

# UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes January 12-13, 1984

1-12-1984

Pages 94-112

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

January 12-13, 1984

The Board of Regents met on the above dates in Room 399 Carlson  
Education building, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Members present: Mr. John R. Mc Bride, Chairman

Ms. Frankie Sue Del Papa

Mrs. Lilly Fong

Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher

Mr. Chris Karamanos

Mrs. Joan Kenney

Mr. Daniel J. Klaich

Mrs. Jo Ann Sheerin

Mrs. June F. Whitley

Others present: Chancellor Robert M. Bersi

President William Berg, NNCC

President Anthony Calabro, WNCC

President Joseph Crowley, UNR

President V. James Eardley, TMCC

President Leonard Goodall, UNLV

President Paul Meacham, CCCC

Acting President Warren Kocmond, DRI

Mr. Donald Klasic, General Counsel

Ms. Mary Lou Moser, Secretary

Also present were Faculty Senate Chairs William Cathey (UNR), Diane Dietrich (Unit), Joan Doggrell (CCCC), Allen Mori (UNLV), Richard French (DRI), Michael Hardie (WNCC), and Mary Ann Lambert (TMCC), and Student Association Officers.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mc Bride at 8:30 A.M.

#### 1. Personnel Session

Upon motion by Mrs. Fong, seconded by Mr. Karamanos, the Board moved to a personnel session for the purpose of completing annual evaluations of officers.

The Chairman reconvened the Board in public session at 1:35 P.M.

2. Approved the Consent Agenda

Approved the Consent Agenda (identified as Ref. A, and filed with the permanent minutes) containing the following items:

- (1) Approved the minutes of the regular meeting held December 8-9, 1983.
  
- (2) Accepted the gifts, grants and contracts as listed in Ref. C-1 and filed with the permanent minutes.
  
- (3) Approved the following changes in the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 13, Section 8, Refund Policy for CCCC:
  1. Delete "CCCC" from Paragraph 2.
  
  2. Add the following policy as Paragraph 4:
    4. The following policy is effective for CCCC beginning with Fall 1984 semester:
      - a. The refund for all students, in all programs, with the exception of Summer Session, for withdrawal of net credit load reduction shall be:

(1) One hundred percent (100%) if initiated prior to the first day of the semester.

(2) Seventy-five percent (75%) if initiated during the first week of the semester.

(3) Fifty percent (50%) if initiated during the second week of the semester.

(4) No refund after the end of the second week of the semester.

b. A refund of fifty percent (50%) of the registration fee shall be made to students withdrawing during the first 10 percent (10%) of a Summer Session or intensive course. No refunds shall be made after that time.

c. Upon written approval of the Director of Admissions and Records, a full refund of all registration fees and tuition shall be given upon official withdrawal at any time during the first six weeks of the semester, in the following circumstances

- (1) Induction of a student into the United States Armed Forces;
- (2) Death of a spouse, child, parent or legal guardian of a student;
- (3) Death of a student; or
- (4) verifiable error on the part of the institution.

No refund is made if withdrawal is after the end of the sixth week, regardless of circumstances.

- d. Nonresident tuition shall be refunded in conformity with the above schedule for load reduction to six credit hours or less and for withdrawal.

- (4) Approved Mr. Earl Johnson for membership to CCCC's Board of Foundation Trustees.
- (5) Approved a correction to the deferred fee in Title 4,

Chapter 10, Section 5, Registration for WNCC:

Paragraph 3 should read:

A student whose record indicates a delinquent indebtedness to the College for registration fees will be placed on financial hold for further registration, transcript or diploma or certificate privileges.

- (6) Approved Mr. Bruce A. Kennedy, President, Thyssen Mining Construction, Inc., to be added to the UNR Mackay School of Mines Advisory Board.
  
- (7) Approved a sublet lease on the Kapo Mining Properties to Nevada North Resources (U. S. A.), Inc., conditioned upon the review of the sublease document by General Counsel.

UNR currently has a mining lease on the Kapo Mining Properties near Valmy (Winnemucca), Nevada, with Decker Explorations, who has made a formal request for permission to sublet the lease to Nevada North Resources (U. S. A.), Inc. The Company has acquired a number of other mining properties and plans ex-

tensive exploration of the area, which may benefit

UNR.

