carried.

Á

(8) Approved-Handbook Revision, Millennium Scholarship Policy – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols’ request for m

Regarding Consent Agenda item (13), Regent Howard asked about the selection of department chairs and school directors. President Harter said it was to clarify the processes available, when there was not an absolute consensus about a chair



Regent Gallagher said everyone knew the Chancellor's strengths and what he has done. She was more inclined

6. Approved-Evaluation-Chancellor James E. Rogers – (Cont'd.)

business background helped make that possible. Regent Sisolak felt the evaluation was well done.

Á

Regent Hill left the meeting.

Á

Regent Gallagher said when the power was given to the Chancellor to terminate presidents it required proper documentation. It was never the intent that the Chancellor could get angry and fire a president. If the Chair of the Board sees that documentation and concurs, then that was a safeguard.

Á

Regent Leavitt complimented the Chancellor on a job well done. He was concerned with the Board's reputation. He felt the Board worked extremely well together and hoped it would continue.

Á

Regent Wixom felt it crucial to bifurcate the two issues. Systemically, when dealing with an organization where one group has the power to hire and another has the power to terminate, there is a disconnect. He was not part of



Howard, Leavitt and Alden.Á

Á

10. Information Only-Report on the Status of the Information System Project - Regent Michael B. Wixom, Chair of the Technology Task Force, reported on the recent activities of the Task Force and the current status of the iNtegrate project, the System-wide information system project.Á

Á

Regent Wixom said much had happened with the Technology Task Force (TTF) over the last few months and felt it was important to bring everyone up to date and introduced a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Board office)Á He explained the term Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), related to technology planning providing student services and information, human resources, financial planning and budgeting.

Á

Regents Howard and Alden entered the meeting.Á

10. Information Only-Report on the Status of the Information System Project –(Cont'd.)Á

Á

Regent Wixom continued that the project the NSHE System has was referred to as the iNtegrate Project. The term iNtegrate conveys the message of seeking an integrated project allowing us to effectively meet the information needs for the next several decades. The term “Legacy System” was not software but refers to whatever system may be in place at a given institution. One of the challenges with the Legacy System was that it may be robust, which referred to the strength and capacity of the system. Some may be antiquated, but were strong and have enough capacity to service the needs of the respective institutions. However, there were some inherent weaknesses:Á

Á

Legacy System Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)Á

- out of date technology - modern, efficientÁ
- outgrown capacity - expandable capacityÁ
- non-integrated - integrated databasesÁ
- old data (slow capture) - real time dataÁ
- centralized – inefficient - de-centralizedÁ
- inadequate redundancy - multiple redundanciesÁ
- licensed, scheduled upgradesÁ

Á

Regent Wixom said there were three structures of needs. At the top, the Board of Regents has different types of informational needs than does the institutions, Chancellor or Vice Chancellors. Specifically, when talking about policy information, broad strokes were desired to make policy decisions. By contrast, the Chancellor and System Administration need a different type or quantity of information, which was different than the institutional information required on a day-to-day basis. CCSN has reached its limit and some other institutions were close to capacity.Á

Á

Regent Wixom stated that at the TTF meeting there was talk about a centralized versus non-centralized system. Centralization can mean multiple things but here it refers to the ability for the institutions to share data on a centralized basis. The model put forward envisioned each institution having different capacities and access to information, which are all connected to access information from another institution. Each will have its own proprietary information so there will be security walls within each institution. Regent Wixom said this model was associated with the second Request for Proposal (RFP) that was presented today and approved by the Technology Task Force. Under this RFP there is a de-centralized and distributed model meaning that the three largest institutions would house the hardware and system functions and would warehouse the data for human resources, student information and budget and finance. Access would be limited on a proprietary basis. The other institutions and the System would also have access.Á

Á

Regent Wixom said the process started about 20 months ago through the efforts of Regents Seastrand and Anthony

full, fair, public and thoroughly vented. Everyone was invited to participate. A consultant will be hired to give some impartial advice, proposals will be

10. Information Only-Report on the Status of the Information System Project –(Cont'd.)Á





suggested hiring a consulting project manager who would be the subject of the RFP being discussed for consulting services. It can be done with salary savings resulting from Dr. Alley's vacancy. This consultant can not only look at the RFPs, but can supervise the project until Dr. Alley was replaced. The consultant will be hired after approval from the Board.

Á

Regent Wixom cautioned the Board that they will be approached by people who will volunteer their opinion for how this project should be run.

Á

11. Approved-Employment Contract, Women's Head Basketball Coach, UNLV– The Board approved President Carol C. Harter's request for a one-year extension of the employment agreement between the Board of Regents and UNLV Women's Head Basketball Coach, Ms. Regina Miller. Her current contract expires March 31, 2008. The proposed agreement would run through March 31, 2009, under the same terms and conditions, with an increase in base pay from \$173,000 for the period April 1, 2007 to March 31, 2008 (as specified in the current agreement) to \$192,500 for the period April 1, 2008 to March 31, 2009 (Ref. B on file in the Board office)

Á

Regent Alden moved approval of the employment contract for UNLV Women's Head Basketball Coach, Ms. Regina Miller. Regent Gallagher seconded.

