

UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes November 5-6, 1981

11-05-1981

Pages 95-139

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

November 5-6, 1981

The Board of Regents met on the above dates in the Carlson Education building, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Members present: Mr. Robert A. Cashell, Presiding

Mr. James L. Buchanan, II

Ms. Frankie Sue Del Papa

Mrs. Lilly Fong

Mrs. Dorothy Gallagher

Mr. Chris Karamanos

Mr. John R. Mc Bride

Mr. John Tom Ross

Mrs. June Whitley

Others present: Chancellor Robert M. Bersi

President William Berg, NNCC

President Joseph N. Crowley, UNR

President Jack Davis, WNCC

President James Eardley, TMCC

President Judith Eaton, CCCC

President Leonard P. Goodall, UNLV

President Clifford Murino, DRI

Secretary Bonnie Smotony

General Counsel Donald Klasic

Also present were Faculty Senate and Student Association representatives.

The meeting was called to order on Thursday, November 5, 1981, by Chairman Cashell at 4:00 P.M.

1. Presentation of Study of School of Medicine

Mr. Cashell recalled that at the October meeting, the Chancellor had reported that the firm of Cresap, Mc Cormick and Paget was retained to conduct the study of the School of Medicine which the Board had requested be done. As noted in the agenda, the report has been completed and the con-

sultants were prepared to present it. Mr. Cashell introduced Mr. George Roen, Vice President of CMP, who in turn introduced Dr. Eugene R. Smoley, Jr., and Mrs. Carol Penskar, who had been chiefly responsible for the study.

Following some brief comments by Mr. Roen, Dr. Smoley presented a comprehensive review of the report, copies of which were distributed to the Board. For purposes of the minute record, Dr. Smoley's remarks are included.

I would like to take you through the salient features of our report. We believe it is critical to do this because our major objective was to lay out for you the features of these issues to aid in decision making.

First, in terms of the situation, controversy has surrounded the Medical School since its inception. It has intensified in recent months, focusing on the organizational placement of the School of Medicine, its service relationship between the School and UNR, and the extent to which the School serves southern Nevada. Our objectives and the scope of our study were to focus on facts and insights regarding the organizational placement and the identification of

the School of Medicine. The report discusses alternatives for increased School of Medicine impact in southern Nevada and particularly Las Vegas, and makes an assessment of UNR's services to the School.

Our approach was to interview extensively – conducting more than 60 interviews with Regents, University Administrators, Medical School staff, School of Medicine Advisory Board members, representatives of medical societies and physicians - and to collect and analyze a variety of information.

The report contains 88 pages with 22 exhibits, and is organized in 4 chapters: (1) Introduction; (2) Summary of Current Situation; (3) Discussion of Organizational Issues; and (4) Discussion of Southern Nevada Program Alternatives, and our presentation will follow that organization.

In terms of the current situation, we want to talk briefly about the organization of UNS, the reporting relationship and the Chancellor's responsibility. The organization chart (contained in the report) shows the Board of Regents, the Chancellor reporting to the Board,

and 13 organizational units reporting to the Chancellor.

7 of these are the educational institutions of the State including UNR and UNLV; 2 support service units - the University Press and the Computing Center; and 4 units that support the Chancellor in his major responsibilities which are Systemwide oversight and executive officer responsibilities for the Board of Regents. The important points of the chart are the Systemwide responsibilities that the Chancellor has and the broad span of control with 13 different units reporting to him, 7 of which are large operational educational institutions.

Look next at the profile of the School of Medicine itself. Its mission, as we confirmed through interviews is, first, to give Nevadans an opportunity for medical education, and secondly, to train doctors for the State of Nevada and particularly for rural Nevada. It is the consensus among those interviewed that the first objective has in fact been met to a degree. That is illustrated by the increase in the number of Nevadans accepted into Medical School.

The School of Medicine is one of 9 schools reporting to

the President of UNR, through the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Medical faculty, including the Las Vegas-based faculty, report through the Dean of the School of Medicine.

A review of the sources of revenue shows that revenue for the School of Medicine has grown from \$5.5 million to \$7.6 million in the last two years, a 38% increase, with State appropriations moving from 47% to 58% of the total budget, and Veterans' Administration funds have moved from 9% of the total budget to 16%.

The School of Medicine program consists of the 2-year basic science program in Reno, a 3rd year clinical clerkship with 7 weeks in obstetrics and gynecology at Las Vegas, with the rest of the clinical clerkships at Reno. 4th year elective clerkships can be taken anywhere. The first 2 years, the basic science is integrated with the clinical problems with 10% taught by the clinical faculty and 20% taught by psychiatric faculty. 3rd year clerkships are taken in community hospitals and physician's offices and require the cooperation of these people and hospitals. There are 6 rotations - family medicine, internal medicine, obstet-

rics and gynecology, pediatrics, psychiatry and surgery.

Currently, there are 6 full-time equivalent clerkships in Las Vegas and 42 full-time equivalent clerkships in Reno. Projections of the School suggest that the number of clerkships will remain as it is now.

In terms of residencies, the program following the 4th year of Medical School, there are residencies established in 5 of the 6 areas, that is, all except psychiatry. Residency becomes important because there is a tendency for students who have their residency in a particular location to stay in that location to practice medicine. Currently there are 23 residents in Las Vegas and 44 in Reno for a total of 67. School of Medicine projections are for 36 in Las Vegas and for 62 in Reno for a total of 98. The residents support the Medical School program by teaching and staffing the Family Practice Center in Reno, where 10,000 patient visits occur annually.

We want to look next at the geographic sources of issue.

In looking at the admissions by geographic area, it shows that the number of applicants had been about the same with a slightly larger number for Washoe County

as opposed to Clark County, smaller for the rural areas of the State, and very large for out-of-state applicants. The number of admittances has been similar for Clark and Washoe Counties, slightly larger for Washoe, smaller for the rural areas, and quite small for out-of-state.

The next exhibit shows the admissions as a percent of applicants by geographic area, and shows the percentage of admissions from rural areas of the State has been high, fairly much the same for Clark and Washoe, and much smaller for out-of-state. Admissions by undergraduate institution shows in 1980 that approximately 30% of the applicants who attended UNR were accepted to the School of Medicine, 26.7% for UNLV; in 1981, the percentages were 34.9% and 11.5%.

In looking at admissions by high school attended for a 5-year period, 71 students who attended high school in Clark County were admitted to the School of Medicine, 79 in Washoe County and 30 in the rural areas, with 108 from out-of-state.

The summary of those data are that the Washoe and Clark

County admissions statistics are relatively similar although there have been more admittances from the Washoe County area, much higher in the rural areas and much lower from out-of-state. In terms of School of Medicine graduates, of the 289 graduates from the School of Medicine, 62 are currently practicing in Nevada, 9 are practicing in the rural areas. With respect to the 2nd mission of the School of Medicine, that mission has been fulfilled to a much lesser degree, with only 9 of the 289 graduates currently practicing in the rural areas of Nevada.

With respect to accreditation, summarizing some of the salient features of accreditation that relate to the Medical School. First of all, it is essential in that a doctor in order to get a license to practice in the United States must be graduated from an accredited medical school. The process of accreditation is handled by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education which is a committee including 6 representatives from the American Medical Association, 6 from the Association of American Medical Colleges, 2 from the public at large and 1 from the Canadian accrediting agency. This committee sets the criteria and supervises the

review of accreditation for each medical school. There is, as a part of the accreditation process, a site visit which is conducted by a team of medical educators, including basic scientists, clinicians and administrators. The school prepares the information, the team reviews that information, makes its site visit, and then writes its report. Since 1977 the LCME has written comments about the School of Medicine. Some of these comments are particularly important to the discussion of the issues at hand. For example, it cites the students as being bright, enthusiastic, mature, competent and loyal. With respect to admissions, it praises the School of Medicine for the State-wide representation on its admissions committee; for its accuracy in identifying motivated and dedicated students.

It emphasizes in its critique the importance of a close tie between the basic and clinical programs. It recommends Reno as the site for clerkships and makes a point of the fact that the hospitals are a more than adequate resource. It cites the benefits that have accrued to the VA Hospital by having the School of Medicine participate in that hospital. It cites the

need for strong State financial support. In a more recent comment, the LCME has recommended the expansion of the Las Vegas programs. It recommends retaining a major portion of the clerkships in Reno, but expanding the teaching program at Sunrise and at Southern Nevada Memorial Hospital.

Next, the service relationship that the School of Medicine has with UNR. There are 3 ways in which this service relationship exists. First, there is the Business Center-North, which contains the Controller's Office, the Purchasing and Personnel Departments, servicing the School of Medicine. Second, reimbursed services, and third, nonreimbursed services. There is in the report an exhaustive list of those services.