(8) Approved the Summer Session Budgets for 1984 for the following Campuses:

A. UNR Summer Session Budget for 1984, Ref. C-2, filed in the Regents Office.

B. CCCC Summer Session Budget for 1984, Ref. C-3, filed in the Regents Office.

C. TMCC Summer Session Budget for 1984, Ref. C-4, filed in the Regents Office.

D. NNCC Summer Session Budget for 1984, Ref. C-5, filed in the Regents Office.

E. UNLV Summer Session Budget for 1984, Ref. C-6, filed in the Regents Office.

(9) Authorized the use of \$25,000 in Capital Improvement Funds at UNR for the completion of the installation of the VAX 11-750 Computer as well as HP 9000. Both VAX 11-750 and HP 9000 will provide the computer facili-

ties necessary for the teaching of electrical engineering courses. In addition, VAX 11-750 will provide text processing services for UNR Campus.

- (10) Authorized to allocate \$100,000 of Capital Improvement Project Funds at UNLV for equipment and improvements in the Thomas and Mack Center, which will enable the facility to be used for such non-athletic events as Commencement, music and theatrical programs.

Mrs. Fong requested a detailed expense account for the allocation of funds.

Mrs. Whitley moved for adoption of the Consent Agenda. Mrs. Sheerin seconded. Motion carried.

3. Approved Phase I Proposal for School of Engineering and Computer Science, UNLV

In March, 1983 a study team from the National Academy of Engineering, Chaired by Dr. Paul Chenea, was requested by the Board of Regents to conduct a site visit to the State, in order to make Statewide recommendations for engineering education in the System. A report was subsequently submitted to the Board in April, 1983 and was referred to the



Campuses for their consideration.

The report and Campus recommendations were discussed at the December 8, 1983 meeting of the Board of Regents. Joint statements by UNR and UNLV on engineering education were accepted by the Board, along with testimony from public and Campus advisory groups on engineering.

The Board of Regents adopted a resolution which reaffirmed the Board's commitment to support a fully accredited program at UNR and requested a Phase I proposal be prepared for a School of Engineering and Computer Science at UNLV, Ref. B, filed in the Regents Office.

Dean David Emerson, College of Science, Mathematics and Engineering, UNLV, summarized the Phase I Proposal, stating that the transition to a full Engineering School would be phased in over the next several years. Emphasizing that duplication of programs at UNR and UNLV should not necessarily be prohibited as long as there is a definite need at both Campuses, he stated that Phase I calls for additional personnel, proposed funding from private and public sources, and a 11,000 sq. ft. building, to open in the Fall of 1987, estimated at \$18 million, including equipment.

Mrs. Gallagher questioned the need for architectural engineering as included in this program proposal, with Mr. McBride agreeing that it should not. Dean Emerson stated that it had been agreed between Presidents Crowley and Goodall that architectural engineering would be placed at UNLV; therefore, it had been included in the Phase I.

Mr. Klaich was recognized by the Chair and made the following statement:

I would like to make some extended remarks to Dean Emerson's presentation, and would appreciate these remarks being viewed in the context of my second to Regent Fong's motion at the December meeting, approving the concept of an Engineering School at UNLV. That second represented my feelings about the philosophical basis of engineering within the system at that time, which remains my opinion today. Despite that feeling, I believe there are a number of concerns raised by this Phase I Proposal, which I would like to address. You should construe my remarks as questions, where appropriate, to be answered at the conclusion.

First, I believe it is important that we consider the environment in which this subject is being discussed.

we have a State on the financial rebound and a Governor firmly committed to the betterment of education at all levels. That same Governor and influential Legislators, both South and North, have cautioned that the financial well is not bottomless, and that they fully expect us to assess and intelligently present our priorities for higher education in Nevada. We have well defined priorities which will not be displaced irrespective of any decision we make regarding engineering anywhere in the system. They are (1) rehabilitating faculty salaries; (2) strengthening the financial infrastructure of the University System, that is, the MIS; and (3) improving student/faculty ratios. These priorities are expensive propositions, which means that all other priorities will be competing for limited dollars against other deserving programs within and without the University System. Even in this context, however, every report to the Board, including the careful and thoughtful joint report of our University Presidents, has emphasized the need and desirability of enhanced engineering opportunities at UNLV - but for what purpose?

