

UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes June 27-28, 1980

06-27-1980

Pages 82-133

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

June 27-28, 1980

The Board of Regents met on the above date in The Center for
Religion and Life, 1101 N. Virginia, Reno.

Members present: Mr. Robert A. Cashell, Chairman

Mr. James L. Buchanan, II

Mrs. Molly F. Knudtsen

Dr. Louis E. Lombardi

Mr. John R. Mc Bride

Mr. John Tom Ross

Mrs. June F. Whitley

Members absent: Mrs. Lilly Fong

Mr. Chris Karamanos

Others present: Chancellor Donald H. Baepler

President William Berg

President Joseph N. Crowley

President Jack Davis

President James Eardley

President Judith Eaton

President Leonard Goodall

President Clifford Murino

Board Secretary Bonnie Smotony

Also present were Senate Representatives Campana (DRI), Claybrook (WNCC), Elliott (TMCC), Emerson (NNCC), Fry (UNLV), Gochnour (CCCC), Moser (Unit), and Seibert (UNR), and representatives from student associations.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Cashell at 10:35 A.M. at which time the Chair was assumed by Vice Chairman Ross.

Upon motion by Mr. Cashell, seconded by Mrs. Whitley, and unanimous vote, the Board convened into personnel session to discuss the professional competence of members of the Chancellor's staff.

The Board reconvened into open session at 11:30 A.M.

1. Adoption of Consent Agenda

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

1. Approval of minutes of previous meetings.
2. Report of gifts and grants.
3. Increase in Laboratory fees at TMCC to \$50 for Dental Radiography and \$50 for Dental Materials and Laboratory Techniques.
4. Augmentation of the following special accounts from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account:

DRI Interview and Recruiting Account	\$ 7,500
UNLV Interview and Recruiting Account	10,000
UNR Interview and Recruiting Account	15,000
NNCC Interview and Recruiting Account	2,000
School of Medicine Admissions Committee	
Travel	8,950

5. Request for extension of leave of absence without pay

for Dr. Mohamed Yousef for an additional year; and a two-year leave of absence without pay for Dr. Satish Bhatnagar.

6. Appointments to College of Business Administration

Advisory Board, UNR, for three-year terms ending June 30, 1983, of the following:

Wayne Condon, President, Security Bank of Nevada -
reappointment

George Drews, Casino Consultant - reappointment

Tom Edwards, General Manager, Nevada Bell (retired) -
reappointment

E. T. Hermann, President, Pacific Freeport Group -
reappointment

Luther Mack, President, Mc Donald's of Reno - reap-
pointment

Thomas Wilson, President, Thomas C. Wilson
Advertising - reappointment

Richard Goeglein, President, Harrah's Inc. - new
appointment

7. Appointments to Citizens Advisory Committee, College of Agriculture, for three-year terms ending 1983, of

the following:

Dorothy Gallagher, Elko - new appointment

Hollis Harris, Pahrump - reappointment

Larry Miller, Fallon - reappointment

Gene Brinkerhoff, Lovelock - new appointment

Lorraine Scatena, Yerington - reappointment

Arvin Boerlin, Carson City, and Robert Ruud, of

Pahrump to the Senior Advisory Board.

8. Appointments of the following to the UNLV Foundation

Fund Board:

Ken Sullivan

Sig Rogich

Sherman Miller

Jerry Herbst

Ernest Becker, Sr.

9. Award of a bid totalling \$93,444 to B & D Construction

for the Aquaculture Laboratory at the Main Station

Farm.

10. a) Award to Clark County of an easement in the north-

west part of the UNLV Campus for flood control purposes.

b) Award to Clark County of an easement at the new entrance to the Campus now being completed in front of Grant Hall, in order to maintain the traffic light that is to be installed at the intersection of Maryland Parkway and Harmon Avenue.

c) Award to Clark County of three small easements, each three foot square, on the north side of Tropicana Avenue to be used as bases for flashing yellow lights to warn motorists of the speed limit in front of Paradise Elementary School.

d) Award to Nevada Power Company of a right-of-way grant for construction of a concrete pad 18-1/2' x 22' to mount transformers, south of the parking lot behind the Business Services Building and adjacent to the underground power line running west from University Road.

11. Approval of the following estimative budgets for TMCC:

1. Printing and Duplicating Sales

Revenue

Sales Income	\$54,500
--------------	----------

Expenditures

Classified Salaries	\$13,425
---------------------	----------

Fringe Benefits	2,011
-----------------	-------

Operating	37,900
-----------	--------

Ending Fund Balance	1,164
---------------------	-------

Total	\$54,500
-------	----------

2. Food Service

Revenue

Sales Income	\$60,000
--------------	----------

Expenditures

Classified Salaries	\$11,000
---------------------	----------

Wages	20,000
-------	--------

Fringe Benefits	2,200
-----------------	-------

Operating	25,300
-----------	--------

Ending Fund Balance	1,500
---------------------	-------

Total	\$60,000
-------	----------

3. Associated Students

Revenue

Student Fees	\$20,000
--------------	----------

Expenditures

ASTM Office	\$ 5,450
-------------	----------

Office Operating	\$ 500
------------------	--------

USUNS Dues	550
------------	-----

Wages	750
-------	-----

*Grants-in-Aid	2,750
----------------	-------

Travel	400
--------	-----

Executive Board

Host/Special Meeting	
----------------------	--

Account	500
---------	-----

Student Newspaper Publications	4,500
--------------------------------	-------

Student Activities Fund	9,000
-------------------------	-------

Student Appropriations Board	1,050
------------------------------	-------

Total	\$20,000
-------	----------

Budget does not reflect carry-over from 1979-1980

estimated \$1,500 which will be deposited in Student

Appropriations Account.

*Executives \$1,500

Senators 1,248

12. Approval of a transfer (#831) of \$12,072.77 from the

Contingency Reserve to the Chancellor's Office

Operating to provide additional funds needed for the

balance of the current fiscal year.

13. Finalization of the CCCC reorganization by creation of

additional instructional Division to house Graphics,

Theater, Speech, Fine Arts, English, Foreign Languages

and Public Relations. No increase in administrative

staffing or administrative costs are anticipated.

14. Revision of the Purchasing policy to (1) raise the

amount requiring advertisement for bids from \$2,500 to

\$5,000 to conform to bidding limits established by the

1979 Legislature; and (2) permit the purchase of se-

lected hay to be used by the College of Agriculture for

research or experimental tests after substantiation

of quotes.

15. Proposed change in leave designation for Professor Joseph Mc Cullough from sabbatical leave to administrative leave.

16. Adoption of amended stock powers resolution to broaden the wording to include stock brokers as well as banks.

17. Change in the credit hour requirement for graduation in the Department of Civil Engineering, College of Engineering, from 134 to 130 credits. This constitutes no reduction of graduation standards, and the lower credit requirement is accomplished mainly by having students start their mathematics sequence with a more advanced course.