I would just briefly read some of them so that you get a sense of how long the list is: The Controller's Office handles all accounting functions, pays all bills and does all encumbrances, prepares monthly financial status reports, invests gift funds, maintains a cashier's office, draws down student financial aid funds from a central depository, assists in the management of projects supported by outside contracts and grants. The

Purchasing Department issues all purchase orders, conducts public bidding, traces and expedites the delivery of goods and services, and serves as liaison with vendors. The Personnel Department provides all types of personnel services for all positions with the exception of recruiting for academic and other professional positions, classifies and determines salaries, maintains lists of qualified candidates, arranges interviews, prepares recruitment paperwork, etc.

In terms of services for which the School of Medicine reimburses UNR, the Physical Plant Department, janitorial services, maintenance of grounds, repairs and improvements by plumbers, electricians, etc. The Library orders and processes catalog acquisitions, maintains the School's periodical subscriptions, provides the School of Medicine faculty and students with access to other University libraries, assists in the hiring of new librarians.

UNR allows the School of Medicine students to use all recreational facilities and gives them discounts on athletic and cultural events.

Services for which the School of Medicine does not directly reimburse UNR, or does not fully reimburse for, include the use of UNR buildings shared by the School of Medicine; services of the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, including review of tenure and promotion recommendations, faculty employment, review of curriculum; services of UNR's personnel committee in reviewing SOM's recommendations on tenure and promotion, and a whole list of other items which I won't read to you, but which have been cataloged in the report.

Cost of these services have been estimated and are displayed in the report. Actual costs for those reimbursements to UNR are approximately \$491,000. Other services have been estimated very conservatively.

You can use any variety of indicators to do that. What we have used is the percentage of students at the School of Medicine of the total student population at UNR - 2.2%. Another indicator that can be used and we have used in the case of the Personnel Department, is 9% for the faculty, as a percentage of the total faculty of UNR. If that 9% were used throughout, then the grand

total would be \$1.2 million, as opposed to a \$681,000 estimate included in the report.

I would like to look next at the medical services Statewide. The significance of this topic is its relation to the placement of the School of Medicine programs and their location. The first 3 exhibits in the report talk about physicians and future medical requirements - framing the future need for physicians.

The first, physicians by location and practice area. That says essentially that the 3 areas in which there are the most physicians are family and general, internal medicine and obstetrics and gynecology. The geographic-location is mostly in Clark and Washoe Counties with 599 in Clark and 439 in Washoe, some in Carson City and 60 in rural areas.

The next exhibit looks at the physicians in comparison with the population. The national average is for there to be 1.5 physicians in actual practice for every 1000 persons. In Washoe County, that ratio is 2.3 to 1000; in Clark, it is 1.3 - slightly below the national average - and in Carson City, it is 1.7. There are clearly more physicians per 1000 population in Washoe County

than there are nationally and than there are in Clark County.

Finally, using population projects from the State Planning Coordinator's Office, we have projected both the current county ratio and the national average to the year 2000, to indicate the number of physicians that would be needed to meet the national average and the number of physicians that would be needed to maintain the current ratio. For Clark County: to maintain the current 1.3 county average, 558 would be needed; to reach the national average, 736 would be needed. For Washoe County, 292 needed to reach the county average of 2.3 and 38 to reach the national average. It is clear that the actual need for physicians to the extent that it exists in Nevada is in the area of Clark County.

Further, the hospital capacity is currently 1551 beds in Las Vegas and 1110 beds in Reno, and that is a measure of the access to hospitals that is available in the two communities. As a measure of the opportunities for clinical and residencies which is viewed in some instances, although somewhat controversial, by the number of indigent patients measured by the monthly

average of Medicaid patients. In Las Vegas that is 8518 which represents 69.6% of the State monthly average Medicaid patients, Reno is 2026 which represents 16.6% of the State total, so the opportunity as measured by indigent patients exists in Las Vegas. Hospital capacity is greater in Las Vegas and the medical requirements are greater in the Las Vegas area.

I want to move next, still within our description of the current situation, to what we have titled informed insights, and this really represents a critical part of our report because we spent a considerable amount of time in intensive interviews with 62 people from the Nevada community and the intent of that was to understand more fully how people felt about the issues and their perceptions of the issues that we were asked to examine. So, in reporting here, it is important to emphasize that these are perceptions rather than our conclusions.

General comments on the University of Nevada System - the University's mission was to provide quality education for Nevadans, research was secondary. Secondly, that it should, the UNS and its Campuses, concentrate

on a few chosen programs, focus its resources within each Campus developing particular strengths for State-wide service. Then, with respect to general comments on the School of Medicine, there were a number of them and we focused on them particularly. Many people felt that the continued debate about the SOM had hurt the School; their perception was that the faculty and students were dispirited and felt the lack of support. The perception was that there was difficulty in filling faculty positions and that there was at least the potential of some loss of federal grants as a consequence. Many people felt that the SOM was poorly managed with respect to Las Vegas. There were instances cited where students were assigned to inappropriate physicians; where there was a failure to notify hospitals regarding the arrival time or assignment of students; where there was a lack of communication with the hospital staff; where there was mishandling of paperwork for adjunct faculty appointments; where there was failure to acknowledge volunteer time of physicians; where there was little communication between the School and the Las Vegas faculty. This was not a limited but rather a widespread perception on the part of those we talked to, so it becomes a significant insight by the inter-

viewees. Several people also spoke about the School of Medicine being underfunded. Some cited the turnover of the Dean and the staff as having hurt the School of Medicine in that it delayed or made it more difficult to build community relationship and to conduct the planning that is necessary.

In terms of viewpoints on the organization issue, there was split opinion and strong feeling. Some people, particularly those focused on Las Vegas, believe that the School of Medicine should report directly to the Chancellor as a way of addressing the deficiencies in the Las Vegas programs. They emphasize that it is a Statewide program and administration, in their perception, would be easier under the Chancellor. A number of other people believe that the School of Medicine should report to UNR as it currently does. They believe that the current relationship between the School of Medicine and UNR is building and that there is a growing acceptance of the relationship, as ties and programs and services are developing, and that this relationship to UNR is necessary in order to build the kind of faculty cooperation between the School and the University that is needed. Without exception, all agree

that the name of the SOM should be changed.

With respect to viewpoints on the SOM's program, in terms of admissions, only 2 thought the admissions process was biased. Most who commented on admissions acknowledged that the reasons for the greater number of acceptances in Washoe County is that students have a perception that being a UNR student or a Reno resident gives them a better chance at acceptance at the School of Medicine and they cite that there is greater visibility of the School in Reno. They believe that those are the reasons for the greater admissions there.

In terms of community relations, several physicians spoke about the evolution of the School of Medicine in the medical community in Reno, believing that is now improving and that if the School of Medicine is moved to Las Vegas the same evolutionary process would have to take place. In terms of planning, many, including all of the Las Vegas physicians, believe that SOM's goals, plans and programs are not adequately defined.

A large number and cross section believe that the SOM's presence in Las Vegas is not effective. Many feel that the Las Vegas community is alienated as a direct result

of the SOM's actions. Many believe that the Las Vegas faculty is isolated from the School of Medicine. And nearly all of those interviewed feel that the School of Medicine needs to increase its visibility and involvement in Las Vegas. They cite as the best method, increasing the number of clerkships and residencies there and most of them also cite the possibility of the construction of a building there as being particularly helpful. None of those interviewed believe that the School of Medicine should move entirely to Las Vegas. Less than 4% believe that the entire clinical program should move to Las Vegas and they cite the cost, the impact on quality, the hardships on students, the difficulty to administer, the likely loss of clinical faculty, the likely loss of \$1 million VA hospital support, as reasons for not supporting a move of the entire clinical program. The Nevada State Medical Association opposes the move of the entire clinical program. A letter to the Board expressing their position on that point is included in the report.

Moving to Chapter 3, I would like to discuss what we see as the organizational issues and our position on these organizational issues, because as you recall we

were asked to make recommendations in this area. A point which needs to be emphasized is that the Regents' concern for the School of Medicine is justified. The perception is that there is a critical problem in lack of planning for community relations, for management, and alienated Las Vegas physicians with respect to the presence of the Medical School in Las Vegas. However, the overwhelming evidence is that despite this, the School should continue to report organizationally to UNR, for a number of reasons. First and most important has to do with Campus accountability. There is a particularly important passage in our report that I would like to call your attention to: "If the University of Nevada System is to function as an integrated system under which each Campus develops its own strengths for the benefit of the entire State, then the overall University of Nevada System must support accountability by each Campus for its own Statewide programs. Because the State and the UNS are too small to duplicate specialized programs on each Campus, most UNS personnel agree that each Campus should develop its own strengths, but should serve the entire State in these strengths. The organizational structure of the UNS should support this concept by enforcing the ac-

countability of each Campus for its unique programs.

An arrangement under which a specific program reports to the Chancellor negates such accountability. Because the location of the School of Medicine under the Chancellor would create the unfortunate implication that to be truly Statewide the program must report to the Chancellor and that below the Chancellor the UNS is not capable of administering a Statewide program. As the UNS grows and strengthens, such programs reporting to the Chancellor would be unwieldy."