Á

11. Approved-Employment Contract, Women's Head Basketball Coach, UNLV– (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak thought, concerning the car program, that Ms. Miller had two cars. Mr. Mike Hamrick, Athletic Director, UNLV, said she had one car and took a salary adjustment. That was a Title 9 gender equity issue that everyone wanted to be conscientious of. The men's head basketball coach gets two cars. Mr. Hamrick said Ms. Miller was given a one-time adjustment to her base salary. President Harter said because it was in the base it was effectively there every year.

Á

Regent Howard said someone should look at the cost of the cars. One individual car may cost the price of two. Regent Sisolak said it was reviewed.

Á

Motion carried.

Á

12. Approved-Master Plan/Goal-Quality Education – The Board approved Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols' recommendation for a revision to the NSHE Master Plan amending the Quality Education Goal to include mention of opportunities for international education. This recommendation follows from the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38 (File No. 69, Statutes of Nevada 2005) that expresses support for international education and foreign exchange student programs as a critical component of higher education in Nevada (Ref. C on file in the Board office)

Á

Dr. Jane Nichols said this item was a revision to the Master Plan goals relating to quality education and international education. Ms. Susie Bender, Director, International Students & Scholars, UNR, went to the 2005 session of the legislature and was successful in seeking the adoption of a senate concurrent resolution (SCR) in support of international education and foreign exchange student programs. Because of that resolution, as part of the implementation of SCR 38, there was a recommended change in the Master Plan adding the language which would say, "as part of our targets to increase opportunities for international education for students." The campuses will be charged with its implementation. Hopefully there will be more travel abroad and international education for the students. Dr. Nichols asked Ms. Bender and Ms. Anneli Adams, Cape & International Development, CCSN, to stand and accept the Board's appreciation.

Á

Regent Alden moved approval of amending the Master Plan Quality Education Goal to include mention of opportunities for international education. Regent Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

Á

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, University Admissions Criteria – The Board approved Board Chair Bret Whipple's request for a proposal to revise the university admission criteria. This proposal will change the effective date of the Board's current policy that students seeking admission to the universities must have at least a 3.00 grade point average from Fall 2010 to Fall 2008, and provides that sufficient test scores are permissible

criteria for university admissions (Title 4, Chapters 14 and 16) (Ref. D on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, University Admissions Criteria – (Cont'd.)Á

Dr. Nichols gave a PowerPoint presentation (on file in the Board office)Á She stated she will recommend a motion relating to the university admission standards to the Board. A summary of the proposed changes are:Á

ÁThe date of the implementation for increase of the GPA to 3.0 from 2.75 will be Fall 2008, not 2007 as originally proposed.Á

ÁEffective in the Fall 2007, ACT and SAT test scores can be used as regular admission criteria to be admitted to the university regardless of high school GPA.Á

ÁEffective in the Fall 2008, transfer students must have a GPA of 2.5 and at least 24 credits to transfer from any college to the university if being admitted on their transfer record. All students with a transferable associates degree from NSHE community colleges automatically, regardless of GPA, are admitted to the university.Á

Á

The current requirements for the core high school courses that must be completed continue with no change. Alternative admission criteria continues to allow at least 10% of the prior freshman class to be admitted to the university based on alternative admission criteria which includes evidence for the potential of success: improvement in the high school record, overcoming adversity or special hardship, special talents, or any other special circumstances that the university feels the student should be admitted with potential for success. That 10% will be approximately 600 students for UNLV and 375 students for UNR, so there are a specific number of students who can be admitted under those special criteria.Á

Á

Dr. Nichols said action was taken to support the students with this change. Chancellor Rogers wrote a letter (on file in the Board office)Á to the presidents underscoring the commitment to diversity initiatives holding the presidents accountable for making progress in that area. The roundtable discussions have made a difference.Á

Á

Dr. Nichols said because of the changes there will be a System study or audit of transfer policies and a study of retention with recommendations that will be presented to the Board. There was also a biennial budget request which addresses the admission requirements. It contains money for: student support, adopt a school program, the MESA program, and scholarship proposals. There is also a need-based aid augmented with carryover funds.Á

Á

Dr. Nichols stated the institutions responded and beginning in the Fall there are some exciting initiatives with the admission requirements. Many of these programs were in place since the Board action in 2001. A number of advisory boards across the state meet regularly to share data and seek feedback.Á

Á

Regent Howard commented that her joint letter with President Harter and President Crowley was not mentioned. Dr. Nichols apologized and acknowledged the letter was the driving force behind much of what she was saying and it should have been included.Á

Á

Dr. Nichols said the institutions, community colleges and presidents were stepping up to reach and work with students to insure their success. She stressed that the change was being taken very seriously. Everyone cares about the students and everything will be

13. Approved-Handbook Revision, University Admissions Criteria – (Cont'd.)Á

done to make sure that every student impacted by the change has a pathway to success that will work. If a student applies to the university and is not accepted, the university sends a letter instructing them to enter the community college which will eventually result in being accepted to the university.Á