18. Delegation of authority to the Administration to award a bid for construction of a concession stand at Mackay Stadium, at an estimated cost of \$35,000, with completion anticipated prior to the 1980 football season.

At Mrs. Knudtsen's request, Item 15 was removed from the Consent Agenda, to be considered on the Action Agenda.

Mr. Buchanan moved adoption of the Consent Agenda as presented, with the removal of Item 15. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc Bride.

(Note to Minutes: Item 15 was subsequently deferred.)

The following gifts were reported in addition to those included with the Consent Agenda:

- (1) 500 shares of Gannett Company, Inc. common stock, from Mr. and Mrs. Paul A. Leonard.

- (2) Two gifts from the Speidel Newspaper Charitable Foundation: \$3,537.65 made at the request of Mr. and Mrs. Paul A. Leonard, and \$10,000 made at the request of Mr. Charles H. Stout.

These three gifts are to be used to establish the Guy L. Leonard Memorial Fund, a permanent endowment, at UNR, with the following conditions:

The proceeds from the sale of this stock shall constitute an irrevocable gift and may be combined with other

Regents' funds for investment purposes.

The income from the permanently established fund shall be devoted to the following purposes at the University of Nevada-Reno:

1. For so long as the University of Nevada-Reno and the Department of Philosophy agree that the objectives and purposes of the LEONARD CONFERENCE ON PHILOSOPHY can still be met, two-thirds (2/3) of the income generated annually by this fund shall be accumulated and used in support of the LEONARD CONFERENCE ON PHILOSOPHY.
2. It is our intent that the remaining one-third (1/3) of the income generated annually by this fund shall be devoted to either student scholarship or faculty development programs within the Departments of English and Physics. The determination of which program is to be supported annually shall be at the discretion of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences following recommendations from the respective Departmental Chairpersons.

If a scholarship program is to be supported, it is our intent that an award be made to junior, senior or graduate students and that the central focus of the selection criteria used in making the award(s) be based on past academic excellence or future academic promise.

3. In the event the University of Nevada-Reno and the Department of Philosophy determine that objectives and purposes of the LEONARD CONFERENCE IN PHILOSOPHY can no longer be met, it is our intent that the whole amount of the income generated annually by this fund be devoted to the purposes outlined in two (2) above. If such circumstance occurs, it is our further intent that the Department of Philosophy participate equally with the Departments of English and Physics in determining which program or programs are to be supported.

In establishing this fund in support of the University of Nevada-Reno and its students, it is our desire that this fund be known as the "GUY L.

LEONARD MEMORIAL FUND".

(3) Nine separate gifts from the Speidel Newspaper

Charitable Foundation, at the request of the fol-

lowing contributors:

Mr. Charles H. Stout, \$20,000 for a Journalism

Scholarship

Mr. and Mrs. Roger Christensen, \$165 to the Depart-

ment of Journalism

Mr. Joseph R. Jackson, \$2,000 to the Department of

Journalism

Mr. Paul A. Leonard, \$1,000 to the Department of

Journalism

Mr. Dean C. Smith, \$240.90 to the Department of

Journalism

Mr. John Brackett, \$6,167.43 to the Einstoss

Memorial Fund

Mr. Warren L. Lerude, \$34.65 to the Einstoss

Memorial Fund

Mr. Clarence K. Jones, \$11,425.85 to the Electrical

Engineering Department

Mr. and Mrs. F. Clinton Howard, \$1,377.20 to the

Howard Family Endowment Fund

(4) Fleischmann grants as follows: \$180,000 to NNCC; \$375,000 to TMCC; \$450,000 to CCCC; \$296,000 to WNCC; and \$550,000 to the University Press.

(5) \$500,000 from Mr. Claude Howard to Phase V of the School of Medicine.

The additional gifts were added to the previous motion which then carried unanimously.

2. Report of Finance Committee

Mr. Mc Bride presented the following report from the Finance Committee meeting the previous day:

The Committee refers the following requests for action to the Board of Regents:

(1) Approval of an increase in the per-credit fee for UNR from \$23 to \$24, effective Fall, 1980, with the proceeds of that increase to be distributed to the Student Health Services, the Student Union Operating and Renovation, and to a Tutorial Program. This increase is

recommended without prejudice to the study currently underway. The distribution of this \$1 increase among the programs identified is reflected in Attachment A.

- (2) Approval of the 1980-81 Financial Plan for DRI, as reflected in Attachment B.

The Committee also:

- (1) Received a report from Chancellor Baepler concerning a meeting of the Community College Presidents and Faculty Senate Chairpersons on May 15, and the agreement reached by that group on the procedure to be followed in resolving the problem of salary inequities identified in a previous meeting by President Berg.
- (2) Received a report from Kafoury, Armstrong, Turner and Company concerning the expanded audit of six revenue producing activities which the Board had requested at a previous meeting, with the understanding that a further report would be filed at a subsequent meeting.
- (3) Discussed the policy of the Board which calls for a five year rotation of independent audit firms with the

understanding that there would be further discussion concerning this matter before a recommendation is made to the Board and prior to the time that proposals for the next audit cycle are solicited.

(4) Discussed with ASUN and CSUN Presidents a proposal pending before the Committee for a change in the internal distribution of the per-credit fee. This matter will be further discussed at a subsequent meeting, at which time alternatives will be presented and considered.

(5) Received a report on the status of the Biennial Budget preparation.

In view of the fact that a number of these matters will be under continued discussion over the next several months, an expanded minutes record will be prepared and distributed to all Regents and Officers.

Attachments A and B referred to above are filed with permanent minutes.

Mrs. Knudtsen moved acceptance of the report of the Finance

Committee and approval of the two action items included with the report. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried without dissent.

3. Report of Investment Committee

Dr. Lombardi presented the following report from the Investment Advisory Committee meeting held earlier today:

The Committee took the following actions:

1. Received recommendations from Mr. Bob Lee of FNB for the following sales and purchases, noting that the proposed sales from the main endowment pool, amounting to some \$2 million, are being made in order to transfer liquid assets to Valley Bank to comply with the Board's earlier instructions that the endowment funds held by FNB for the benefit of UNLV were to be transferred to Valley Bank as of June 30:

Approx.