That is the first point on Campus accountability, but there are really a number of others as well. In terms of the role of the Chancellor's Office, with his span of control and with his overall functioning as the chief executive officer for the Regents, and with broad policy oversight over these many educational institutions, such a move would change his role to that of line administrative officer and it would divert attention from these broader concerns of the UNS and focus them on the School of Medicine and its particular concerns. Furthermore, the organizational change does not address the real concern which has caused the problem of the lack of management of the Las Vegas programs. The cause

of the shortcomings in the SOM's Las Vegas programs are management problems as opposed to structural problems.

In terms of administrative costs, there would be some additional administrative personnel required if it were changed to the Chancellor's Office. The benefits of University affiliation could be lost by such a change.

Currently, the governing structure with the appointment and standards for tenure and promotion are University-wide concerns with the School of Medicine being part of the broader committee structure of the University which provides quality control. In terms of facilities, recreational facilities and the other facilities, library particularly, that are available to the SOM might be lost or in any case the access would be more difficult.

With respect to the SOM recruitment for faculty and students, I would suggest that this lack of access to University facilities would, in our view, make it more difficult to attract appropriate personnel. In terms of relationship with the University, it has been improving and this distance could detract from its further improvement. In terms of the School of Medicine and undergraduate programs -- medical technology, speech

pathology - they might be transferred and in any case their relationship would be difficult. With respect to the interdisciplinary programs, there is the issue of tenure existing at only one institution and collaboration would be more difficult. With respect to the School's accreditation, the Committee on Medical Education guidelines indicate that wherever possible, the School of Medicine should be part of the University. Financial aid to SOM students would possibly be reduced because they would be ineligible for UNR funds, and a new financial aid coordinator and new relationship would need to be established. Approval of the School's indirect cost rate would have to have new federal approval. There might be a necessity to pay more directly for services from the University - in any case, there would be a negotiation required to determine service costs.

Finally, it is unprecedented in the community-based medical schools in the country for a School of Medicine not to be part of a University Campus. There are medical schools that are separate, but where they are separate, they are part of hospitals or medical centers, and furthermore, they are often also a part of an overall health sciences center.

With respect to the organizational placement, what is it that the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Regents can do? We believe that the Chancellor of the UNS should provide strong policy and administrative review, particularly in the short term, as a part of his overall overview functions. If there are issues or problems with the University System, in any of the institutions, his attention needs to be directed there. It also is a part of his function to strengthen the role of Las Vegas as a part of the UNS. This means that his role is monitoring the development of a more supportive relationship, requiring well defined plans from the School, requiring that the plans agree with the Regents' policy and direction; requiring that there is evidence of effective conception and direction of the Las Vegas program.

Furthermore, UNLV should review and comment on the School's plans and budgets for Las Vegas. The purpose of this review should be to insure their sensitivity to Las Vegas needs and also to insure that they are consistent with UNLV's medically related programs. In terms of the School's formal identification, the name

should be changed and the recommendation is that the name be the University of Nevada School of Medicine.

It is important symbolically. It will strengthen the perception of the School as a Statewide School and it is clear that there is widespread support for that change.

With respect to the School's service relationship with UNR, there are some strengths. It is inexpensive by and large through the pooling of services. Furthermore, the School of Medicine's share in some instances exceeds its proportionate share because its facilities are more expensive to maintain. Joint appointments expand the faculty of the School at reduced costs. It expands the breadth and depth of resources available to the School. It gives administrative supervision and, by and large, the perceptions are that the quality of services is good, prompt, professional, competent, helpful, reliable. There are, however, some specific issues that need to be addressed. One is registration, where there is a perception that the Medical School's registration should be separate from the rest of the University. This is an issue being worked on currently, there appears that there will be a resolution of it, and it

appears to be a sound idea. With respect to the Personnel Committee, there has been a concern regarding promotion and tenure criteria. This is not an unusual problem for relationships between Universities and medical schools. It is definitely a problem that needs to be addressed and the Vice President for Academic Affairs should focus attention on this and his findings should be reviewed by the President and the Chancellor. Indirect cost is another issue. The perception on the part of SOM is that the indirect costs from the outside projects in which the SOM is the major contributor are not accruing back to the SOM to the extent that they should and this should be reexamined and the University President should be directly involved in that examination.

With respect to the Controller's handling of financial status reports for outside funds, there is a need to change that process so that the manager of the funds receives and reviews the financial status report before it goes to the funding agency, which is not currently the case. With respect to the Personnel Office, its relationship with the School of Medicine, there are a number of issues regarding personnel rules. It is not

clear whether those are a consequence of State rules or Personnel Office rules, but there is clearly a need for attention and discussion.

Finally, there is some duplication of efforts in the Alumni Office and that needs to be addressed and duplication eliminated.

I would like to turn now to the final chapter and a discussion of the program alternatives for southern Nevada.

First, to emphasize - our purpose in this chapter is not to make a recommendation but rather to document the characteristics of the alternatives. Our approach has been to describe, in order of magnitude, capital costs and to discuss other facets with respect to each alternative, but not including other costs which include relocation which may exceed \$1 million, and by and large not operating costs, although in a few cases we have mentioned certain of these. And then, finally, to indicate the implications for implementation of alternatives. The alternatives we have identified are: the total relocation to Las Vegas; the relocation of the clinical program in Las Vegas; and then a series of specific enhancements to the current program in Las

Vegas, of which 6 are discussed.

With respect to the first alternative which is relocation of the School of Medicine to Las Vegas. No one favored this, and the reason for including it and discussing it in some detail is that it provided an important framework for the discussion of the other alternatives, because major considerations here in the extreme are mitigated by the various alternatives which include some presence in Reno and some presence in Las Vegas. Certainly, the discussion in the extreme is mitigated by retaining some presence in Reno. As far as the capital costs estimates, a look at the exhibit contained in the report shows a total capital cost estimate at possibly \$17.4 million to move the entire School of Medicine. This is based on construction costs for the current buildings. With respect to other considerations, a total move of the program would require a review of accreditation, there would be concern because accreditation is closely linked with the strength of the graduate programs in biomedical sciences.

Public relations - some people would perceive of such an expenditure as a misuse of scarce resources. Faculty

relocation - some wouldn't move, the relocation costs would be high, the recruitment costs would be high. Recruitment of adjunct faculty - there would be a need to recruit replacements for the 246 adjunct or part-time faculty currently in Reno. Loss of VA hospital funds of \$1 million. Effect on the VA hospital - it would influence the quality of the hospital program and would influence the funding that the hospital receives. Community relations - it would negate gains in community relations which have been made in Reno. With respect to new residencies, there would be a need for residencies which are precursors of clerkships in pediatrics and family practice in Las Vegas. The Family Practice Center would be most likely lost to Reno or reduced, and it currently has 10,000 patient visits per year. The Animal Research Facility - if that were moved, it would reduce some savings from the Job Corps support.

Finally, interdisciplinary programs - there is more opportunity in Reno since there are 20 doctoral programs in Reno and only one in Las Vegas, and there would be the loss of those joint appointments; for example, 8 or 9 in biochemistry between SOM and College of Agriculture.

Second alternative - to relocate the School of Medicine Clinical Program. Again, this could be mitigated by some presence in Reno so that it could mean basically moving the Administration and the bulk of the programs to Las Vegas. Capital costs are estimated at \$3.8 million. Other specific considerations: administrative costs would include at least a second Chief of Medicine and 6 Department Chairmen; library costs, estimated at \$71,000 minimally, and staff salaries. Coordination and communication - a separation between the 2nd and 3rd year programs, need to deal with separate business centers, need to integrate basic sciences with clinical, relocation of students since it would be necessary for students to move between the 2nd and 3rd year, hard when spouses work and there are families - 25% of the medical students are married. And then finally, the same list, accreditation, public relations - same arguments that were listed for the first alternative.

And then, finally, the specific enhancements to the Las Vegas program. Some of these are already planned and our objective here is to present the facts that are associated with these, not to make recommendations that

any particular one should be adopted but rather to lay out the factors for the Regents' discussion.

First, construction of a School of Medicine building in Las Vegas. We have estimated the cost of that, at 3 levels. For a minimum size, which would include offices for the Associate Dean, classroom, library, one faculty office, \$343,000. For a larger building that would include 2 additional classrooms and 5 additional faculty offices, with additional staff space, resulting in a cost of \$509,000. A possible addition of the UNLV Radiological Technology programs to be housed in the same building, bringing the total cost to \$1.5 million.

Secondly, in terms of construction of a School of Medicine building in Las Vegas, there is a major benefactor of long standing who has expressed his intention to contribute a deed of trust to the School, with proceeds to be used for a building or clinic in Las Vegas. Interviewees expressed strong support for the tangible visibility of such a move; however, there is a need to define the purpose to which a building would be placed before the decision to go ahead with such a building is made.