First: to support the economic diversification so necessary to the long-term health of our State; and

Second: to supply more engineering professionals to a market that is projected to absorb them.

The order of these purposes is critical, and, I will suggest, has not been addressed by this Phase I Proposal.

where does this leave us? We have an honest and essential educational need and very limited existing University funds, only speculative State funds, and as yet, only the promise of private funds; what I think this adds up to is the immediate need for keen academic analysis of alternative engineering programs at various funding levels, and above all, creative thinking. To the contrary, what we have received is conventional, expensive, unresponsive, one-dimensional and inflexible.

What is wrong with this Phase I Proposal? It is extraordinarily vague in the area of finances. I personally do not believe we can further indulge in the fiction that planning can be severed from budget realities.

It is not constructed on the basis of the joint agreement of the Presidents of UNR and UNLV. For example, in that agreement there was no mention of a School of Architecture, which has been included in this proposal.

It is a shotgun approach that proceeds on a philosophical basis of a little bit to all, starting at the bottom. What this means to me is a commitment to mediocrity in the long run, and to no perceptible positive effect in the short run. It begs the Board to abdicate its authority to the Legislature as essentially a funding decision. It ignores the needs that we are specifically seeking to address, that is, industry support and economic diversification. I believe we owe more to UNLV, to the people of the State, and most specifically, to the Southern Nevada community.

I will not merely criticize this proposal without giving some thought as to what I think we should do. If economic diversification is our main goal, we must realize what type of engineering opportunities are of the first importance:

First, Masters Programs at the University level;

Second, engineering technology programs, which probably belong at the Community College level.

The type of businesses that we need and want don't need our baccalaureate engineers. They recruit nationally

at a level with which we cannot compete for the foreseeable future. They need ongoing post-graduate, professional education and assistance with technicians.

Can we provide these services? The Masters Programs at the University level are the easiest and cheapest to staff and equip. Masters professors can be adjunct faculty with an immediate flexibility to consult with industry. The least facilities are required immediately and ultimately required in the long run. Engineering programs can and are capable of being founded at the mid- or Masters level. Programs founded here are capable of growing up and down into both stronger baccalaureate and advanced programs -- and that growth can be long term and well planned.

with the foregoing in mind, I would propose that this Board take the following action with respect to the Phase I Proposal before us this afternoon:

1. we should approve the reorganization of the School as set forth in the Phase I Proposal with the deletion of architecture.
2. we should direct the immediate hiring of a UNLV con-

sultant in engineering or Director of the Engineering School who, first, knows the profession, second, understands the educational model, and, third, can dovetail the programs we develop into the health of the community.

3. We should remand the Phase I Proposal to UNLV to be rethought in connection with the consultant/director to comply with the joint proposal of the Presidents and the express needs of the Southern Nevada business community.
4. We should reaffirm this Board's commitment to the most accelerated procedures for engineering at UNLV and the initiation of enhanced programs within our means at the earliest date.
5. We should direct the development of alternative proposals for engineering at UNLV within various funding levels so that we are not faced with and forced to forward to the Legislature an all or nothing at all proposal.

The Phase I Proposal as submitted to us this afternoon simply is not good enough for UNLV and should be re-

jected by the Board.

Ms. Del Papa, supporting Mr. Klaich's position, emphasized the need for private funding sources, but stressed that just promises of those private funds are not commitment enough. Mrs. Sheerin commended Mr. Klaich for the positive report and suggested that it will be necessary for the College to be very creative in their programs, urging that they look at alternatives to avoid duplication of programs with other Campuses. Mrs. Gallagher suggested that the Campus must work within its own 10-year plan for the placement of this school. Further, she stated she did not support a separate building at this time, but rather that it must be considered within the System Capital Improvement Plan in conjunction with all other building requirements.

Mr. Mc Bride spoke in favor of accepting the Phase I report, reiterating that he has been contacted by many of those connected with industry from around the State and has continually emphasized the need for a firm commitment from them, the general public, and the State, to a College of Engineering at UNLV.

Mrs. Whitley moved to accept the Phase I Proposal for the School of Engineering and Computer Science at UNLV with the



deletion of 1) the degree of Architectural Engineering, and 2) construction of a new building at this time. Mrs. Fong seconded.