Units	Security	Price
-------	----------	-------

Sales

7,000	Standard Brands, Inc.	31 1/2
4,500	American Can Co.	33 1/8
34	Ina Corp.	35 1/8
8,000	Standard Oil of Ind.	57
8	Texaco	37 1/8
5,000	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	24 1/8
50M	Consolidated Edison Co. N. Y. Inc. 1st & Ref. Mtg. 4.375% due 10/1/92	55
30M	Consumers Power Co., 7.625% due 6/1/99	68
22M	General Tel. & Electric Corp. Deb., 9.75% due 8/15/95	90
100M	General Tel. Co. Calif. 1st Mtg. Ser. X, 7.625% due 12/1/01	70
100M	General Tel Co. Wis. 1st Mtg., 7.50% due 3/1/02	68
20M	Hawaiian Elec. Co. 1st Mtg., 8.35% due 12/1/03	70
25M	Aluminum Co. of America, 9% due 5/15/95	90
25M	Aluminum Co. of Canada Ltd., 9.50% due 3/1/95	86
200M	Providence of Ontario Debs., 8.875% due 3/1/05	85

100M	Safeway Stores Inc. S.F. Debs., 7.40%	
	due 4/1/97	70
23M	Westinghouse Elec. Corp. Deb., 8.625%	
	due 9/1/95	84
100M	Alabama Power 1st Mtg., 8.50%	
	due 7/1/01	72
88M	Houston Nat'1 Gas Corp., 9.75%	84
	due 2/1/95	72
100M	Indianapolis Pwr. & Lt., 7.125%,	
	due 5/1/98	70
50M	Massachusetts Elec. Co. 1st Mtg., 4.375%	
	due 9/1/92	55
200M	Michigan Bell Tel., 7% due 11/1/12	72
100M	Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Debs., 7.375%	
	due 11/11/11	76
50M	Southern New England Tel. Co. Deb., 7.75%	
	due 6/1/2004	76
100M	Southwestern Bell Tel. Co. Deb., 5.875%	
	due 6/1/2003	60
50M	Virginia Electric & Pwr. Co. 1st & Ref.,	
	7.75% due 6/1/99	70
50M	West Penn. Pwr. Co. 1st Mtg., 7.875%	
	due 7/1/1999	77
400	So. Calif. Edison So. Pfd., 5.80%	13

Sales from the Engel Unitrust

40M U. S. Treas. Bonds., 9 1/8 due 5/15/09 93

Purchases from the Engel Unitrust

25M Santa Fe Intl., 7 1/2 of 6/15/05

conv. sub deb. par

10M Shearson Loeb Rhoades conv. bonds,

9.0% due 2/2005 103

Purchases from the Mc Coskey Endowment

10M Shearson Loeb Rhoades conv. bonds,

9.0% due 2/2005 103

25M Santa Fe Intl., 7 1/2 due 6/15/05,

conv. sub deb par

2. Received a report from Mr. Lew Shuman of American Investors concerning \$200,000 invested with that company for the benefit of the Mamie Kleberg Chair in Historic Preservation. Mr. Shuman reported that the loan in which the \$200,000 had been invested has now

been repaid, and he recommended reinvestment in two second deeds of trust (details of which are filed with permanent minutes) totalling \$202,000, with American Investors participating in buying the \$2,000 overage.

The Committee recommends that the Board approve the transactions as presented.

Dr. Lombardi moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley, carried without dissent.

4. Computing Center Study

Chancellor Baepler recalled that in September, 1979 the Board approved a recommendation by the Officers that consultants be retained for a study of the UNS Computing Center, with the study to consist of a complete analysis of the capability of the hardware, programs and staff of the Center as it relates to the University.

He further recalled that in December, the Board selected the firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., to do the study and provided funds for this purpose from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account.

Dr. Baepler reported that the study has been completed and copies had been provided to members of the Board. He introduced Mr. Gary Lion from Arthur D. Little, who commented on the findings and conclusions of the study, which was conducted with the objective of setting the direction for System-wide computing for the next decade. One of the key issues was to determine how resources should be organized; i. e., people, equipment, funding, and what the computers should look like; also, how the resources should be planned, allocated equitably to all the potential users of the University, and how this should be controlled from both the management's and user's point of view.

Based on the information gathered through interviews, questionnaires directed toward current users of the Computer Center, and surveys of other State University Systems, ADL prepared a preliminary report which was then presented to various groups in an effort to determine the strategic implications of the direction which appeared to be evolving.

Mr. Lion emphasized that the intent of the strategy formulation meeting was to get a broad cross-section and representative group to discuss the issues. A consensus developed as a result and the consulting team did some addi-

tional planning, concluding with a final report at the end of May.

Mr. Lion reviewed the conclusions of the study:

- (1) That the performance of the current Computing Center is satisfactory, given the funding constraints under which it has functioned for a long period.
- (2) There are insufficient resources to meet the demands placed upon the Center.
- (3) The requests for services are not controlled; that is, the services are given freely upon request, with no allocation process to determine who should be able to request services, and no priorities imposed on the users.
- (4) Since there is no way to allocate demand, users are often frustrated because they cannot always get on the computer. As a result, users frequently acquire their own resources (i. e., minicomputers, outside services, etc.).

(5) In terms of technological trends, the key issues seem to be concerned with (a) distributed computers; (b) integrated networks; and (c) office automation (word processing). Although minicomputers are very cost effective, it is important to tie them together with some sort of communications device to insure a sharing of data and programs.

Mr. Lion also commented on the recommended strategy contained in the ADL report, specifically that:

(1) There should be a balance between distributed responsibility and centralized control; that is, maintain System-wide control of (a) hardware/software acquisition; (b) communications network; (c) application development; (d) administration/maintenance; (e) shared computer centers; and (f) funding.

Decentralization, or distribution of responsibility can occur in the areas of (a) data entry; (b) independent computer centers; (c) academic/research consulting; (d) technical trouble shooting; and (e) contract programming.

- (2) Management control should be restructured, providing for: (a) a Computer Executive Board to handle policy and resource allocation; (b) a Technical Subcommittee to the Computer Executive Board to review hardware/software acquisition; and (c) a third group to meet periodically to provide a communication channel from the users to the Executive Board.
- (3) That resources be budgeted and accounted for by establishing a "soft charge back system". That is, that an annual budget process be established to determine how many dollars in service might be provided to different user groups, requiring such groups to develop justification for the allocation of resources for their purposes, and to assist the Computing Center in justifying its budget through a resource accounting system.
- (4) That a hardware network system be established that would provide one or two large central computers connecting with minicomputers. This would allow for upgrading of mainframes, off-load timesharing to minicomputers, the use of minicomputers for remote terminals.

(5) That user-purchased hardware be incorporated by establishing a "computer-store" catalog, including office automation or word processing equipment allowing the Center to provide the communications necessary to coordinate the technical support.

Mr. Lion projected the costs to be minimal, suggesting less than 1/2% of the current UNSCC budget. The key benefits identified would be (a) that the resources will be allocated equitably and can be justified to a greater extent; (b) advantages of an integrated network and the opportunity for management information, software and application sharing, data sharing, and electronic mail; (c) the availability of a large "number cruncher" for research purposes; (d) economies of scale; and (e) improved user control, responsiveness and communications.