The second alternative would be the expansion of clerkship and residency programs in Las Vegas. Recently, there have been established residencies in surgery and internal medicine at Southern Nevada Memorial. Southern Nevada would support an expansion. Sunrise would be willing to be involved if the School of Medicine defines its contribution. Clinical programs in Las Vegas offer convenience for southern Nevada students, service to the southern Nevada community, exposure on the part of the students to a wide variety of medical cases. It should be noted that an expansion of residencies is already planned, an expansion of clinical programs currently is not. With respect to other programs and operating changes, one plan is to institute a School of Medicine Library. Another to expand the Advisory Board to strengthen the ties to southern Nevada and tap the valuable perspective of additional resource people in Las Vegas and southern Nevada communities. Also, establish a Las Vegas clinic. Because of the large indigent population, such a clinic may be needed, although Southern Nevada Memorial believes that their clinic can do this job, so careful planning would be needed. Establish compatible functioning if the School

of Medicine faculty could hold joint appointments and teach undergraduates as they do at UNR. SOM faculty could participate in interdisciplinary programs as they do at UNR. There are currently UNLV programs in radiological technology, exercise physiology and nursing that might provide initial opportunity for cooperative effort.

That constitutes a summary of the factors related to the alternatives. There is one more point to be made and that is consideration for implementation. In our view, the School of Medicine should pursue whatever course of action is chosen with resolution and vigor. Serious shortcomings in the SOM's Las Vegas programs justifies such action. That is clearly evident in the interviews as we have discussed them in several instances in this report.

With respect to planning and direction of community relations, no formal change will be effective without the commitment to improve the School's Las Vegas program. In order to insure that commitment, there is a need for the Dean of SOM, the Chancellor and the Board of Regents to take resolute and vigorous action appropriate to

their respective roles, and that means that the Dean needs to take those actions required for implementation, the Chancellor to monitor those actions, and the Board of Regents to review progress periodically.

At the conclusion of his presentation, Dr. Smoley, together with Mr. Roen and Ms. Penskar, responded to questions from the Board, following which the Chairman announced that the consultant would be present the following morning when discussion on this matter would be resumed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M. and reconvened at 10:20 A.M., Friday, November 6, 1981.

2. Approval of Consent Agenda

Adoption of the Consent Agenda containing the following items was recommended (Agenda identified as Ref. A and filed with permanent minutes):

(1) Approval of minutes of the regular meeting of October 9, 1981.

(2) Acceptance of gifts and grants.

(3) Reappointment of the following to the UNR College of

Arts and Science Advisory Board for 3-year terms:

Barbara Feltner

William Fox

George Hardaway

Ellen Thompson

Margery Cavanaugh

(4) Approval of the following new estimative budget within

Statewide Programs - UNR for the Summer Session London

Theater Experience:

Revenue:

Opening Balance	\$ 1,000
Student Fees	49,500
Total Revenue	\$50,500

Expenditures:

Professional Salaries	\$ 2,250
Fringe Benefits	100
Out-of-State Travel	1,000
Operating	45,150

Ending Fund Balance	2,000
Total Expenditures	\$50,500

(5) Approval of the following fund transfers:

TMCC - \$12,000 from Student Services operating to Professional Salaries for part-time counselors.

This transfer is to correct an error in the operating budget.

UNR - \$76,500 from Contingency Reserve to Residency Program, Internal Medicine. An offsetting transfer has been made from professional salary savings.

(6) Appointment of Mr. Earl Johnson to the Advisory Committee for the UNLV Center for Business and Economic Research, replacing Mr. William Johnson.

(7) Approval of amendments to the 1981-82 Financial Plan for DRI for: Weather Modification Project; Social Sciences Center - Unrestricted; and Administration and General Expense.

(8) Approval of a \$5 per student special laboratory fee

for Data Processing classes offered by TMCC.

(9) Authorization for travel by Chancellor Bersi to Taiwan as a guest of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of China, commencing November 8 and returning on November 24, 1981, also visting Korea and Japan at no expense to the University.

(10) Approval of new easement for Tropicana Wash Flood Channel to correct an error in the legal description of an earlier easement granted to Clark County for flood control purposes.

Mr. Mc Bride moved approval of the Consent Agenda as submitted. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

3. Naming of College of Hotel and Business Building, UNLV

President Goodall announced receipt of a major gift to UNLV from Mr. Thomas T. Beam, to be used 1/3 in support of the College of Business and Economics, 1/3 in support of the College of Hotel Administration, and 1/3 in support of the development and expansion of architectural programs at UNLV.

Also involved in this offer of a gift is the naming of the UNLV Business and Hotel building after Mr. Beam's parents.

In announcing the gift, President Goodall recognized the efforts of the UNLV Development Office and Mr. Lyle Rivera, and Mr. Bill Ireland, Vice President Dixon, Regent Lilly Fong and Mr. Wing Fong.

Mrs. Fong moved that the gift be accepted subject to the conditions cited by President Goodall as to the use of the funds, and that the College of Hotel and Business be named in honor of Frank and Estella Beam. Motion seconded by Mr. Buchanan, carried without dissent.

4. Additional Gift from Mr. Claude I Howard

Chairman Cashell reported an additional gift from Mr. Claude I. Howard, as described in a letter to Chancellor Bersi and which Chairman Cashell read for the record:

When we last talked at the School of Medicine Advisory Board meeting on October 8, I told you that it was my intention to give to the Medical School a deed of trust for about \$950,000 on a shopping center in North Las

Vegas which I have recently constructed and sold. This deed of trust will pay approximately \$4,000,000 over the next 20 years in principal and interest. I want to confide to you that it is still my intent to convey this deed of trust to the Medical School for its use in developing its programs and its visibility in southern Nevada. I have already expressed my feeling to you about keeping the Medical School in Reno. However, I do feel there is a need in Las Vegas for developing additional School of Medicine clinical programs. In light of these needs, I would like to dedicate the above mentioned gift to the construction of a clinical education and research center for the School of Medicine on the Las Vegas Campus. I believe this building would give the School a much needed opportunity to tie its growing programs together, to give the School a focus, and to give it visibility in the community. It would at the same time make for the most efficient use of Medical School faculty and personnel in the southern part of the State.

I believe such a building would be a real asset to the Medical School and to the Las Vegas community. I would like to dedicate as much of my gift as is necessary to

pay for 1/2 of the construction costs of such a building. I would like to request that the Board of Regents arrange for matching funds to pay for the remainder of the costs necessary to construct a building that would meet the School's needs.

I will appreciate your help in this matter, and look forward to hearing from you.

Mr. Cashell recalled that in October he had visited with Mr. Howard concerning his proposed gift, following which some preliminary plans for a facility in Las Vegas were developed and were available for Regents to review if interested.

Mr. Cashell expressed his appreciation to Mr. Howard, and pledged that efforts would begin immediately to secure the matching funds in order that this building could become a reality on the Las Vegas Campus.

Mr. Howard announced that following discussions with his accountants, he was pleased to increase his offer to \$2 million, and would also pick up the cost of the library, estimated at \$71,600.

Mr. Mc Bride moved that the gifts offered by Mr. Howard be

accepted, and that the building for which the gift funds are provided be named in honor of Mr. Howard. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley, carried without dissent.

Discussion resumed on Item 1., Study of School of Medicine

Mrs. Gallagher moved that the name of the Medical School be changed to the University of Nevada School of Medicine. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley, carried without dissent.

Mr. Buchanan moved that in light of the donation by Mr. Howard, the Board of Regents direct that the 3rd and 4th years of the School of Medicine be moved to Las Vegas, to the UNLV Campus, that the clinical programs be maintained under UNR supervision, and that the transition take place as materials and facilities become available. Motion seconded by Mr. Karamanos.

Mr. Ross spoke in opposition to the motion, suggested that it violated every recommendation contained in the report. He expressed special concern for the disruption such a move would cause to the 3rd year medical students, many of whom he pointed out are married and have families.

In response to a question from Mrs. Whitley as to what would be involved in moving all of the clinical programs to Las Vegas, Dean Daugherty pointed out that the 3rd year only is involved since the 4th year is an elective year where students go all over the country. Dean Daugherty commented that it was his understanding that Mr. Howard's gift does not anticipate the 3rd year in Las Vegas, rather the plan was that the building for which he is providing funds would serve to provide more visibility for the program in Las Vegas and would allow the School to continue to develop and enlarge on the Las Vegas program.

Dean Daugherty also pointed out that the School started back in the Spring with the process to identify the needs of Las Vegas and to develop additional 3rd year programs for that community. There is currently an obstetrics program there, and he suggested that it would be entirely feasible to develop additional programs, particularly in internal medicine and surgery. There would, he stated, be a great deal of difficulty in developing programs in family medicine and in pediatrics because of problems related to accreditation and manpower.

Dr. Daugherty also stated that it was the commitment of the

School of Medicine, and would be as long as he remained Dean, to continue to develop the programs in Las Vegas. At the present time, there are 260+ doctors in Reno involved in teaching, and 100 doctors in Las Vegas. Any changes in the programs, particularly such a move as suggested by the motion, would interfere with the process of planning to identify the needed resources.