Á

Dr. Nichols said that she and the ACLU have met and agree there was a lot of work to be done, particularly in reaching students from low economic families. Having said that they agreed to disagree on the impact of the proposed changes, as outlined in the letter from the ACLU (on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á

Dr. Nichols said the motion was to approve the proposed HandbookÁ revision on the university admission's criteria to support Chancellor Rogers' letter to the presidents and to direct the System staff to bring the Board a study on the impact of the new criteria effective in the Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 in a time fashion so that the GPA

implementation can be delayed if a disproportionate impact on minorities occurred.

figures resulting in serious impacts in the student body which already has a low rate of minority students. She was glad to hear of the continued study to compare results of the impact. It would be better to look at what the student brings to the university and not just look at a numerical figure as cutoff criteria because it may not be the best choice. Shifting the student to the community college might not be the right solution at this point.Á

Á  
Nevada ranks the lowest in the number of students who obtain a bachelors degree at the universities. Unless the road was prepared for these alternative options for students, success will not be achieved in terms of graduation rates. Also, there was only one college in this state that offers a public four-year program, so delaying this decision to 2010, as it was originally, would allow time to study the impact in minority and low income enrollment. It would also give time for college development so they could receive students not accepted by the university and would allow time for the university system to create real programs and in-school academic social support that would help individuals to achieve success. It would give time for the K-12 system to implement remedial programs.Á

13. App. M. 11.11.10. Revision, University Admissions Criteria – 4C

is similar to the provisions of NAC 284.594 for classified staff (Ref. E on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á  
Regent Alden moved approval of the Handbook ~~revision~~ (Title 4, Chapter 3, New



18. Approved-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – The Board approved Chancellor James E. Rogers’ and NSHE staff’



Finance & Business, UNLV, said there was a problem with the booklet which listed the UNLV projects from two years ago, not the current project listing. It was the prior 2005 biennium listing, not 2007. The current projects were all within the scope of the HECC/SHECC projects and copies of the current listing can be made available.Á

Á  
President Crowley said he believed HECC derives from the first effort on the part of the state to recover funding from the federal slot tax, which goes back a long time ago, and that resulted in approximately a 50%-50% split between higher education and K-12 of that portion of the slot tax, which at the time was 50% and that would have been some time in the early 1970's. In the late 1970's and early 1980's the boosters from UNLV and UNR went to Washington to recover the remaining 50%. Most of that money went to build Thomas & Mack and Lawlor, but set aside from that was capital construction or repair or similar projects. Mr. Klaich said the Higher Education Capital Construction (HECC) was a \$10 million annual set aside and Special Higher Education Capital Construction (SHECC) was an additional \$5 million for a total of \$15 million each biennium.Á

the SPWB regarding management of major projects. There have been very positive meetings with various people on both sides. Because of those discussions a bill draft was not introduced for the NSHE opting out of the SPWB project. There was a clear role for the SPWB to play and a role where the institutions can more aptly provide services that would arguably now be duplicative and we think we will be successful in that. There was also the construction manager at risk concept which has been supported by the SPWB that tries to cap those.Á

Á  
Regent Wixom said when he looked at the total request and compared it to where it began, it was nearly double this figure. He looked at this list of capital improvements designed to maximize current resources as an effort to protect assets by continuing

18. Approved-2007-2009 Biennial Budget Requests – (Cont'd.)Á

projects that have been started. He does not see any over-reaching and the list was very positive and inclusive and nothing was beyond what the System needed. That is the message that should be conveyed publicly because that fact may not be understood. The public sees the bottom line figure without the benefit of the analysis and the thought behind it. He hoped that the public is considered and understands what is being done in regards to capital improvements. Chancellor Rogers said the System was behind \$1 billion when he joined. There has been a concerted effort that when we are asking for a quarter of a billion dollars it is based on a billion dollars of real needs. The presidents encourage people to view the buildings and the necessary repairs.Á

Á  
Regent Dondero asked how much would be saved by not going through the State Public Works Board. Mr. Dan O'Brien of the SPWB responded that he cannot quantify that answer. He knew the time frame of the bureaucracy of state where time costs money, 1% per month on a project the size the of Greenspun building is a lot of money. The sooner projects were completed there was money to be saved. Starting projects right away will reduce the time frame and result in savings. SPWB of

Á

Mr. Klaich recommended doing a complete System-wide inventory of deferred maintenance and to undertake a plan for addressing it. It may have been done at the campuses, but has not been integrated into a System plan. It



Á

20. Approved-CCSN Northwest Campus Development – (Cont'd.)Á

Regent Wixom said this was a very exciting, innovative plan. On three occasions the System has encountered the BLM and in each case we took down land through a BLM lease, but there were restrictions as to how the property could be used. When the property was released to a municipality by the BLM one of the uniform conditions, by statute, was that the end use of the property be for educational, recreational or governmental use. The problem was the plan presented, at least in one case, took several years and congressional intervention to get the restriction released to do what needed to be done with the property. The city may not realize the potential problem. Developing the property solely for educational purposes would be fine, but because there are plans to use it as a public/private partnership there could be an issue which needs to be resolved within the time frame. Financing for the private part of the partnership could cause major problems because on a ground lease, the BLM has to consent to the financing and permission for the development. Regent Wixom suggested considering whether there is any way to get the BLM working on the process or if senatorial assistance would be required and, if so, how much time will that take. President Carpenter will ask Mr. Swisher, the developer, to address some of this.Á