Following Mr. Lion's presentation, Chancellor Baepler recommended that the report be accepted, after which he stated that he would meet with the Presidents and with Mr. Niels Anderson, Director of the Computing Center, to begin to explore the committee structure proposed and ways in which to implement the recommendations contained in the report.

At Mrs. Knudtsen's request, Mr. Anderson commented on the report, noting that the survey had revealed that the users are generally supportive of the services provided by the Computing Center, which he added he greatly appreciated, and pointing out that many of the recommendations contained in the report had been identified previously and, although the Board of Regents had been supportive in the Center's efforts to seek funding from the Legislature to implement these suggestions, requests had not been funded sufficiently to allow the Center to move as rapidly in that direction as was desirable.

Mr. Anderson reported that the Data Processing Policy and Planning Board has reviewed the ADL report and it is the position of that Board that the report confirms the correctness of the direction in which the Board is attempting to move, while at the same time offering new ideas. Mr. Anderson stated that while the Data Processing Policy and Planning Board believes the suggestion of a Users Advisory Board is worthwhile, they would like to study the concept further to explore ways of implementing that objective. He also commented on the suggestion of a resource accounting system, noting that the concern of the Data Processing Policy and Planning Board is that implementation of such a

system should, in no way, inhibit the users from use of the computer. Insofar as the proposal for centralized budgeting, Mr. Anderson reported that the Board believes that each institution should have the option to budget for its computing needs.

Mr. Buchanan moved that the report be accepted. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc Bride.

In response to Dr. Crowley's inquiry, it was agreed that acceptance of the report does not indicate approval of any specific recommendation contained in the report.

Motion carried without dissent.

5. Request for Special Projects Funds

Chancellor Baepler recalled that in May, 1979 the Board of Regents approved the initiation at UNR of an advanced computer-assisted registration system, with the understanding that should it prove effective, the program would be considered for implementation at UNLV. The Board provided \$20,000 to fund the start-up costs, with UNR providing a classified position in Admissions and Records needed to

support the program. A third item requiring funding was an Optical Character Reader, which was requested but not funded by the 1979 Legislature. It was anticipated that, in the event this equipment was not funded by the Legislature, it would be possible to tie in with Washoe County equipment for a limited period of time. Because of the very tight turnaround dictated by the registration process, this tie in has not proven to be practical.

UNR has now requested the Computing Center to proceed with the purchase of an Optical Recognition Reader to be used initially to process input data relative to student admissions, registration and accounting applications. The equipment is required to allow the Center to implement the computerized student scheduling application now under development.

Chancellor Baepler noted that the funds required for this purchase are not available within the Center's budget, and requested an allocation of \$92,500 from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account.

Mr. Ross moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Knudtsen, carried without dissent.

6. Approval of Purchase

Chancellor Baepler reported that bids have been received for the purchase by TMCC of a minicomputer with the following results:

Data General Corporation (DG) - \$29,851

Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) - 33,580

IBM (bid unacceptable)

Dr. Baepler reported that the capabilities of the DG and DEC computers are generally comparable; however, the bid of Digital Equipment Company was recommended over the lower bid of Data General for the following reasons:

- (1) The existence of other DEC equipment in the System provides personnel knowledgeable on software maintenance and operation. If DG equipment is selected, an additional \$2,600 will be required for training of personnel.
- (2) Additional funds will be required after the first year for software maintenance of system and language prod-

ucts from DG, whereas the DEC software can be maintained by Computer Center personnel.

- (3) User-developed software is available for nominal distribution charges through DECUS, a very large DEC equipment user.
- (4) Cache memory availability can greatly improve expansion capabilities and is not available on the DG equipment.

Chancellor Baepler recommended approval of the purchase.

President Eardley noted that this purchase is possible through Vocational Educational funds.

Mr. Buchanan moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried without dissent.

The meeting adjourned for lunch and reconvened at 1:30 P.M.

7. Request for Adjustment in 1980-81 Salary

President Murino requested that the 1980-81 salary previously approved for Dr. F. Winterberg at \$38,000, be further adjusted to \$40,750, thereby providing Dr. Winterberg with

an increase over 1979-80 of \$4,150, or 11%. Dr. Murino noted that, if approved, this salary adjustment will give Dr. Winterberg the same percentage increase over the 1979-81 biennium as the average given other Rank IV personnel within DRI.

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

8. Final Drawings, Fallon Campus, WNCC

Mr. Harry Wood, System Architect, recalled that this project has a total development budget of \$851,000 of which \$674,300 is for construction and \$55,390 for furnishings and equipment. A bid date of August 7 has been established.

President Davis introduced Mr. Maurice Nespor, project architect, and following presentation of the final drawings by Mr. Nespor, President Davis recommended approval by the Board.

Dr. Lombardi moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Ross, carried without dissent.

9. Request for Funding for Administrative Study, UNLV

President Goodall recalled that the Board had previously allocated \$5,000 each to UNR and TMCC for administrative studies, with the understanding that when the UNLV accreditation study was completed, a similar request would be forthcoming from that institution.

President Goodall noted that the accreditation review is complete and requested \$5,000 from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account to undertake the study. He further noted that the vacancy in the position of Vice President for Educational Services makes a study even more timely and proposed that one aspect of the study will concentrate on the functions and organization of educational services.

Chancellor Baepler recommended approval of the allocation of \$5,000 as requested.

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

10. New Program Budget Request, UNLV

President Goodall presented a proposal for an interdisciplinary program leading to a Master of Science in Water Resources Management, to be initiated at UNLV in Fall, 1981, noting that implementation of the program is contingent upon review and approval as it proceeds through the normal faculty approval channels and appropriation of the necessary funding by the 1981 Legislature. He further noted that approval of this program is requested on the basis of the understanding that, prior to implementation, representatives from UNR, UNLV and DRI will work out a total system approach to this and the related program at UNR. This approach will insure that the limited available resources for these programs will be utilized equitably on the basis of System-wide and State-wide needs.

President Goodall suggested that this would probably be UNLV's highest priority for new program funding for the coming biennium, depending on whether any recommendation is made by the Law School Committee.

Chancellor Baepler recommended that this new program request be submitted to the 1981 Legislature for funding.

Mr. Buchanan moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr.

Lombardi, carried without dissent.

11. Request for Fraternity Row Leases, UNLV

President Goodall reported that requests have been received from Alpha Tau Omega and Kappa Sigma for leases of land in the area designated for fraternity and sorority houses on the UNLV Campus. He recommended that the requests be approved under the same conditions approved at a previous meeting; that is, that the University retain the right of architectural agreement before final approval is given.