Vice Chancellor Fox reported that the Academic Affairs Council had just received the Phase I Proposal at their meeting in the morning (just prior to the Regents meeting) and that they support the Board of Regents Resolution adopted at the December meeting, accreditation of the College of Engineering at UNR, and the technical training program proposed for Community Colleges. They were not privy to the material supplied by Dean Emerson to the Regents at this presentation which, if it had been available, could have cleared up a number of questions brought forth at their meeting.

Further, Vice Chancellor Fox stated the Council does recommend the removal of the \$18 million building, the removal of the appendix attached to Phase I, which is not really a part of this proposal, and they needed further clarification of the positions as requested in the Phase I (some of which were addressed in the aforementioned handout). For Phase II, the Council requests that each area within the School be addressed separately, and that alternative methods, such as the use of video tapes, could address the problem of duplication of programs.

Mr. Klaich posed a question of President Goodall concerning what would happen to the program if approval is given but no State funds are available for support. Dr. Goodall responded that UNLV would continue to work within their budget to build the School, and reminded the Board that one of the thrusts at UNLV is towards engineering.

A roll call vote was requested:

Aye: Del Papa, Fong, Gallagher, Karamanos, Kenney,  
Whitley, Mc Bride

Nay: Klaich, Sheerin

Chairman Mc Bride relinquished the gavel to Vice Chairman Gallagher.

4. Report of Internal Audits, October 1 - December 31, 1983

Kathy Kossick, Director of Internal Audit, presented a summary report of internal audits completed for the quarter, October through December, 1983. See Ref. E, filed in the permanent minutes.

Chancellor Bersi announced to the Board that Mrs. Kossick

would be leaving the System in February. He commended her on her remarkable service to the System and announced that among her accomplishments while with the System, she had instigated A-110 audits to be used as a national model for internal, external and federal audits.

Mrs. Kenney introduced Mrs. Vivienne Morris and Mr. Hal Smith of the State Board of Education.

5. Report from Bank Investors

A. Mr. Bob Lee submitted the report for First Interstate Bank.

B. Mr. Monte Miller submitted the report for Valley Bank of Nevada. Mr. Klaich had previously requested a detailed breakdown of his report which he submitted to the Board. Mr. Klaich thanked him for his endeavors and Mr. Miller informed the Board that he would continue this service.

C. Mr. Murry Foster submitted the report for Security Bank of Nevada

Mrs. Gallagher requested Mr. Foster to continue working

with Vice Chancellor Dawson on the Planetarium Account.

D. Mr. Pete Burns submitted the report for Nevada National Bank.

6. Approved the Action in the Estate of Vera Francis

In 1980 Vera Francis executed a will in which, after various bequests to other persons, she left the balance of her estate to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, upon the condition that all funds arising from said bequest shall be used exclusively for the purposes of student loans. The National Association of Retarded Citizens requested that the Board of Regents reject the bequest of Mrs. Francis so that it may be used for the benefit of her adopted son, who is retarded. A full explanation is contained in memorandums of General Counsel Klastic and President Goodall contained in Ref. F, filed in the Regents Office.

Mrs. Fong moved the Board reject the bequest of Mrs. Vera Francis and authorized General Counsel Klastic to enter into negotiations which would benefit Mrs. Francis' adopted son. Mrs. Kenney seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Klauch requested General Counsel Klastic to report back

to the Board on the negotiations.

7. Approved the Appointment of Director of University of Nevada Press

Chancellor Bersi, with the concurrence of the Search Committee, recommended Mr. John "Rick" Stetter to the Board for the appointment as Director of the University of Nevada Press, effective January 16, 1984 at an annual salary of \$38,500.

Mrs. Whitley moved approval of Mr. John "Rick" Stetter as the Director of the University of Nevada Press, effective January 16, 1984 at an annual salary of \$38,500. Mrs. Fong seconded. Motion carried.

Chairman Mc Bride returned and resumed the gavel.

8. Report of Joint Ad Hoc Committees Meeting on UNR and UNLV Athletics Meeting

Ms. Del Papa reported that the joint committees had met and heard reports from Presidents Crowley and Goodall on the implementation of the Athletics policies as adopted by the Board in May, 1983.

The Five-Year Plan for both Campuses will be submitted for Board consideration at the April meeting.

Ms. Del Papa recommended that these ad hoc committees be disbanded and that an annual report be placed on the calendar for progress reports regarding Athletics.