Á

President Carpenter went back to the slide referring to the caveat with the MOU with what the city wanted to occur. It is critical that the city wanted CCSN to make the application with the BLM. The discussion today was that the city would do this in partnership with CCSN. Now, the realization was that it might not be able to move as quickly as the city expected, but the city would actually be a partner with CCSN. What the agreement would be today was to allow CCSN to continue that work with the city. Obviously, if the BLM says it cannot be done or has some restrictions that make alterations, CCSN would have to come back to the Board.Á

Á

Mr. Steve Swisher said it was a development process and that meant the results to the questions will become known as the application process is completed. The case with the BLM was substantially different than some of the cities' have had when trying to build golf courses and private activities. One of the things with our strategic development partners was that they will be providing internships and apprenticeships to the students attending the classes. It was not just a pure commercial lease arrangement. There were other examples of these types of arrangements ASI at the West Charleston Campus, student union retail and the like. We think that we can meet with the BLM and negotiate these issues. After eight or nine months, there will be answers to these questions. Iese

Regent Derby asked in terms of the Arizona model, did they utilize public2lica Uicadof©©5y ©t\_

sit down once a year for two days and look at these larger issues. There are always competing interests in the System. Every time dollars are dispensed the question is where else could those dollars go. There has to be a spirited debate and there needs to be enough time and a setting to do this. Regent Leavitt felt it was the Board's responsibility to hear from the Chancellor, other Regents and the presidents. This was just one example but it was not the setting to explore these things in the manner that this new partnership demanded and required.Á

Á  
Chair Whipple felt the partnership was an outstanding opportunity which he fully endorsed. Following up on Regent Leavitt's comments, these were not decisions that can be made in a vacuum. It is incumbent upon us to compare this community with what has worked in other communities. This information is not available and it raises questions when excellent opportunities arise, but again it is a competing interest issue which requires some background.Á

20. Approved-CCSN Northwest Campus Development – (Cont'd.)Á

Á  
President Carpenter said it was important to note that NSC and CCSN were partnering on a wide range of projects and were very actively engaged. One of the buildings approved on the list this morning was a building on the Cheyenne Campus in joint use with NSC. This campus was never envisioned without partnering with NSC. He also reminded everyone that there was a need for 456,000 square feet for the current two-year college students enrolled in Las Vegas. Chair Whipple asked if we were being pushed or pulled and understood there was a need for the existing students. Again, he was interested in seeing comparable studies on a national average and what was to be expected of us as a System.Á

Á  
Regent Derby asked what the risk would be concerning the timing of the project. President Carpenter said the property would probably be lost based upon past history. They also have other competing interests for the property. President Carpenter said there was not an exact date, but he felt they want us to move and not deliberate on it for an extended period of time.Á

Á  
President Maryanski said the Academic Affairs Committee received an MOU between CCSN and NSC regarding the details of our academic partnership and the fact that we will begin to offer full fledged 2+2 programs in business, nursing, education and psychology at the CCSN campuses in the next academic year. He and President Carpenter have discussed this project and agreed the MOU would cover the programs at that campus. Obviously the project was still a few years away

activities in progress.Á

Á

Regent Wixom said at the Investment Committee meeting he was told that hard dollars committed to by approving the proposal was \$200,000 for the architectural drawing, consulting and initial plans. Mr. Gilbert said that money was what would be required to meet everything the city was asking for in the MOU. Mr. Gilbert concurred with Regent Wixom said the \$200,000 was money already within the CCSN operating budget so additional funds were not required to meet that commitment.Á

Á

Regent Wixom asked that by approving the MOU what dollars will be committed beyond the \$200,000. President Carpenter said none. Regent Wixom asked that if this was approved today, it would be for the MOU, the \$200,000 and at what point will CCSN be required to come back to the Board to seek additional approval for the development. Regent Wixom inquired if CCSN would need to come back for each of the subsequent joint venture agreements and the release. Regent Sisolak ollarmOllarmOllaMMMMMoMmeMMMWMRNd bsW



Regent Derby reminded the Board that this has been part of their Master Plan in terms of going into that area. In reference to Regent Leavitt's comment about a policy summit, the Board does approve all these Master Plans and they need to be looked at very carefully. As a System we have our own Master Plan and it incorporates all of these and we have to take a System-wide approach, but it was not as though these things come up haphazardly. The first question to ask is if it was in the Master Plan which the Board approved, and she was relieved to see that it was.

Á

Regent Anthony felt it was a great project, was glad it was being done and supported the public/private partnerships. He asked if approval was requested for the three companies listed in the presentation to start the project. President Carpenter said they had to start with somebody and these were the people at the table right now. Regent Anthony said as far as actually doing the public/private partnership and the project, there were other companies who came in and gave presentations and he asked who decides who will be doing that and how will it work. Chancellor Rogers said there will be so much work throughout the entire System that there was plenty for everybody. On a piece of property like this there may be five developers or 50 developers because not all developers do all things. Each individual project will have to be reviewed to see who would be best suited to do the job. All of this will be brought back to the Board.