Chancellor Baepler concurred.

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

Whitley, carried without dissent.

12. Proposed Sale of University Property

President Goodall recalled that UNLV owns an undivided one-half interest in 40 acres of land located north of Nellis Air Force Base. Approximately one year ago, the Board authorized the offering of this land at its appraised value of \$80,000, with proceeds to go to the Performing Arts Center.

No bids were received.

Dr. Goodall reported that Clark County Land Corporation has now offered to purchase this land at its current appraised value of \$90,000, under the following conditions:

- (1) \$20,000 down to be paid in cash at the close of escrow;
- (2) The balance of the purchase price would be paid in five yearly installments, with an annual interest rate of 10%.

President Goodall recommended acceptance of this offer, with payment of a 5% real estate commission to Murray Herman of Wagner Realty, Inc. Chancellor Baepler concurred, noting that approval of the Governor is also required.

Mr. Mc Bride moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried with Mr. Buchanan abstaining, explaining that Mr. Herman of Wagner Realty, Inc. is a client of his.

13. Environmental Protection Agency Grant, UNLV

President Goodall reported that the UNLV Department of Biological Sciences has received tentative approval of a

grant from the Environmental Protection Agency that would include receipt of indirect cost payments of about \$270,000 over two years. In order to proceed with the project, Dr. Goodall stated that it would be necessary to construct a small Butler-type building on Campus at a cost not to exceed \$65,000. He recommended that the first \$65,000 of indirect cost funds from the contract be excluded from the normal distribution of such revenue and be used to fund the building, and that the Regents approve a loan of up to \$65,000 from the UNLV Capital Improvement Fee Fund to allow the construction to proceed immediately. The loan would be repaid from indirect cost revenue as it becomes available, and repayment would be completed by late Spring of 1981.

Chancellor Baepler noted that indirect cost recovery funds received by the University are presently allocated one-half to the general fund, with the remaining one-half distributed internally with a portion going to the institution and a portion going to the component within the institution generating the revenue. He recommended that the policy on distribution of indirect cost recovery be changed and that for those areas receiving no State support and which operate exclusively from grants and contracts (for example, the UNLV archaeological Survey, the UNLV Limnological Research Sta-

tion and the UNR Minerals Institute), indirect cost recovery be distributed 25% to the general fund, 25% to the research component generating the funds, and the remaining 50% to continue to be distributed internally in accordance with the current policy in effect at each institution.

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

14. Administrative Appointments at CCCC

President Eaton recommended the appointment of Dr. Jerry W. Young as Dean of Educational Services, effective July 1, 1980, at a salary of \$35,000, and the appointment of Dr. W. Keith Evans as Dean of College Services, also effective July 1, 1980, at a salary of \$35,000. Copies of Dr. Young's and Dr. Evans' vitas were distributed and are filed with permanent minutes.

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

15. Proposed Associate of General Studies Degree: Telecourse

President Eaton reported that CCCC, in cooperation with Coastline Community College District and Nellis Air Force Base, has developed a degree program whereby personnel at Nellis may earn 60 credits for the Associate of General Studies degree by means of instructional telecourses. This will require the purchase of 20 telecourses over a two-year period to serve a minimum student population of 200. Individuals will earn their credits by means of attendance at the Air Force Base Education Center where a telecourse laboratory will be set up. Text books and examinations will be provided, and the program will be supervised by an on-base coordinator.

In order that the program may be initiated by September 1, 1980, President Eaton requested an allocation of \$15,000 from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account to cover the cost of the initial five courses needed for the program, telecourse duplication, and necessary staff coordination.

In addition, she requested approval of a special course fee of \$60 per credit hour for the telecourse program, noting that this fee will allow the program to become self-sustaining at its minimum expected enrollment of 200 students.

75% of this per-credit hour fee is to be subsidized by the government for all Air Force Base personnel enrolled in the

program. Chancellor Baepler recommended approval, noting that the special fee should accrue to a separate account to underwrite the cost of the course and materials and should not be counted as part of the general fund.

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

16. Bid Opening, Henderson Campus

President Eaton reported that bids were opened June 24, 1980 for construction of the Henderson Campus of CCCC with the following bids received:

Alternates

Base Bid	A	B	C	D	E	Total
Universal Construction Company						
1,099,140	4,360	42,794	22,797	20,670	24,764	1,214,525
Sletten Construction Company						
1,240,400	9,500	44,900	7,900	24,500	12,400	1,339,600
Blanchard Construction Company						

1,252,000 10,000 39,000 6,500 35,000 9,800 1,352,300

Zuni Construction Company

1,281,000 4,900 45,980 6,600 24,500 16,690 1,379,670

Steelwood Construction Company

1,282,000 4,500 44,635 7,920 24,577 20,287 1,383,919

Cook & Kerzetski Construction Company

1,304,624 3,000 45,435 9,200 24,750 14,564 1,401,573

J. E. Yoxen Construction Company

1,327,960 19,000 47,000 7,700 24,000 16,200 1,441,860

Alt A - Install six (6) welding booths and welder supports.

Alt B - Install greenhouse, 110 L. F. of concrete sidewalk
and water and electric lines.

Alt C - Install resilient sheet flooring and butt-to-base
in lieu of resilient tile flooring (Rooms 25, 33).

Alt D - Install landscaping and irrigation system.

Alt E - Install formed concrete curbs and three (3) 6'0"
wide x 12'0" long concrete sidewalks.

All bids, including the five additive alternates, were within the authorized funds for construction. The apparent low bidder, with a total bid of \$1,214,525, is Smith Universal Construction Company; however, because of an apparent error in calculation, Smith Universal has asked the State Public Works Board to delay the contract award for a few days to allow them to consider whether to accept the contract for the stated amount, or to withdraw their bid and forfeit the 5% bid security in the amount of \$55,000.

Once the low bidder has reached a decision, the State Public Works Board will follow one of two available options:

- (1) Award the contract to Smith Universal for \$1,214,525.

- (2) Assess liquidated damages against Smith Universal in the amount of the bid security (\$55,000) and award the contract to the second lowest bidder, Sletten Construction Company, in the amount of \$1,339,600.

President Eaton recommended that the Board of Regents agree to concur with the State Public Works Board's ultimate recommendation in the award of this bid.

Mr. Mc Bride moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr.

Lombardi, carried without dissent.

17. Bid Opening, Reroofing of Sage Building, DRI

Chancellor Baepler asked that the Board consider an additional bid opening which had occurred on June 26, 1980, and recalled that in February, 1980 bids were opened for the reroofing of the Sage building, DRI. However, all bids received at that time were in excess of the funds available. The project was readvertised with the following bids received:

L and L Roofing	\$ 76,587
Alpine Roofing	84,261
Van Dyne and Sons	87,900
D and D Contractors	89,700
Enterprise Roofing	119,593
Yancy Roofing	135,317

The construction budget is \$88,000 and the State Public Works Board has recommended award of a contract to L and L Roofing in the amount of \$76,587. Chancellor Baepler recommended that the Board of Regents concur in this award.