Mr. Howard spoke concerning the motion, stating that it was his understanding that this matter was all settled and the 3rd and 4th years would remain in Reno. He expressed concern that this was still under discussion, adding that if this action is taken, he did not feel that his contribution would be needed. He urged that the School remain in Reno, that it be recognized as a Medical School for the State and that the South and North start working together to support it.

Mr. Karamanos stated that he had a better understanding of the matter now and wished to withdraw his second.

Mr. Buchanan explained the reason for his motion, stating that he felt that it was necessary to have a medical facility and the degree of care which the CMP report states is

not available in Las Vegas. He suggested that if the 3rd and 4th years of the Medical School were committed to Las Vegas, the community would be provided better medical care in the future. Mr. Buchanan stated that the doctors in Las Vegas have felt slighted because of the treatment they have been getting from the administration in Reno; by splitting the School and placing the clinical program at UNLV, support of the Las Vegas community would be gained. He asked Mr. Howard to reconsider and support the movement of the clinical program to Las Vegas as materials, facilities and personnel become available.

Mr. Ross objected again to the motion, stating that he believed it inappropriate to subject Mr. Howard to this discussion. He pointed out that the report proposes the expansion of clinical programs in Las Vegas but does not recommend a transfer of the total program.

Mr. Buchanan offered to withdraw his motion in view of Mr. Howard's objections.

Mr. Howard expressed a desire for the North and South to work together, suggesting that there be one common goal, a Medical School for the entire State and for its people,

and suggested that the Regents get together in supporting that goal.

Ms. Del Papa moved, in the interest of the University of Nevada School of Medicine, that the report by Cresap, McCormick and Paget be accepted, that the Dean and the staff of the School of Medicine be directed to prepare a plan for implementation of specific enhancement of programs for Las Vegas within a reasonable amount of time and to report back to the Board, and that the Board of Regents go on record with a vote of confidence for the Dean and the staff of the School. Motion seconded by Mr. Ross.

It was agreed that the motion to accept the report did not imply approval, in that several of the Regents had reservations of varying degrees with some of the assumptions of the report. Mrs. Fong specifically requested that the record reflect her concern that the projected growth in the number of residencies for Las Vegas was unbalanced in proportion to the total projected population growth for the community.

Mrs. Gallagher endorsed Mr. Howard's suggestion that the School of Medicine be regarded as a program for the entire

State, and stated that she hoped the Board's action today would serve to settle the issue of the School's location and that everyone would move on to make it the very best Medical School of its size. She thanked Mr. Howard for his generosity to the School and for his support.

Dean Daugherty suggested that the report prepared by Cresap, Mc Cormick and Paget could serve as the first phase of a long range plan, a process which many describe as dynamic and ever changing, depending on new information and new data. He said that he would welcome the opportunity to work this through, to come back through the President and the Chancellor, to discuss various programs in Las Vegas. He expressed his appreciation for the commitment and support of the Board which had been demonstrated by the Regents, and stated that the facility and students in the School will also appreciate it greatly.

Mr. Ralph Denton, a Las Vegas member of the School of Medicine Advisory Board, stated that he wished to compliment the firm that prepared the study. He suggested that it pointed out many of the problems that the Advisory Board has recognized existed in the past and that they were trying to correct. As a member of the community, he said, he was looking

forward to a growing presence of the School in the South.

At the request of Mrs. Fong, Dr. Ted Jacobs, also a Las Vegas member of the Advisory Board, commented on the Medical School programs, agreed that there should be more visibility in Las Vegas, and suggested that the end result of the study and the meeting underway should produce that. However, he stated, he did not believe that one could transfer half of the Medical School to Las Vegas without serious consequences. He urged that the programs in Las Vegas be improved and enhanced and expressed agreement with the conclusions of the report.

Chairman Cashell asked that the motion be expanded to include the Chancellor and Presidents Goodall and Crowley in the vote of confidence.

President Goodall noted that one of the specific options mentioned in the report is the integration of all of the medical programs in Las Vegas, including the allied health programs at UNLV, into a single facility. He stated that he believed this was an important recommendation and he hoped that the Board and others involved in the planning would give that very serious consideration.

Ms. Del Papa expanded her motion to direct that this option be studied. Mr. Ross accepted the amendment.

Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

5. Report of Investment Advisory Committee

Mr. Karamanos presented the following report and recommendations arising from the meeting of the Investment Advisory Committee on Thursday, November 5, 1981:

1. Bob Lee of First Interstate Bank reviewed the assets held in the account managed by FIB and recommended the following purchases:

From the Engel Unitrust

200 Manufacturers Hanover	38	7,600	544	7.1
200 Continental Illinois	38	7,600	400	4.9
300 CBT Corp.	24	7,200	450	6.3
200 Crum & Forster	36	7,200	328	4.6
200 Federated Dept. Stores	37	7,400	380	5.1
100 Eli Lilly Co.	54	5,400	280	5.2

100 American Tel & Tel	60	6,000	540	9.0
------------------------	----	-------	-----	-----

100 General Electric	57	5,700	320	5.6
----------------------	----	-------	-----	-----

Total Stocks	54,100	3,242	6.0
--------------	--------	-------	-----

100K Par U. S. Treasury Notes

10 3/4% due 8/15/90	84	84,000	10,750	12.8
---------------------	----	--------	--------	------

Total Purchases	138,100	13,992	10.1
-----------------	---------	--------	------

From the Mac Millan Endowment

300 Manufacturers Hanover	38	11,400	896	7.2
---------------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

200 Bay Banks, Inc.	56	11,200	640	5.7
---------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

200 St. Paul Co.s	53	10,600	464	4.5
-------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

300 Federated Dept. Stores	37	11,100	570	5.1
----------------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

200 Macy's	59	11,800	350	3.0
------------	----	--------	-----	-----

300 Merrill Lynch	37	11,100	374	3.4
-------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

400 Mc Donnell Douglas	33	13,200	424	3.2
------------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

200 Eli Lilly Co.	54	10,800	560	5.2
-------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

200 General Electric	57	11,400	640	5.6
----------------------	----	--------	-----	-----

Total Purchases	102,600	4,918	4.7
-----------------	---------	-------	-----

From the Main Endowment Fund

5000 Mellon National Corp.	40	200,000	5,100	2.6
5200 Manufacturers Hanover	38	197,600	14,144	7.1
5200 Continental Ill. Corp.	38	197,600	10,400	5.3
3500 Bay Banks Inc.	56	196,000	11,200	5.7
8000 CBT Corp.	24	192,000	17,000	5.7
4500 Aetna Life & Cas. Co.	44	198,000	10,440	5.3
5500 Crum & Forster Co.	36	198,000	9,020	4.6
3700 St. Paul Co's	53	196,100	8,504	4.4
3400 Connecticut General Corp.	57	193,800	5,984	3.1
9500 Cart House Inc.	21	199,500	4,940	2.5
6600 Denny's Inc.	30	198,000	5,808	2.9
5300 Federated Dept. Stores	37	196,100	10,070	5.1
3400 Macy's Inc.	59	200,600	5,950	3.0
4300 E. F. Hutton & Co.	46	197,800	3,526	1.8
5300 Merrill Lynch	37	196,100	6,784	3.5
3100 Litton Ind.	63	195,300	4,340	2.2
6000 Mc Donnell Douglas	33	198,000	6,360	3.2
3600 Eli Lilly Co.	54	194,400	10,080	5.2
3500 Bristol Meyers	58	203,000	6,440	3.2
3300 American Tel & Tel	60	198,000	17,820	9.0
3100 General Electric	57	176,700	11,520	5.6

Total Purchases 4,122,700 185,430 4.4

2. Tom Josephsen of Security National Bank reviewed the assets held in accounts managed by SNB and recommended the following purchases from the University of Nevada Atmospherium/Planetarium account:

300 First Insterstate Bancp. 38 11,400 537 4.7

600 Bank of America 23 13,800 912 6.6

3. Monte Miller of Valley Bank reviewed the assets in the accounts managed by VB but made no recommendations for change at this time.

4. In addition to the transactions detailed above, the Committee requested that guidelines, under which investment decisions could be made between Board meetings, be developed. It was agreed that the bank representatives would submit proposed guidelines to the Chancellor's Office, following which Counsel will develop policy for consideration by the Board which will specify the parameters of the authority delegated to the Chancellor and the Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Buchanan moved approval of the report and recommendations of the Investment Advisory Committee. Motion seconded by Mrs. Fong.

Mr. Mc Bride expressed some reservations with the recommendations for investment in the stock market, and asked for reassurance that there is a mechanism in place for a quick decision to sell should the conditions of the market suggest that action. Mr. Karamanos acknowledged that the ability to respond quickly to recommendations by the bank representatives was critical and suggested that the guidelines which the Committee was requesting would serve that purpose.

Motion carried without dissent.