Á

20. Approved-CCSN Northwest Campus Development – (Cont'd.)

Regent Gallagher said when she asked if this was in the Master Plan President Carpenter did not think so. She felt better that it was in the Master Plan and it was approved. She felt it was a good project and encouraged President Carpenter to keep the Board involved.

Á

Motion carried.

Á

21. Approved-Student Registration Fee Distribution, 2007-2009 – The Board approved the student registration fee distribution for 2007-2009. During the March 16-17, 2006, meeting of the Board of Regents, the members approved the aggregate increases for non-resident tuition and student registration fees for fiscal years 2008 and 2009. At the meeting, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Legal Counsel Dan Klaich indicated he would return to the Board in June 2006 to request approval of the internal distribution of the student registration fee increases based on the recommendations received from the Council of Presidents. A portion of the student registration fee revenues collected by the institutions are used to support the State operating budget for higher education. The remainder of the registration fees collected are retained by each institution to provide for student access (need-based financial aid) as well as other institutional and student-related needs, including General Improvement, Capital Improvement, and Student Government/Programs (Ref. 1)

Á

Mr. Klaich said after fee increases were passed at the last Board meeting there was a directive to go back to the presidents and student leaders to bring a recommendation to the Board for the distribution of those fees between the state general fund and campuses with respect to the access projects. The recommendation was that for the 2007-2009 biennial fee increases to be allocated: 40% to the state general fund, 10% to need based access and 50% to general campus needs to support capital improvements and general improvements. Each of the campuses indicated in the exhibit (on file in the Board office) their intended uses of those funds. He indicated that there was a lower allocation of fee increases to access than in the past. Mr. Klaich would also like the Board to understand that the pool of funds generated for student funded financial aid by fee increases in the past have now created essentially an annuity fund of \$14 million which was a minimal fund going annually to System institutions for need based access scholarships. It was a minimal fund because it grows with student registration enrollment and it will never dip below that amount. When attending the campus hearings the students said fee increases would



bottom and gaining ground that is good, but what does it really mean in terms of where we are, where it places us and are we making a difference. Regent Derby inquired if there are students we do not have need based scholarship aid for. When talking about student financial aid, are you talking about all need based. President Harter said there was other need based financial aid and scholarships available as well as federal aid, but she was speaking solely about the access money. Regent Derby asked if it was making the needed gain. President Harter asked Dr. Mills to come forward to address that question, but felt the amount was doubled from fiscal years 2006 to 2009, which was a 200% difference, and tuition was not going up 200% in that same period of time, so there has been progress. Whether all of the need can be fulfilled, the answer is probably not. A

Ms. Rebecca Mills, Vice President for Student Life, UNLV, said it was always impossible to say categorically that all the financial needs of the students were met, but President Harter was correct. What the Board did with the 50% increase in aid has made a significant difference with a 50% increase in aid.

money from anywhere else. That increase will come back to GSA and go back out to the graduate students. We could use so much more.Á

Á

Mr. Anthony Filippo, President of NSC Student Alliance, said access was not the problem at NSC. The problem was access to tutoring, advising and mentors. These were programs the students want but they need to be at levels that will actually help the students and the graduation rates. We need more money for these tools for the success of the students.Á

Á

Mr. Jeff Champagne, President of Associated Students, UNLV, said there was a meeting on his campus of what the fees would be changed to and said it was a chance for students to have their dollars work for them with the increase. There was money going into the library, general capital improvements, the GSA and student government. This past year \$120,000 was given out for students to participate in different programs. He encourages building upon these programs. Concerning need based aid, they were satisfied with the response and satisfied with the manner in which the campus fees were distributed.Á

Á

Regent Howard asked if there was a dollar amount that campuses have allocated to need based aid. Mr. Klaich responded that the information was on page 1 of 4 of Ref. I (on file in the Board office)Á and it was set forth with respect to the universities, the state college and

21. Approved-Student Registration Fee Distribution, 2007-2009 – (Cont'd.)Á

the community colleges. The information following gets very detailed as it goes into actual percentages and dollars that will be generated over the biennium. For the universities the student access dollars are \$1.25, undergraduate \$2.25 and graduate at the state college \$.75 of the request, at the community colleges it is a smaller request at \$.25. Regent Howard was not sure how that would equate to help students. She felt it was very important that they were conscientious of the fact that some students will have a harder time accessing higher education. That is what will happen after they arrive, but many will not get there because they do not have the ability to afford getting into the colleges or universities. This was student access and she hoped it meant helping the students to get in, not only helping the students once they got there.

Á

Regent Hill moved approval of the student registration fee distribution for 2007-2009 as presented. Regent Leavitt seconded. Motion carried. Regent Derby voted no.