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

18. Request for Funding for LPN Program, NNCC

President Berg reported that NNCC has been asked by representatives of White Pine County to offer a Practical Nursing Program in Ely during the coming year to meet a critical shortage. The College has, in turn, requested permission of the State Board of Nursing to administer such a Program for 10-15 students. The Program would begin in September and would parallel the one offered on Campus in Elko. It is planned to offer this program one year only to meet an identified need.

President Berg noted that the program is estimated to cost \$36,946, half of which CETA has agreed to fund, provided that half of the students will be CETA-sponsored. The State Department of Education was approached for vocational funds for the balance but none are available.

President Berg requested an allocation of \$18,500 from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account to provide half

the funding required for this LPN program for 1980-81.

Chancellor Baepler recommended approval.

Dr. Lombardi moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs.

Whitley, carried without dissent.

19. Phase II Program Proposal - Diesel Mechanics, NNCC

President Berg recalled that at the May 9 meeting, the Board approved a Phase I proposal for a one-year certified program in Diesel Mechanics to be offered by NNCC, and authorized the planning for this program to proceed to Phase II.

Accordingly, a Phase II proposal was developed and included with the agenda (identified as Ref. C and filed in the the Chancellor's Office).

President Berg requested approval to include this program in the 1981-1983 Biennial Budget Request for funding.

Chancellor Baepler concurred.

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

20. Administrative Reorganization, UNR

President Crowley recalled that copies of an Administrative Reorganization Study had been distributed to the Board previously, with the understanding that recommendations for implementation of several organizational changes, to be effective July 1, 1980, would be presented at this meeting. accordingly, he recommended the following reorganization intended to both reduce the number of offices reporting directly to the President and to realign functions in a more coherent manner under the Vice Presidents:

(1) President's Office

- a) To establish the position of Assistant to the President on a half-time basis. Responsibilities of this position would include data gathering and report writing, committee liaison, tracking and expediting decisions, briefing the President, and handling special projects. The position was recommended as a full-time position but is proposed at this point as a half-time with possible subsequent expansion to a full-time level. It is to be established by combining existing, vacant, fractional FTE positions into a .50 FTE.

b) To reassign the following functions to the Vice Presidents, as described in detail below: News Bureau, Affirmative Action Office, Institutional Planning and Budget, Admissions and Records and the Office of Alumni and University Relations. This reassignment would leave the three Presidents, the Dean of Students and the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics reporting directly to the President.

(2) Vice President for Academic Affairs

a) To assume responsibility for the Office of Admissions and Records. This office was formerly assigned to the Academic Vice President.

b) To assume responsibility for a combined Office of Affirmative Action and Academic Records. Previously, academic records have been the responsibility of Institutional Planning and Budget. With the proposed reorganization of the latter office, described below, the records-keeping function would be reassigned to the Affirmative Action

Office. As the Affirmative Action Officer works closely with academic records, a combined office would consolidate two related functions.

c) To assume responsibility for the Office of Institutional Studies. Institutional studies have heretofore been the responsibility of the Office of Institutional Planning and Budget but, because the budget function and academic records have also been assigned to that office, little time has been available to give proper attention to this responsibility. With the proposed transfer of academic records to the Affirmative Action Office and of the budget function to the Vice President for Business, institutional studies can receive the full time responsibility they require. The establishment of this Office would not necessitate the addition of new staff, since the Director of Institutional Studies will occupy the position previously held by the Director of Institutional Planning and Budget.

(3) Vice President for Business

As noted above, to transfer the budget function to this Office from the Office of Institutional Planning and Budget. The Director of the latter Office has been recommended to the Board for appointment as Vice President for Business and, assuming approval of that recommendation, it is appropriate to transfer the budget function, which has been his major responsibility.

(4) Vice President for Public Affairs

The basic recommendation is to expand the responsibilities of, and assign an appropriately changed title to, what has previously been the Vice President for University Services. The changes proposed would consolidate much of the University's outreach effort and reshape the University Services Vice Presidency into an Office with prime responsibility for external programs.

The specific changes recommended are:

- a) To alter the Office of Alumni and University Relations as currently constituted by transferring its functions (Alumni Relations, School Relations, Development, Publications and Public Occasions) to the Vice President for Public Affairs.

b) To assign the News Bureau to this Vice President and combine it with the Speaker's Bureau and Publications into an Office of Information. The result would be a coherent grouping of related functions, with a view towards possible consolidation of several news and information publications currently produced in different Departments of the University.

c) To transfer the motion picture services function from Vice President for University Services to the Office of Communications and Broadcasting. This transfer would relieve the Vice President of one responsibility and relocate the motion picture services to an Office whose function is closely related.

Organization charts reflecting the present and the proposed structures were included with the agenda (identified as Ref. D and filed with permanent minutes).

Mr. Ross moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried without dissent.

21. Appointments of Assistant to the President and Vice

President for Business

President Crowley recommended the appointment of Dr. John P.

Marschall as Assistant to the President, effective July 1,

1980, at .50 FTE, with a continuing .50 FTE appointment as

Associate Professor in the Department of History. Dr.

Marschall's salary as Assistant to the President was recom-

mended as \$15,001, which is one-half of his total salary

established for 1980-81. A copy of Dr. Marschall's vita

was included with the agenda (identified as Ref. E and filed

with permanent minutes).

President Crowley also recommended appointment of K. Donald

Jessup as Vice President for Business, effective July 1,

1980, at an annual salary of \$45,550. Copy of Mr. Jessup's

vita was included with the agenda (identified as Ref. F and

filed with permanent minutes). President Crowley also

recommended that, effective with the appointment as Vice

President, Mr. Jessup be assigned signature authority on

University checks and on all existing bank accounts.

additional signature authority on bank accounts to be

assigned to Mr. Dan Pease, appointed Controller of UNR,

effective July 1, 1980.

Mr. Buchanan asked for a report from the Affirmative Action Officer concerning the procedure followed in recruiting for these two positions, specifically asking if there were any violations of the Board's regulations on affirmative action.

Mr. Harry Wolf, Affirmative Action Officer for UNR, explained the procedure which had been followed and stated that, in his opinion, the procedure conformed with the Affirmative Action regulations and he was confident that there had been no violations.

Mrs. Knudtsen expressed concern about the release of information concerning such appointments prior to action by the Board. She further suggested that appointments of this kind should be left to the respective President to make, and recommended that this be addressed in the Code revision which is underway.