6. Review of Business Centers

Chancellor Bersi recalled that the Board had requested the Chancellor "to conduct an objective analysis, with assistance from the institutional Presidents, of the functions and structure of the two Business Centers." He reported that a meeting of the Officers had been held and submitted the following statement of policy as a general recommenda-

tion from the Chancellor and the Presidents for adoption

by the Board of Regents:

The Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer and Treasurer of the University of Nevada System - responsible for the general and financial management of the System.

The Presidents of the UNS are accountable to the Chancellor for the administration of their respective institutions and report through the Chancellor to the Board of Regents.

To guarantee equitable and consistent business service to all units of the UNS:

(1) The Chancellor shall be empowered to establish the policies and practices under which the financial administration of the UNS will be conducted.

(2) The Chancellor shall establish a Business Affairs Council, composed of the chief financial officer of each System unit, to review and recommend Systemwide financial policies and procedures to

the Chancellor.

- (3) Additionally, the Chancellor shall, in consultation with the Presidents, develop a model for effective utilization of business services by the Community Colleges and the Desert Research Institute.

Chancellor Bersi noted inclusion of an organization chart depicting this new relationship and recommended approval by the Board of Regents.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval of the statement of policy.

Motion seconded by Mrs. Fong, carried without dissent.

7. Consideration of Budget Committee Matters

The Chair was assumed by Budget Committee Chairman Del Papa for a meeting of the Board as a Committee of the Whole for consideration and action on the following Budget Committee matters:

- (1) Report of Outstanding Loans - In response to a request from the Budget Committee at its meeting of October 9, 1981, a report of all outstanding loans from the Board

of Regents Special Projects Account was submitted.

Ms. Del Papa stated that it was her intention to meet with the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance to discuss the status of these loans further and have another report and recommendation at a subsequent meeting.

- (2) Report Concerning Schedule of Review of Graduate Programs, UNR - Ms. Del Papa recalled that at the October meeting the Budget Committee had recommended and the Board had subsequently approved a request for \$15,000 to initiate an anticipated 3-year review and evaluation of UNR graduate programs, but had requested President Crowley to submit at this meeting a report on the feasibility of an accelerated schedule for this review.

Dr. Crowley reported that he had discussed with the Dean of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council the possibility of increasing the number of programs to be reviewed during the first year of the 3-year project. It was the opinion of the Council and the Dean that the number scheduled for review in the 1st

year should not be changed, but consideration given to an increase in the number to be reviewed during the succeeding years, following an evaluation of the 1st year's work.

(3) Requests for Funding from Board of Regents Special Projects Account - The following requests for funding were submitted:

A. Proposal for Staff Development Funds, TMCC -
\$30,000

B. Proposal for Staff Development Funds, WNCC -
\$13,725

C. Proposal for Relocation of Chemistry Lab from
Headquarters Building to Sage Building, DRI -
\$103,000

D. Request for Special Travel Funds, NNCC - \$5,000

E. Request for Funding for Graduate Program Review,
UNLV - \$14,800

F. Request for Funding for NSACC Leadership Conference

- \$20,000

G. Request for Funding for Lighting Control System,

Church Fine Arts, UNR - \$26,300

H. Request for Funding for Radio Production Facili-

ties, UNR - \$37,500

Ms. Del Papa reported that the request contained in Item F had been withdrawn.

Mr. Cashell expressed strong reservations with respect to the request contained in Item C, pointing out that funding for this project has been requested and denied by two successive Legislative Sessions. He suggested that if the Board provides financing for projects which the Legislature has turned down, the Legislature might reasonably expect the Board to continue to fund such projects without legislative assistance.

Dr. Murino suggested as an alternative that instead of a grant from the Special Projects Account, the Board approve a loan which would then be repaid by the Insti-

tute.

Ms. Del Papa recalled that in 1975, a loan of \$100,000 was made for DRI to front fund grants and contracts for which DRI was certain they would be receiving funds eventually.

She suggested the Regents authorize the use of this fund. President Murino agreed that this fund was still intact, but recalled that the Board has authorized at the October meeting a loan of \$95,000 from the account for a 30-day period, and suggested that this fund was still required for the purposes for which it was established.

Mr. Cashell moved that the request contained in Item C be denied. Motion seconded by Mr. Buchanan, carried without dissent.

Mrs. Whitley moved approval of the requests contained in Items A, B, D, E and H. Motion seconded by Mrs. Fong, carried without dissent.

(4) Proposal for Endowment Account - President Goodall re-

called that in October he had requested authorization to place \$200,000 which has accumulated through service fees, research contracts and overhead for the Lake Mead Limnological Research Center into an endowment account.

The Budget Committee had tabled this request. Subsequently, Chancellor Bersi and President Goodall had discussed this in an attempt to resolve some of the concerns expressed at the earlier meeting. For example a concern that a University unit might be moving appropriated money or other University funds into an endowment, which would be an inappropriate use of State funds and would perhaps set a precedent which would begin to erode the Regents' Special Projects Account.

Dr. Goodall stated that, at the Chancellor's request, he had prepared a report on the source of these funds.

The report shows that the Center is totally self-supporting, existing totally on grants and contracts.

They now have \$217,000 which they wish to invest to further insure their ability to remain self-supporting.

Chancellor Bersi added that this is not inconsistent with the development of the Special Projects Account and recommended approval.

Mrs. Fong moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs.

Gallagher, carried without dissent.

Mr. Mc Bride suggested that the action taken by the Board with respect to Item C also had implications insofar as the requests contained in Items G and H, and moved for reconsideration of that action. Motion seconded by Mr. Cashell, carried without dissent.

Mr. Mc Bride moved that the requests contained in Items G and H be deleted from the approving action by the Board.

Seconded by Mr. Cashell.

President Crowley suggested that perhaps there needed to be some clarification concerning the criteria which was to be applied for projects qualifying for grants from the Special Projects Account, noting that it was his understanding that the rule regarding not funding projects that might be funded by the Legislature was general in nature and not to be applied rigidly, and if one could make the case that the projects involved were of an emergency nature then the Board would consider them. He proposed that rather than voting down the projects, he be allowed to withdraw them pending clarification of the criteria. Mr. Mc Bride and Mr. Cashell

agreed to the withdrawal and, in turn, withdrew their motion to deny approval of the requests.

Mr. Mc Bride then moved that Items G and H be withdrawn without prejudice from the agenda. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher.

Mrs. Fong commented on the request contained in Item H for funds to construct a radio production facility at UNR, stating that UNLV also has a radio facility which is cramped and crowded and suggested that if funds are approved for one Campus, a request could be expected from every other Campus.

President Crowley commented on this assumption, noting that frequently when one of the institutions brings a request for funding to the Board, there is a propensity to regard that as having Systemwide application. He pointed out that what he expresses in his requests to the Board of Regents are intended as priorities for UNR, and are not intended and should not disrupt or affect in any way the priorities of any other institution.

Motion to withdraw without prejudice the requests contained in Items G and H carried without dissent.

Mr. Cashell resumed the Chair.

8. Proposed Meeting Calendar for Board of Regents

In order that Regents and Officers may plan their personal and professional calendars in advance, it was proposed that the Board consider adopting a meeting calendar providing for 10 regular (special or emergency meetings not included) meetings each year, to be held on the 3rd Friday of each month. It was further proposed that in even-numbered years (e. g., 1981, which is a budget-preparation year), no meetings be held in the months of May and December. In odd-numbered years (e. g., 1982, which is a legislative year), no meetings be held in August and December. This would produce the following calendar of regular meetings in 1982:

Friday, January 22*	Las Vegas
Friday, February 19	Reno
Friday, March 19	Las Vegas
Friday, April 16	Reno
No meeting in May	
Friday, June 18	Las Vegas
Friday, July 16	Reno

Friday, August 20 Las Vegas

Friday, September 17 Reno

Friday, October 15 Las Vegas

Friday, November 19 Reno

No meeting in December

*Date previously established

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc
Bride.

Ms. Del Papa requested that consideration be given to Satur-
day meetings as an alternative to Friday, suggested that
when 2-day meetings are required, they be scheduled for
Friday and Saturday, rather than Thursday and Friday, there-
by requiring Regents to be away from their places of work
only one work-day instead of two. Mrs. Whitley also ex-
pressed an interest in Friday/Saturday scheduling on occa-
sion.

Mrs. Gallagher urged that whatever calendar is adopted, it
be adhered to, noting that many Regents have to schedule
many weeks ahead around a Board meeting calendar and changes
in the schedule cause a great deal of inconvenience in meet-

ing other obligations.

Motion to adopt the proposed calendar carried without dissent.

Chairman Cashell announced that the next meeting is scheduled for December 11, and originally slated to meet in Reno; however, to accommodate a scheduled basketball game in Las Vegas on Thursday, December 10, between UNR and UNLV, it is moved to Las Vegas.