Ms. Del Papa moved approval. Mrs. Gallagher seconded.

Motion carried.

9. Approved the Amendment to Bylaws, UNR

Approved the following amendment to the UNR Bylaws:

Part 1, Chapter 1, Section 4. AMENDMENT OF THE BYLAWS

Any member of the faculty may propose amendments to the Bylaws. Proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing to the Faculty Senate, which shall refer the same to a Senate Bylaws Committee for its review and recommendation. If approved by a majority of the Faculty Senate, the proposed amendment shall be submitted to the faculty and professional staff for a vote by a written, secret mail ballot. A proposed amendment which, after consideration by the

Faculty Senate, has not been approved by a majority of that body, shall be submitted to the faculty for a vote by a written, secret mail ballot, if at least ten percent of the faculty sign a petition requesting this action. The amendment shall be in force upon: 1) approval by the faculty, which shall be by at least a two-thirds majority of those voting in a written, secret mail ballot; 2) approval by the President after consultation with the Administrative Council; and 3) approval by the Board of Regents.

General Counsel Klastic recommended approval subject to further review of the provision after the proposed UNR Bylaws in their entirety are submitted to the Regents for approval.

Mrs. Kenney moved approval of the amendment of the UNR Bylaws subject to further review after the proposed UNR Bylaws are submitted to the Regents. Mr. Klačich seconded. Motion carried.

#### 10. Report from the Regents Ad Hoc Liaison Committee

At the December, 1983 meeting the newly formed Professional Staff Council at UNLV asked for recognition by the Regents to represent nearly 1/4 of the professional staff at UNLV, who for the past 5 years have not been represented by action

of the Faculty Senate.

The Liaison Committee met with the Professional Staff Council on December 19, 1983. Mrs. Gallagher, Chair, related that there apparently has been no success in bringing the Professional Staff Council back into the Faculty Senate at UNLV.

Ms. Nancy Forni, Chair of the Professional Staff Council, stated that she had met with President Goodall, who informed her that the Professional Staff Council would now be recognized on the campus. There are 137 members who are in the Professional Staff Council, which is 37.5% of the professional employees at UNLV, without representation.

Mrs. Gallagher moved for approval of recognizing the Professional Staff Council on the level of the Faculty Senate and that they be seated with the Faculty Senate Chairs at Regent meetings. Mrs. Whitley seconded.

Mr. Klaich stated that he was not against the recommendation but that it would be creating a precedent which would be undesirable and that in voting for this recognition it is not to be misunderstood as encouraging other organizations to break away. However, at UNLV there are extreme circum-



stances to be considered. He urged the Faculty Senate and Professional Staff Council to reunite into one organization and suggested a one year trial basis for the two groups.

Dr. Allen Mori, UNLV Faculty Senate Chair, stated that he had presented President Goodall with a recommendation which would give the professional staff representation on committees and provide them with two Senators, with Ms. Forni replying that she had not heard of this recommendation. Dr. Mori then emphasized that this was only his recommendation and that it had not been endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

President Goodall reiterated that the Professional Staff Council now has Campus recognition and will be able to attend meetings, have access to budgets, and have access through the President to the Board of Regents to speak on issues; however, he felt that under present circumstances the two organizations likely would not be able to merge at this time.

Dr. William Cathey, UNR Faculty Senate Chair, stated that UNR has a very successful model with equal representation, but if the Professional Staff Council is included that there might be a division of strength at the Senate table. Mrs. Gallagher agreed with the successful model at UNR, but said

there would not be a change in power at the table, but rather that each group from UNLV would each have "half-a-vote". She expressed her hope that down the road the two would reunite.

Mr. Jim Kitchen, Professional Staff Council, stated that 6 years ago the Faculty Senate at UNLV was organized in the same fashion as UNR's Faculty Senate, but the problem at UNLV is that the Faculty Senate does not consider professional staff as faculty. The professional staff, he stated, is also concerned with academics, with many of them holding Ph. D. and/or Master's degrees.

Mr. Karamanos encouraged the union of the two groups, stating that the greater the number, the better representation, in any negotiations. He felt there was an effective Faculty Senate 5 years ago when everyone was represented.