Mr. Mc Bride moved approval of the appointments as recommended. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried without dissent.

22. Proposed Merger of Department of Health Science and Social Services and Corrections, UNR

President Crowley recommended the merger of the Departments of Health Sciences and Social Services and Corrections, effective July 1, 1980, with the resulting new Department to be a component of the College of Arts and Science and to be called the Department of Social and Health Services.

Dr. Crowley noted that the Department of Social Services and Corrections is currently part of the College of Arts and Science, while the Department of Health Science has been part of the Allied Health area previously administered by the School of Medicine but standing alone for the past year. The Health Sciences were a major foundation for the original Medical School but could not be readily incorporated into the 4-year program. Dr. Crowley stated this merger will bring together two Departments with complementary interests, missions and philosophies and would reduce duplication of courses and streamline administrative responsibilities. As part of the merger arrangements, the corrections curriculum of Social Services and Corrections would be transferred to the Department of Criminal Justice.

Mrs. Knudtsen moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr.

Lombardi, carried without dissent.

23. Request for Loan from Board of Regents Special Projects

Account

President Crowley recalled that at the May 9 meeting, the Board had approved a recommendation to authorize whatever portion of the Hughes payment might be available up to \$200,000, for remodeling costs of the School of Medicine.

The remodeling project is intended to transform space vacated by the Audio Visual Department into offices and laboratories. The funding was to be reimbursed to the Hughes account from the anticipated \$250,000 to be derived from the Scarlett Estate.

Dr. Crowley reported that since the May meeting, the Hughes money has had to be reverted to the State. However, a \$100,000 payment from the Scarlett Estate is expected to be received prior to the end of the month and will be used for the remodeling project. He requested an additional \$100,000 be provided by a loan from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account, to be repaid when the additional proceeds from the Scarlett Estate become available in late Fall.

Chancellor Baepler concurred.

Dr. Lombardi moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs.

Whitley.

Mr. Buchanan suggested that this be deferred until consideration of the proposed move of the Medical School.

President Crowley explained that the remodeling which is proposed will in no way make the building unusable for other instructional purposes.

Motion carried without dissent.

24. Proposals for Naming of University Facilities

President Crowley submitted, with his endorsement, the following recommendations from the UNR faculty:

- (1) That the Physical Assessment Laboratory in the Orvis School of Nursing be named in honor of Dean Vera Brand, who is retiring this year after six years of meritorious service in the Deanship.

(2) That one of the two gymnasiums in the Lombardi Recreation building be named in honor of the late Dr. Ruth I. Russell, who spent 39 years with the Department of Recreation and Physical Education.

Dr. Lombardi moved approval. Motion seconded by Mrs. Knudtsen, carried without dissent.

25. Bid Opening, College of Business Administration Building,
UNR

President Crowley reported that bids were opened June 3, 1980, for the College of Business Administration building, UNR, with the following results:

Alternates

Base Bid	A	B	C	D	Total Bid
----------	---	---	---	---	-----------

Walker Boudwin Construction Company

6,177,000	18,659	52,365	87,311	533,888	6,869,223
-----------	--------	--------	--------	---------	-----------

Robert Fischer Construction Company

6,639,000	18,400	46,400	99,000	615,000	7,417,800
-----------	--------	--------	--------	---------	-----------

Del Webb Construction Company

6,684,000 18,500 62,100 100,000 673,000 7,537,600

Mc Kenzie Construction Company

6,788,000 18,500 54,000 91,000 614,000 7,565,500

Vasko Construction Company

6,821,000 18,113 49,434 90,019 614,300 7,592,866

Alt A - Audio/Visual and computer remote terminal cables

and devices and building and sound console.

Alt B - Precast concrete parapet on roof.

Alt C - Elevator #2.

Alt D - Auditorium and various other rooms.

The construction budget for this project is \$7,122,000. The State Public Works Board recommends award of a contract to Walker Boudwin Construction Company for the base bid plus all alternates for a total contract of \$6,869,223.

President Crowley requested concurrence by the Board of Regents in the bid award recommended by the State Public Works Board.

Dr. Lombardi moved approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc
Bride, carried with Mr. Cashell abstaining, explaining
that Mr. Boudwin was a business partner.

26. Bid Opening, Demolition of Mechanic Arts Building, UNR

President Crowley reported that bids were opened June 19,
1980, for demolition of the Mechanic Arts building, with
the following results:

R. E. Ferretto Construction	\$15,809.30
T. W. Construction Co., Inc.	17,260.00
Gerhard and Berry, Inc.	17,400.00
Earl E. Games, Inc.	18,980.00

President Crowley recommended that the bid of R. E. Ferretto
be accepted.

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

27. Report on the Status of Graduate Education

Chancellor Baepler recalled that in November, 1979 the Board of Regents requested a study of graduate programs at the two Universities. In response to that request, a report of a UNR task force appointed to conduct a study at that institution and a report from UNLV, prepared as part of their accreditation study, were distributed with the agenda.

President Crowley introduced Dr. Richard Burkhart, Chairman of the UNR Task Force, who spoke briefly concerning findings of the committee. Dr. Burkhart reported that UNR currently offers the masters degree in 55 different areas and the doctorate in 17 areas, exclusive of the School of Medicine. He noted that approximately one out of five students at UNR is enrolled in a graduate program.

Dr. Burkhart also commented on the benefits of graduate programs on the total educational and research efforts of the institution, suggesting that because of their involvement in graduate education, the character of the faculty has changed in that they are becoming more professionally oriented. A second benefit is the enhancement of the overall undergraduate experience by the presence of graduate students interacting with the undergraduate. A third benefit occurs in the area of sponsored research, noting that in 1974-75 the

University received \$1.1 million, increasing to \$2.3 million in 1979-80 in sponsored research. In addition, there has been a number of visible products as a result of the graduate program and accompanying research: 21 books have been published and 437 papers generated and accepted by refereed journals.

President Goodall spoke concerning the report filed by UNLV, noting that the graduate programs at UNLV have been initiated much more recently than those at UNR, and those programs still tend to be more at the masters level than at the doctoral level. The enrollment tends more toward part-time students, and there is a fairly strong emphasis on graduate work in Education; however, that is shifting more into other professional areas. Dr. Goodall suggested that UNLV will continue to develop graduate programs in those areas where it has a strong expertise or an ability to respond to a particular interest. He reported that one of the recommendations from the Northwest Association was that UNLV attempt to find more ways to provide research support on Campus for faculty and graduate students. A second, specific recommendation by the Northwest Association is that the institution consider its current policy that allows faculty at UNLV to enroll in its own doctoral programs.

Dr. Goodall stated that this matter will be reviewed and a recommendation made to the Board at a subsequent meeting.