9. Proposed Constitution, Nevada Student Association of Community Colleges

Chancellor Bersi noted inclusion with the agenda of a proposed constitution for the Nevada Student Association of Community Colleges (identified as Ref. C and filed with permanent minutes), and recommended approval by the Board.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

10. Report of Bid Opening, UNLV Pavilion

President Goodall reported that, acting under the delegated authority extended by the Board previously, the State Public Works Board, with the concurrence of the UNLV Administration, awarded the following contracts for the UNLV Pavilion:

Mardian Construction Co.	\$25,531,248
--------------------------	--------------

for building and site
development

Irwin Seating Co.	710,083
-------------------	---------

for fixed seating

American Seating	299,300
------------------	---------

for retractable seating

President Goodall requested confirmation by the Board.

Mr. Buchanan moved approval. Motion seconded by Ms. Del

Papa, carried without dissent.

11. Salary for Part-Time Faculty

President Goodall commented on the status of part-time faculty compensation, recalled that the 1981 Legislature

had provided \$55,000 for this purpose, no increase in the level of funding available in 1980. By using salary savings, some very careful adjustment from vacant positions, approximately \$130,000 is actually being spent by UNLV on part-time faculty salaries. Dr. Goodall pointed out that although there has not been a salary increase for part-time faculty for several years, there is a faculty/administrator committee currently looking not only at the salary question, but a number of issues that impinge on this group, that will hopefully reach a conclusion for implementation next Fall and certainly for discussion with the Legislature during the 1983 Session. As a partial attempt at resolution President Goodall recommended that part-time faculty salaries at UNLV be increased from \$900 to \$1200 per course (i. e., \$400 per credit hour), effective with the Spring semester.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Buchanan.

Ms. Carol Severns, speaking on behalf of the part-time faculty, spoke about the relative position the recommended increase would bring part-time faculty to, suggesting that \$1200 is not equitable when cost-of-living increases pro-

vided to other State employees are considered.

Chairman Cashell agreed that salaries for part-time faculty must be reviewed and suggested that it be included in the 1983 Legislative Program. President Crowley pointed out that this has been of concern to the institutions for some-time, and he did not wish it to appear that the Administration was unaware of the problem. He recalled that a substantial increase was included in the 1981-83 budget request but was deleted by the Budget Office. He agreed with a suggestion by the Chair that once the base is where it should be for part-time faculty, annual cost-of-living increases be proposed.

Motion carried without dissent.

12. Bid Opening, Central Management Information and Control System, UNR

President Crowley recalled that this project is the last component of a larger project for which funds were provided by the 1977 Legislature. The low bid was slightly over budget; however, since there are unobligated funds in other projects that can be used, the State Public Works Board has

recommended a contract be awarded to the low bidder, Johnson Controls, Inc., in the amount of \$47,340. President Crowley requested the Board concur. Chancellor Bersi recommended approval.

Mr. Mc Bride moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

13. Bid Opening, Morrill Hall Elevator, UNR

President Crowley reported that bids to install an elevator in Morrill Hall were opened November 5, 1981 with a single bid in the amount of \$9,685 submitted by Silver State Elevator. He recommended acceptance of the bid, with the project to be financed from a gift given to the Alumni Association specifically for that purpose.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley, carried without dissent.

14. Bid Opening, Irrigation System, UNR

Dr. Crowley reported that bids to install an irrigation system and to level a portion of the dairy property were opened

October 23, 1981, with the following bids submitted:

	Base	Alternate	Total
A & K Earth Movers	\$199,507	\$91,140	\$290,647
Gopher Construction Co.	208,928	86,025	294,953

President Crowley noted that the bids exceed the available funds and requested authorization to negotiate with the low bidder, A & K Earth Movers.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

15. Appointment to Board of Directors, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

The University of Nevada Board of Regents, along with the Nevada State Board of Education, the Regents of the University of California, the California State Board of Education, the Trustees of the California State Universities and Colleges, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, the Board of Regents of the University of Utah, and the Utah State Board of Education, is a party

to a Joint Powers Agreement, which established the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in 1966. Under the Joint Powers Agreement, the Board of Regents appoints two voting members to the Board of Directors.

Chancellor Bersi reported that Mr. Albert Seeliger, former Regent and member of the Board of Directors for 16 years, has asked that he be replaced as a representative of the University of Nevada. Dr. Bersi recommended that Mrs. Lilly Fong be appointed to a 3-year term as a replacement for Mr. Seeliger.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

16. Status Report on Ed. D. Program, UNLV

In response to a request for an update on the review of the Ed. D. program, President Goodall reported that he could now provide answers to two questions raised earlier; i. e., whether a moratorium on admissions would be necessary, and whether the Board would be requested to provide funding for two or three major positions, the answer to both being no. The evaluation of the program is proceeding, the program

continues and admission is open. A Campus committee is currently doing an extensive review and, although a request for modest funding for one or two consultants may be submitted through the Budget Committee later, no further action is required of the Board at this point.

In response to a question by Mr. Buchanan, President Goodall acknowledged that the distribution of overload teaching assignments is one of the two or three major issues involved in the review that will be resolved before the final report is brought to the Board.

17. Doctoral Program in Exercise Physiology, UNLV

Vice President Nitzschke recalled that the Board had requested the College of Education and the Department of Physical Education to proceed with development and submission of a Phase I program for a doctoral program in Exercise Physiology. Dr. Nitzschke reported that the proposal has been prepared and will shortly be under review in the School of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, and will probably be ready for Board consideration in December or January.

18. Phase I Proposal, Master's Degree in Nursing, UNLV

At President Goodall's request, a Phase I proposal to initiate a Master's Degree in Nursing at UNLV was withdrawn from the agenda.

19. Proposed Increases in University Rentals, UNR

President Crowley recalled that at the October 9, 1981 meeting, the Board had approved increases in rental rates at UNR for University-owned apartments and houses. In continuation of the study of rental rates, he requested the following increases be adopted to allow the University to keep pace with increased utility and maintenance costs and to provide some major and much needed improvements in the married student housing units.

-- Monthly Rate --

Current Proposed

Married Student Housing	\$ 85	\$125
-------------------------	-------	-------

Stead Apartments

1 - Bedroom, Married Students	125	150
-------------------------------	-----	-----

1 - Bedroom, Staff	165	190
2 - Bedroom, Married Students	150	175
2 - Bedroom, Staff	190	215

President Crowley proposed that these increases be phased in 4 monthly increments, beginning on January 1, 1982.

Mrs. Fong moved approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Buchanan, carried without dissent.

20. Change in Name of College of Agriculture Major, UNR

President Crowley requests authorization to change the name of the 2-year Parks and Turf Management major in the College of Agriculture to Ornamental Horticulture.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

21. Reinstitution of Majors in College of Business Administration, UNR

President Crowley recommended that 3 majors formerly offered in the College of Business Administration - Finance,

Management and Marketing - be reinstated. He noted that there are no costs for additional courses or staffing attached to this request.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

22. Proposed Amendment, UNS Code

President Murino submitted a proposed revision to the DRI section of the UNS Code (identified as Ref. E, filed with permanent minutes). By inclusion on the agenda, the proposed revision was referred to each of the institutional Senates and to the Code Revision Committee for consideration.

23. Recommendation for Appointment of Vice President for Finance and Administration, DRI

President Murino recommended the appointment of Dr. Albert Gold as Vice President for Finance and Administration for the Desert Research Institute, at an annual salary of \$54,000, with an automobile allowance of \$250 per month to be paid from nonappropriated funds available to the

Institute. (Copy of Dr. Gold's vita filed with permanent minutes.)

Mr. Buchanan moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Fong, carried without dissent.

24. Recommendation for Appointment of Dean of College Services, CCCC

President Eaton recommended the appointment of Dr. Richard E. Behrendt as Dean of College Services at CCCC, effective January 11, 1982, at a salary of \$37,000. (Copy of Dr. Behrendt's vita filed with permanent minutes.)

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Fong, carried without dissent.

25. Naming of NNCC Buildings

President Berg submitted a resolution by the NNCC faculty, which he reported had been endorsed by the NNCC Advisory Board and which he also endorsed, that the two NNCC buildings be named in honor of two former members of the Advisory Board:

Vocational-Technical building named in honor of

Mel Lundberg

Learning Resources building named in honor of

Hugh Mc Mullen

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Fong, carried without dissent.

26. Proposed Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation for NNCC Foundation

President Berg requested approval of the proposed Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation for the NNCC Foundation as included in the agenda, and requested approval of the following initial appointments to the Board of Trustees:

Name	Address	Term
Ballew, Charles	Elko, Nevada	4 years
Blackham, Max	Ely, Nevada	4 years
Chilton, Mark	Elko, Nevada	2 years
Copley, Al	Elko, Nevada	2 years
Evans, Marguerite	Elko, Nevada	4 years

Eyre, E. E.	Eureka, Nevada	6 years
Gallagher, Dorothy	Elko, Nevada	4 years
Harmer, Burgess	Jackpot, Nevada	2 years
Huber, Al	Jackpot, Nevada	6 years
Ithuralde, Jim	Eureka, Nevada	2 years
Knight, Charles	Elko, Nevada	6 years
Lane, Mike	Winnemucca, Nevada	6 years
Marfisi, Michael	Elko, Nevada	4 years
Mc Mullen, Sam	Elko, Nevada	4 years
Mc Phee, Ted	Elko, Nevada	2 years
Post, Ruth	Spring Creek, Nevada	2 years
Pullman, Fredrick	Lamoille, Nevada	6 years
Read, Barbara	Lamoille, Nevada	6 years
Satterthwaite, Connie	Elko, Nevada	4 years
Sawyer, Paul	Elko, Nevada	6 years
Scott, Warren	Winnemucca, Nevada	2 years
Shuck, Carl	Elko, Nevada	2 years
Taylor, Lyle	Ely, Nevada	6 years
Vaughan, Robert	Elko, Nevada	6 years
Wilson, Orville	Elko, Nevada	4 years
Wright, Jim	Tuscarora, Nevada	4 years

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Motion seconded by Mr.