Á

Regent Hill said there was no one in the room that he liked better than Chair Whipple, and he was going to vote for him. However, he disagreed with some things that he did as Chair. Regent Hill said he may be wrong, but he was going to state it. He suggested that Chair Whipple needed to listen to other people more and take others' advice. He said

22. Approved-Election of Officers – (Cont'd.)Á

Chair Whipple has a wealth of experience sitting around the table and in the room and he recommended listening more often.Á

Á

Regent Hill continued that Chair Whipple should be less or more involved in the job of being chair that was to either be 100% chair, or 0% chair. Being 25% chair was not better than being 0% chair because of becoming involved in things he was not fully informed of. Lastly, there have been bad decisions as far as some appointments and have been rewards to some outrageous activity, which he disagreed with.Á

Á

Regent Hill said Chair Whipple has the potential of being the best Chair ever in the history of the System if he would listen and get more involved.Á

Á

Regent Derby applauded the job that Chair Whipple has done at being inclusive and bringing everybody in. Being chair is a tough job but the process worked better when everybody was brought in, given responsibilities and made to feel part of the team. Another thing to compliment Chair Whipple on was not always taking

have been made in the interest of the whos aM\_it stood for  
for his good leadership.Á

Á

. Regent Derby thanked Chair Whipple

.Á

Á

inclusive. That eing said, his support of Chair Whipple ms in no way meant to disparage the candidacy of Regent Rosenberg who has been areat olleague and an assemo the MM He does not feel that voting for One was opposing another.Á

Á

Regent Leavitt agreed with Regent Sisolak.Á

Á

Upon aoll call vote Regent Bret Whipple ms elected Mhair , Derby, Hill,  
ixom voted for Regent Whipple. RegentmTondero,

Gallagher and Rosenberg voted for Regent Rosenberg.Á

Á

? V hair – Regent Alden nominateiegent LindzwMmMM hair .Á

Á

Regent Sisolakmed if having an election in December for aew hair would be the propriate step.  
Chair Whipple agreed.Á

Á

Upon aoll call vote Regent LindzwMs elected M i hair , Derby,  
Dondero, Gallagher, HowM

22. Approved-Election of Officers – (Cont'd.)Á

Leavitt, Rosenber ixom voted for Regent HowM Regent Hill abstained. Á

Á

one term. It may be aubject for discussion at mM Á

Á

Mr . This can be an  
item for either newusiness, a future agendiitem or a item for the MMDevelopment Committee. Á

Á

23. New Business – Regent Alden suggested that there be two vice chair positions, one in the north and one in the south.Á

Á

Regent Schofield suggested leaving the position as chair the way it is because if there was a chair as good as Chair Whipple has been, it would be advantageous to have someone for consecutive years with the possibility of re-election.Á

Á

Regent Sisolak suggested bringing the term of chair to the Board Development Committee for further discussion.Á

Á

24. Information Only-Campus Areas Utilized for Speech by the General Public - Deputy Chief Counsel Bart Patterson provided background information on the matter of public use of campus areas for First Amendment activities as brought forward by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)Á System institutions provided a summary of their respective policies on this matter. The Board discussed whether there is a need for a uniform policy concerning First Amendment activities held on NSHE campuses by the general public.Á

Á

Mr. Patterson said this topic was advanced by the ACLU a couple of meetings past, and so it was on for discussion now. The ACLU delivered a memo (on file in the Board office)Á to the Board in March, 2006. That memo contained some legal analysis. System Counsels' offices prepared some legal analysis to help understand the legal background to aid the Board in considering the various campus policies and whether there should be a System policy, or a revision in the System policy. At the outset, based on the campus policies, there are significant legal issues, but primarily this was not viewed as something imminent to be done from a legal standpoint. He recommended this be considered from a policy standpoint. The ACLU's proposal was to open up all of the campus outside areas to any free speech by the public, at any time, as long as it was not disruptive and there was no compelling reason to close a particular area. He will let them speak more specifically to their position.Á

Á

Mr. Patterson also wanted to be certain that there was a difference between the presentation that Special Counsel Nielsen gave about content-type regulation of free speech and what was being discussed today, which assumed that none of these campus policies infringe speech on the basis of the particular content of the speech, so that will not be discussed today. The subject today is can there be a content neutral restriction or a

24. Information Only-Campus Areas Utilized for Speech by the General Public –(Cont'd.)Á

time, place and manner designation of when speech occurs. The legal question to ask, in any of these cases, is whether the particular campus restriction meets the legal standard.

Á

Mr. Patterson listed three questions in the memorandum that the ACLU was asking for consideration, which was looked at from a legal standpoint: 1) Is the campus legally required to open all grounds for first amendment activities to the public. Mr. Patterson's conclusion to that was no. There was a significant amount of case law that does understand that higher education's purpose was just that, education that there were limited facilities and you can make restrictions of when members of the general public come on to a college campus to exercise first amendment activities. 2) Does the law require a campus to treat outside public groups in the same way it treats students and faculty. Again, the answer was no. In fact, a campus community can give priority to student groups and to faculty and can have different rules with respect to insurance requirements for those facilities, and that type of thing. 3) Can you require advanced notice for someone to come onto a campus ground and exercise first amendment activities. That was a murky area of the law. It depended on the nature of the restriction. But, again, a fairly minor one or two day notice requirement to the campus that there is intention to use it for free speech purposes have generally been upheld under the law. There was a different standard in how the rules were evaluated based on whether the campus was designated a public forum or not. The restrictions being discussed today would meet the standard under either of those tests in terms of whether it was a reasonable time, place and manner restrictions.Á

Á

Mr. Patterson said when the legislature adopted changes to the statute, which actually fostered more public initiatives, our campuses, for the first time in quite some time, became routinely used to gathering petition











housing, child care, health, academic life, campus usage and use

26. Information Only-Presentation of the University of Nevada, Reno Graduate Student Association 2004 Graduate Student Survey – (Cont'd.)