Dr. Mori expressed to the Board that the Faculty Senate is an Academic Faculty Senate. Mrs. Whitley reminded him that the professional staff was a support service to the faculty, the Board is concerned with academic standards and quality and she felt there could not be a separation of the support staff.

Mr. Klaich amended the motion by adding that there would be a one year dialogue under the direction of the President between the two groups and that at the end of the one year, a report be made to the Board, along with resolution, and if the two groups could not merge, the reasons be given.

Mrs. Fong seconded.

Mrs. Gallagher reiterated that if UNLV Faculty Senate was only concerned with academic affairs, then it was very important to have the professional staff represented.

President Crowley stated that if two Senates are formed, then there would be issues that would be of concern for both Senates. He informed the Board that in setting this precedent the Graduate Student Association at UNR may be declaring its own representation.

Mrs. Fong addressed the Faculty Senate by asking whether they really could operate without the assistance of the professional staff.

Faculty Senate Chairs Lambert and Hardie registered their opposition in recognizing the professional staff.

The Board then considered the amended motion.

Moved that the Professional Staff Council be approved and recognized on the level of the Faculty Senate and that they be seated with the Faculty Senate Chairs at Regent meetings and that there would be a one year dialogue under the direction of the President between the two groups and that at the end of the one year a report be made to the Board, along with resolution, and if the two groups could not merge the reasons be given. Motion carried. Ms. DeI Papa voted no.

11. Approved Officers' Contracts for 1984-85

Annual evaluation having been completed, the Board approved extending UNS Officer Contracts for 1984-85 without change in compensation.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Mrs. Whitley seconded.

Motion carried.

12. Approved Resolution Regarding Investment of Funds

Approved the following Resolution:

WHEREAS, the University of Nevada System Controller's Office invests the surplus operating funds of the University of Nevada System in quality risk-free, short-term investments; and

WHEREAS, CDX, the national exchange for jumbo certificates of deposits in \$100,000 lots federally insuring both the principal and interest requires the University of Nevada System to have a Custodian and Agent in New York City to accept delivery and keep in safekeeping the certificates; and

WHEREAS, State Street Bank and Trust Company, a banking corporation acting as a Custodian and Agent in New York City for other CDX investors has agreed to act in that capacity for the System; NOW THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada System enter into a Custodian Agreement with State Street Bank and Trust Company to act as Custodian and Agent for the University of Nevada System.

Mrs. Whitley moved approval of the Resolution. Mrs. Kenney seconded. Motion carried.

13. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Regent Bylaws

Ms. Del Papa asked for suggestions from Regents regarding Bylaws.

Ms. Del Papa informed the Board that General Counsel is in the process of reorganizing the Handbook and adding policies on evaluation and ethics.

14. Report of the Presidential Search Committee, DRI

Mr. Klaich reported that the deadline for applications has closed. The Committee will be meeting on January 20 to select the finalists.

15. Report on MIS

Mr. Klaich reported that Deloitte, Haskins & Sells has completed a draft report which will be submitted to the Board at the April meeting.

16. Approved Loan from Capital Improvement Fee Fund, UNLV

President Goodall requested approval of a loan from the

Capital Improvement Fee Fund to the Athletics Department of up to \$400,000 to be paid back with interest at the rate the Fund is currently receiving on its investments (approximately 9%), to be paid back by August 1, 1984. Vice Chancellor Dawson had recommended approval, but that the loan be held to the current fiscal year.

Dr. Goodall explained that this loan was needed because of a cash flow problem only, stating that in the Spring the Department has commitments on game guarantees, television distributions, conference and post-season play distributions for various sports, but that the cash flow is sporadic, while the expenditures, such as salaries, are at regular intervals.

Mr. Karamanos questioned whether the current budget includes such items as team travel. Dr. Goodall replied that it did not, but that he has the authority to make transfers to the Department to cover these items, which are paid back when the commitments to UNLV from these games are honored by the other institutions and/or conferences.

Mrs. Sheerin, asking and receiving confirmation that this loan will in no way supplement any of the budgets as they now stand, also asked for confirmation that the only way the

current budget could be supplemented is from private donations specifically earmarked for a sport. She was assured that is the case; i. e., should any budget for a sport be inadequate -- such as basketball -- then any additional expenditures must be covered by outside donations earmarked for that sport -- basketball.