Mc Bride, carried without dissent.

27. Recommended Policy Statement for Inclusion in Handbook

President Davis requested approval of a policy statement for inclusion in the Handbook which would set forth the policy concerning admission, registration, grades and examination for WNCC. (Proposed statement identified as Ref. G and filed with permanent minutes.)

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley, carried without dissent.

28. School of Medicine Advisory Board

President Crowley recommended appointment of Mr. Rollan Melton to the School of Medicine Advisory Board.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Gallagher, carried without dissent.

29. Main Station/Jones Ranch Irrigation Ditch

President Crowley reported that the College of Agriculture wishes to construct an irrigation ditch along the west side

of the Jones Ranch component of the Main Station Field Laboratory. To make this possible, it would be necessary to utilize a narrow strip of land, 25 feet wide, extending from Kimlick Lane to Pembroke Drive, owned by the cities of Reno and Sparks (map of area identified as Ref. H and filed with permanent minutes).

Dr. Crowley requested authorization to apply to the two City Councils when they meet on November 9 for permission to construct the ditch, in return for which the University would agree to compensate the cities in one of the following ways:

- (1) Trade an equal acreage (approximately 3 acres) either immediately west of the cities' property, or adjacent to property lines associated with the sewer plant.
- (2) Purchase the land at a fair and mutually agreed value.
- (3) Negotiate a lease.

If negotiations with the cities can be successfully concluded, Dr. Crowley suggested that construction can begin in mid-November. He requested authorization to negotiate

with the cities of Reno and Sparks along the lines indicated by the above alternatives, with a report on the results to be submitted to the Board at a subsequent meeting. Chancellor Bersi recommended approval.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc Bride, carried without dissent.

30. Phase I Proposal, Certificate Program in Gerontology, UNLV

This proposal was withdrawn from the agenda at the request of Chancellor Bersi.

31. Affirmative Action Report, UNLV

President Goodall recalled that the Board had requested a response to a recent report of the Nevada Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. He noted that a written response had been distributed to each of the Regents and he asked Mr. Jim Kitchen, UNLV's Affirmative Action Officer, to comment generally on the progress at UNLV.

Mr. Kitchen reviewed the progress in the areas of hiring, promotion, tenure and salary advancement for women and

minorities which he could document had been made by UNLV since 1977. He cited specific instances where a woman and/or minority person had been promoted to or appointed to positions held previously by a white male; e. g., Director of Institutional Research and Analysis, Assistant to the President, Assistant Director of Admissions, Coordinator of Women's Athletics, Director of Publications, Ticket Manager, Dean of Student Services, Associate Dean of College of Education.

Out of 23 promotions in rank in 1981, 6 were women and 1 was a minority; out of a total of 125 administrative and support positions, 52 are filled by women (26%) and minorities (15%), as opposed to figures cited to the Commission of 6% and 8%.

Current information shows 42% of women and 67% of minority males and 38% of minority females earn \$25,000 or more, as compared with the report to the Commission quoting only 6% of minorities and 12% of women in that salary category.

In the area of tenure, out of 100 women on Campus, 49 are tenured, whereas in 1977 only 20 were tenured. Of minority females, 39% are tenured, and 41% of male minorities are

tenured.

Since 1977, almost half of all new hires at UNLV were women.

13 blacks have been hired, of which 5 are currently still on staff.

With respect to compliance with the provisions of Title IV, sufficient improvement has been realized that UNLV is now practically barrier-free. Similar progress has been made in Title IX compliance.

Mr. Kitchen concluded his report by expressing a concept that equal opportunity is a condition, with affirmative action, the means by which the condition can best be achieved. He suggested that one further step - that of commitment - needs to be made to insure that the process works.

In response to a question from Mrs. Whitley concerning the recruiting money spent, Mr. Kitchen explained that a total of \$37,200 was spent for recruiting at UNLV, for such things as advertisement of vacant positions, air fare, lodging and meals for candidates, and host expenses.

Mr. Kitchen spoke about current efforts underway to prepare

new goals and timetables for affirmative action, estimating that these would be complete by the first of the year. He also agreed to prepare, at the request of Mrs. Whitley, a budget in support of the Affirmative Action Plan for UNLV and would submit such a budget to the Board in January.

Mrs. Fong moved that the Board reaffirm its efforts to encourage affirmative action and equal opportunity at all levels. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley, carried without dissent.

32. New Business

(1) Ms. Del Papa recalled that over the past year, requests have been made by various Regents for reports on different subjects, only some of which have been completed. She requested a status report on all such requests be included on the December agenda.

(2) Mrs. Fong spoke of a tour she had recently made of Tonopah Hall, at which time she had observed various problems. For example, she had observed on the 5th and 6th floors that the washing machines are not hooked up, and it was explained that the plumbing needs to be

changed to correct a code violation; broken glass on the fire hose window; an unpleasant cockroach problem requiring the services of an exterminator; and the emergency telephone in the elevator is inaccessible to anyone in a wheel chair. Finally, Mrs. Fong asked about the Repair and Replacement Fund and its availability for correction of these problems.

Vice President Dixon stated that in anticipation of her request, Dean Daniels had prepared a report; however, he was not able to be present at the meeting and had asked that his report be read for him. Dr. Dixon noted that not all of Mrs. Fong's questions had been anticipated and the report, therefore, did not deal with some of them. Dean Daniel's report follows:

BACKGROUND

In mid-September, 1981 the CSUN President, Mr. Ravenholt, took me on a floor-by-floor inspection tour of Tonopah Hall. The students were most cooperative and pointed out areas of concern. I then contacted Vice President Westfall to ascertain the status of any residence hall improvement fund.

Realizing that there is an amount of approximately \$50,000 for immediate use, I contacted Physical Plant Director Moody requesting that he and Jerry Dove of the Physical Plant organization join me on an inspection tour. The inspection was held in October. It was generally agreed that the entire structure was in need of major repairs and renovation and pest extermination. Unfortunately, during this time a repairman on a routine repair call accidentally caused considerable damage due to improper treatment of a water problem.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. The water damage has been repaired.
2. Bids have been invited for the extermination of pests.
3. Mr. Dove has completed plans for some renovation on the 3rd and 6th floors. Specifically, on the 3rd floor, indoor-outdoor carpeting in the hallway will be replaced with washable and durable vinyl fabric. The 6th floor will be

converted into a quiet corridor for those students who prefer less than normal noise at interaction levels. The indoor-outdoor carpeting in the hallway will be replaced with washable vinyl.

The walls will be panelled with fireproof treated material. The study lounge will be recarpeted and furnished with appropriate furniture. Formal permission to implement this project will be requested within the next two weeks.

In addition to previously cited efforts, I wrote a proposal to the City of Las Vegas for \$5000 of its revenue sharing funds to purchase venetian blinds for all of the residence hall windows.

Perhaps we will receive a favorable response before Thanksgiving. Yearly renovations will continue on a priority basis; the 1st floor lounge is scheduled for improvement during the 1982-83 academic year.

Dr. Dixon stated that he would transmit to Dean Daniels

Mrs. Fong's additional remarks which were not anticipated in his report and would further pass along to him her suggestion that the students assume some responsibility for keeping the hallways clear of litter.

(3) Mr. Buchanan spoke about the counseling which is mandatory under the new DUI Law and the concerns on the part of some Clark County judges with the quality of the counseling programs now available. He suggested that the Community Colleges could provide a valuable service to the community and improved counseling programs, at the same time expanding their own counseling staff. He recalled that he had spoken about this with President Eaton and was aware that she had initiated some planning. He suggested that the other Community Colleges may wish to look into the possibility of providing this counseling service.

President Eaton explained that at the present time in southern Nevada, only private operators are available to the driving awareness program, and she believed that the Community Colleges were able to provide that kind of service at a lower cost but nonetheless at a favorable financial arrangement to the institutions. She

offered to share CCCC's planning with other Colleges.

- (4) Mr. Buchanan asked for a report on how the seating allocations in the new Pavilion at UNLV would be handled and whether advance reservations were possible.

President Goodall agreed to report back on this matter in December.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 P.M.

Bonnie M. Smotony

Secretary of the Board

11-05-1981