Á  
of the GSA programs. She will be making a comparison from 1999 and 2005 graduate student bodies.Á  
Á

Ms. Bevans continued that the graduate students were poor and make less than \$30,000 per year. More loans were taken out and more were paying for their college education using credit cards. Graduate students were less likely to own their own homes. They live closer to campus with 60% living within five miles and they drive less to campus. They were more likely to be single and less likely to have dependents. Graduate students were being encouraged to attend more conferences and publish more. Unfortunately, they were less likely to have adequate access to technology for their work, with a decrease of 11%.Á

Á  
Ms. Bevans said the typical graduate student at UNR was a 35 year old, single, white female earning less than \$30,000 per year, paying for tuition via credit card, renting within five miles of the campus, working on campus in the evenings preparing work for the next conference or publication and thinking about when she will be able to leave the state.Á

Á  
Ms. Bevans stated that with the minority characteristics only 12% were international graduate students, 19% have dependents. She said that 44% of the graduate students were on campus over 30 hours per week, with 62% of students were there in the evenings, 36% of the students were there on the weekends and 22% would like to see more child care options on campus. The graduate student wish list: more scholarship money more travel money, a graduate student center, a graduate faculty pub and graduate student housing. Revolutionary dreams: graduate student housing, a graduate community and retention. Concerning the graduate housing, all peer and next-level institutions have graduate housing save one. 41% of graduate students would live in on campus housing if more options were available. Two needs: the highest priority was to provide housing for singles/couples without children, the second priority was improving family housing options. A Graduate Student Community would be a place for people to meet, share and discuss challenges, problems and offer tips for completing graduate school. It would be uplifting to feel like a part of a learning community and to share thoughts with people who were going through the same situations. An educational community needs an identifiable space to congregate and grow such as a graduate student center.Á

Á  
Ms. Bevans reported that on retention: 36% of graduate students feel their program was taking longer than

were in the education department. She does not know how many of them will leave the state.Á

Á

President Crowley indicated he would want more information. There would be some helpful distinctions like are Ph.D. and masters students included and also what departments. It would be interesting to know that of those who stay how many come from the College of Education because masters degree and Ph.D. pursuers in that college are people who live here and are going to stay. Housing for students and graduate students has been discussed and he hoped to learn more about the particulars.Á

Á

28. Approved-Audit Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Douglas Roman Hill reported the Audit Committee met June 8, 2006, and heard the following reports:Á

Anternal Audit Reports – The Committee recommended approval of the following internal audit reports:Á

Athe Association of Government Boards recommended the Audit Committee meet annually with the external auditors before commending the annual audit of the financial statements. Ms. Sandi Cardinal, Assistant Vice Chancellor, discussed the Moss Adams interim work plan for the June 30, 2006 financial statement audit.Á

Ms. Denise Baclawski, Executive Director, UNR Fire Science Academy, reported m

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Leavitt seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Sisolak were absent.Á

Á

30. Approved-Cultural Diversity and Security Committee Recommendations and Report – Chair Linda C. Howard reported the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee met June 8, 2006 and heard the following reports:Á

ÁThe Committee reviewed information released by Oprah Winfrey and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation identifying the disparities in facilities and academic rigor available to low income and minority students in high school.Á

ÁThe Committee heard a report from staff on the Dropout Nation from Time Magazine and The Silent Epidemic from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation identifying the dropout crisis and possible solutions.Á

Á

Regent Howard requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:Á

ÁMinutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 16, 2006 meeting (Ref. CDS-1 on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á

Regent Howard moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Anthony seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Sisolak were absent.Á

Á

31. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Howard Rosenberg reported the Student and Academic Affairs Committee met June 8, 2006. Information items considered:Á

ÁVice Chancellor Jane Nichols summarized a recent national study, The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion From High School Through College , and explained how its finding related to Nevada’s policies and practices.Á

Á

Regent Rosenberg requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:Á

ÁMinutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 16, 2006 Committee meeting (Ref. SAA-1 on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

ÁNew Academic Programs, Degrees or Units:

Á CCSN – New Major:Á

ÁAssociate of Science in Horticulture (Ref. SAA-8 on file in the Board office).Á

Á

Á

31. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations and Report -Á(Cont’d.)Á

Á GBC – New Major:Á

? Associate of Applied Science in Radiology Technology (Ref. SAA-5 on file in the Board office).Á

~~? Associate of Applied Science in Industrial Energy Efficiency (Ref. SAA-6 on file in the Board office).Á~~

ÁMCC – New Major:Á

? Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Technology, Machining Emphasis(Ref. SAA-7 on file in the Board office).Á

NSC – New Unit:Á

Á Bachelor of Science in Plant and Horticultural Sciences (Ref. SAA-10 on file in the Board office).Á

University of Nevada School of Medicine:Á

Á Emergency Medicine Residency Program (Ref. SAA-4 on file in the Board office).Á

Á A revision to the Board of Regents' Handbook (Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 19) concerning the Regents' Academic Advisor Award was recommended for approval. However, since yesterday's meeting additional revisions have been suggested by the Faculty Senate Chairs and therefore, it is requested that the matter of awards for academic advisors be pulled and considered separately at this time.