Mrs. Sheerin, in questioning an \$120,000 amount still to be collected for football, was informed that amount will be forthcoming from game guarantees which have not as yet been paid, although the games have been played. Dr. Goodall reiterated that the revenue projections presented at this time are the best the Athletic Department's budget committee can make and they believe them to be conservative, and that is the reason they feel they can repay the loan by the end of the fiscal year.

Mrs. Whitley asked for an explanation of the \$60,000 controversy over the Georgetown game and Classic played during the Christmas holidays. Dr. Brad Rothermel, Athletic Director, explained that UNLV wanted Georgetown to play in the Classic and in order to do so, had to guarantee them two games. In order for them to play, UNLV would have to cancel Wyoming. A return match with Georgetown is scheduled in Washington, D. C. in December, with a possible national TV airing, which



would guarantee more revenue for UNLV in 1984. Wyoming agreed to allow UNLV to exercise one option which was a \$60,000 payout. For the Classic, Georgetown agreed to come to UNLV and play Marshall University for \$20,000 and UNLV for \$10,000. However, UNLV is not paying Georgetown the \$30,000 this year, but will owe them that sum next year when they play in December and which will hopefully be nationally televised, thereby having more funds to work with and with which to pay Georgetown for this year's games. The advantage of this arrangement, according to Dr. Rothermel, was to have Georgetown present for the December Classic, which gave additional revenue in ticket sales for the 2-day event. Ticket sales were good -- 18,000 for the Georgetown game and around 17,000 for the first night of the Classic. UNLV, however, still owes \$60,000 in game guarantees/payouts next year.

Mr. Karamanos expressed his strong concern over athletic contracts being signed without approval from the legal staff. Mr. Mc Bride explained that such contracts as these are administrative decisions.

Mr. Karamanos moved to approve a loan from the Capital Improvement Fee Funds of up to \$400,000 to the UNLV Athletic Department to be paid back with interest of the going rate

for investments on the Capital Improvement Fee Funds, with the pay-back being completed by June 30, 1984. Reports will be made at each Regent meeting concerning the status of this loan. Further, that all athletics contracts at UNLV and UNR must be approved by Legal Counsel before they are signed, and that this will also include all letters of intent; and further, that Counsel will report to the Board on all such contracts. Seconded by Mrs. Fong.

Mrs. Sheerin again stated that she felt there was more than a cash flow problem, saying that it is an operating problem, one that involves game guarantees, payment of rental to Thomas and Mack Center, recruiting expenditures, and team travel not being included in the athletic budget.

Mr. Klaich stated that in the 9 months he has been a Regent, this is the second time there has been a major contractual difficulty that would cost the University a considerable sum. He stressed that the University is a big business, there are procedures in place, and they must be followed, and that ignoring them can no longer be tolerated.

Upon voice vote, motion carried. Mrs. Sherrin voted no.

## 17. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Bersi recommended that the Board designate a day at the February meeting to be devoted to discussion of the Legislative Report.

18. New Business

A. Mr. Karamanos requested General Counsel to review all athletic commitments and contracts. This request is stated in the resolutions in regard to both Campusus.

Mr. Klaich again stated that this was the second time since he has been on the Board of a major contractual difficulty. He requested that these ramifications be thoroughly thought through.

B. Mrs. Fong requested a breakdown of donors to the Thomas and Mack Events Center. She stated that there are differences of revenue between the convention center and the events center.

C. Mrs. Kenney requested a freeze on all hiring at UNLV in administrative positions. Chairman Mc Bride stated that this would be placed on the next agenda for discussion.

19. Emergency Item Regarding Lease, UNR

President Crowley requested an emergency item.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval. Mrs. Whitley seconded.

Motion carried.

Chairman Mc Bride relinquished the gavel to Vice Chairman Gallagher.

Approved a lease-hold agreement between UNR and XEBEC Corporation for the establishment of a Computer Aided Design facility within the College of Engineering and directed that the lease agreement be reviewed by General Counsel, and approved by the Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Karamanos moved approval of a lease agreement between UNR and XEBEC Corporation, to be reviewed by General Counsel and approved by the Chancellor, then forwarded to the Chairman of the Board for approval. Mrs. Kenney seconded. Motion carried.

Chairman Mc Bride retained the gavel.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 A.M.

Mary Lou Moser

Secretary of the Board

01-12-1984