Á

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report with the exception of that item. Regent Leavitt seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Sisolak were absent.Á

Á

31. Approved-Student and Academic Affairs Committee Recommendations and Report - (Cont'd.)Á

Á Regents' Academic Advisor Award – The Committee recommended approval of a proposal to revise the provisions of Board policy concerning the Regents' Academic Advisor Award (Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 19)Á with the intent of elevating the prestige of the award by reducing the number of awards granted annually (Ref. SAA-2 on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á

Regent Rosenberg requested Board action on the following Committee recommendation:

Á The Nevada Regents' Academic Advisor Award shall be given annually to faculty or staff members with the distinguished record of student advisement. The award will carry with it a cash stipend of \$5,000 to the universities, community colleges and state college. One award will be granted annually to a full time community college member of the faculty professional staff or classified staff who provide academic advisement as part of their regular assignment or who will provide academic advisement as their primary assignment. Two awards will be granted annually between the universities and state college: one for undergraduate advisement and one for graduate advisement. DRI full time faculty or professional staff who provide academic advisement to graduate students at UNLV and UNR as part of their regular assignments or provide academic advisement as their primary assignments are eligible for the award. Although these awards are intended for individuals, groups who, by their collaboration have made outstanding contributions in academic advisement, may be recognized as well. Faculty members who receive the Regents' Academic Advisory Award may use the title as such in perpetuity. Guidelines for the nomination and selection of the recipients of the Regents' Academic Advisory Award shall be established by the office of the Chancellor.Á

Á

Dr. Nichols said the Committee approved this change in the award which would elevate the award to the same level of the Regents' Teaching A

award and decision. The Regents' award is the \$5,000 one that is patterned after the Regents' Teaching Award. Regent Hill said it was a minimum of \$1,000 with the amount to be determined by the individual campus. Dr. Nichols said that language could be added, which reflects the intended practice.

Á  
Regent Hill moved that the proposal be adopted but at the end of the stipend of \$1,000 to add the language "with the maximum to be determined by the individual campus". Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.  
Regents Alden and Sisolak were absent.Á

Á  
32. Approved-Board Secretary Search Committee Recommendations and Report – Chair Dorothy S. Gallagher reported the Board Secretary Search Committee met March 9, March 23, and April 6, 2006.Á

ÁAt the March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Committee discussed the position description and received a briefing from Deputy Chief Counsel Bart Patterson regarding the application of the Nevada Open Meeting Law.Á

ÁAt the March 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the Committee was provided an overview of the selection process and Committee and staff responsibilities. An overview of the applicant pool was provided by the Director of Human Resources, Ms. Carla Henson, including the total number of applicants, the number of applicants meeting the minimum requirements and the general background of the pool.Á

ÁAt the April 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Committee discussed the search and interview process, the process for contract negotiations and interviewed candidates for the position.Á

Á  
Regent Gallagher requested Board action on the following Committee recommendations:Á

ÁMinutes – The Committee recommended approval of the minutes from the March 9, 2006 Committee Meeting (See Consent Agenda for copy of minutes)ÁÁ

ÁReview of Search Procedure – The Committee discussed mMMtentm



file in the Board office)ÁÁ

UNR Sale of Stead Parcel – The Committee recommended approval of the sale of Stead parcel 086-151-05, totaling 8.10 acres, and the sale of four (4) acre feet of water associated with the parcel (Ref. INV-7 on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

UNR Easement – The Committee recommended approval of UNR negotiating an agreement for the possible development of property jointly owned by the Board of Regents and MTK Limited, LLC, and granting an easement on parcel 021-030-07, located northeast of the UNR Main Station Farm (Ref. INV-8 on file in the Board office)ÁÁ

Á  
Regent Dondero moved approval of the Committee recommendations and acceptance of the report. Regent Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried. Regents Alden and Sisolak were absent.Á

Á  
34. Approved-Research and Economic Development Committee Recommendations and Report - Chair Jill Derby reported the Research and Economic Development Committee met June 1, 2006 and heard the following report:Á

Á  
34. Approved-Research and Economic Development Committee Recommendations and Report – (Cont'd.)  
ÁThe Committee reviewed a report from the Nevada Development Authority on the economic outlook of Nevada and how research and economic development activities support economic growth. In addition, the Committee heard from the universities and DRI on the best practices for building successful technology transfer programs. Vice Chancellor Jane Nichols reviewed the NSHE structure and policies that impact research and economic development. Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Klait roproperty y øpn

consideration for the position of President of the University of Nevada, Reno. After thorough review of resumes