28. Request for Payment of Moving Expenses

Chancellor Baepler requested that President Murino's moving expenses from Boulder, Colorado to Reno, in an amount not to exceed \$7,000, be paid from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account.

Mr. Buchanan moved approval. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried without dissent.

29. Request for Supplemental Funds for Assistant Counsel

Chancellor Baepler reported that, effective July 1, 1980, Mr. Lyle Rivera, System Endowment Officer and Assistant Counsel, will be funded 1/2 by UNLV (as Endowment Officer for that institution) and 1/2 by the System, as Assistant Counsel. Dr. Baepler requested that the funds necessary for salary, fringe benefits and operating costs assignable to Mr. Rivera's function as Assistant Counsel be provided from the Board of Regents Special Projects Account in the following amounts:

Professional	.50 FTE	\$19,003
Fringe Benefits		2,089
Classified	.50 FTE	5,506
Fringe Benefits		905
Operating		900
		\$28,403

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

30. Proposed Acquisition of Commercial Space in Las Vegas

Chancellor Baepler recalled that at the May 9 meeting, a request was made that the Chancellor's Office look into the cost and feasibility of renting commercial space in Las Vegas to provide office space for Regents who live in southern Nevada. He reported that he had determined that space was available and suggested that Mr. Mc Bride be appointed as a committee of one to work with him to physically inspect such areas.

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

31. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Baepler asked for the Presidents' reports concerning the status of their institutions' accreditation.

President Davis reported that he had received a letter from the Northwest Association and that accreditation of WNCC has been reaffirmed by the Commission on Colleges. He noted that the policy of the Commission provides that each institution conduct a self-study and is visited at least once every ten years with an interim report during the fifth year and progress reports and visits at other times as requested. WNCC has not been asked to provide a progress report.

President Goodall reported that UNLV has also received notification of full reaffirmation of accreditation, with a progress report to be provided in 1983. Dr. Goodall commented on the general recommendations of evaluation committee, among which was a recommendation for implementation of a more specific long-range planning evaluation process, and a second one dealing generally with Campus development.

President Eaton reported that CCCC has received notifica-

tion of reaffirmation of accreditation and a request for a progress report and a one-person interim visit in 1982.

There are three major areas apparently of concern on the part of the Commission. First there was significant concern that the funding level for the Community College was inadequate. Dr. Eaton further noted that the staffing parameters under which the College is currently working, particularly the 45-55% ratio which calls for a large number of part-time staff members, have raised a question concerning the quality of instruction. A third concern of the Commission is the frequency of change at CCCC. Overall, however, she regarded the response of the Commission as very positive.

President Eardley reported that he had received notification that TMCC has been accredited as a separate unit of the University of Nevada System. A progress report has been requested in 1983 and, since this is TMCC's initial accreditation as an operationally separate institution, the College will be expected to conduct a comprehensive self-study and be visited by a full evaluation committee in 1985.

32. Report of the Chairman

Chairman Cashell commented concerning the status of Board

appointed committees and asked that the July agenda include a written report from the Chairperson of each of the following committees:

Code Revision

Board of Regents Bylaws Revisions (Officers)

Development of Financial Information (Finance Committee)

Ad Hoc Committee of Regents to Develop Officer

Assessment/Evaluation Procedures

Academic Master Plan (Chancellor's Advisory Cabinet)

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

Work Load Study Committee, UNR

Work Load Study Committee, UNLV

Committee to Review Financial Accounting Services

Mr. Cashell noted that the final report from the Law School Study Committee was scheduled for presentation on Saturday, and that appointment of a Chairman to replace Judge Hug on the System Administration Study Committee would be made shortly so that the Committee could proceed with its assignment.

Mr. Buchanan asked for a report at the July meeting concerning the status of UNLV's application for membership in WAC and a report concerning NCAA and UNLV Athletics Department.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 P.M., and reconvened at 9:00 A.M., Saturday, June 28, with Chairman Cashell presiding, and with Regents Buchanan, Knudtsen, Lombardi, Mc Bride, Ross and Whitley present. Also present were Chancellor Baepler, Presidents Berg, Crowley, Davis, Goodall and Murino, and Board Secretary Bonnie Smotony.

34. Law School Study

Chairman Cashell introduced Judge William Beko, Chairman of the Law School Study Committee, who, in turn, introduced the following members of the Committee who were present: Ms. Frankie Sue Del Papa, Mr. John Foley, Judge Procter Hug, Jr., Judge Addeliar Guy, Mr. Harley Harmon, Sr., Mr. Bruce Roberts and Mr. Richard Weisbart. Committee members Judge Paul Goldman, Mr. John Key, and Justice Noel Manoukian were not present.

Chairman Cashell introduced Mr. George Roen, Vice President and Director of Cresap, Mc Cormick and Paget, Inc., the management consulting firm which had conducted the Law School Study. Mr. Roen then introduced Dr. Eugene Smolley, the team leader for the study, and Ms. Clayton Spencer and Mrs. Carol Penskar, who had assisted in the study.

Dr. Smolley presented a comprehensive review of the report, pointing out that the answer to the question of whether or not Nevada should have a Law School was not clear cut; the data reflects that it would be marginally cost-effective to have a Law School, but the broader view of Nevada's development indicates that it would be desirable.

Dr. Smolley cited the following basic facts as revealed by the Study:

- (1) In the period 1968-1978, the ABA approved Law School enrollments went from 63,000 to 122,000.
- (2) In 1978, 40,000 first year places in Law Schools were awarded, compared to 126,000 LSAT administrations (roughly equal to applications).

(3) There are currently 500,000 lawyers in the U. S. compared with 365,000 in 1970, 286,000 in 1961 and 222,000 in 1950.

(4) Since 1954, 41 ABA approved Law Schools have been established; there are currently none in Alaska, Rhode Island and Nevada.

(5) In this time frame, Nevada's population has gone from 160,000 in 1950 to 767,000 currently, and it is projected to rise to 1,192,000 by 1990.

Dr. Smolley reviewed the background, objectives, scope and methods of the study, noting that the objective of the study was to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing a Law School as part of the University of Nevada System. Within that objective, the scope included determining the need for legal education and services in Nevada and the benefits which could accrue to the State; looking for alternatives to the establishment of a Law School; determining the resources and program commitments that would be necessary to establish a Law School; the cost involved; and the location, if a Law School were to be established.

In conducting the study, CMP worked very closely with the Law School Study Committee appointed by the Board of Regents and found their assistance to be of great value. Background information, both national and Nevada-oriented, was assembled; informal views on legal education and service were evaluated through interviews, including perceptions of current arrangements, alternatives which might exist, and benefits and problems which might occur from the establishment of a Law School.

CMP staff conducted 79 formal interviews: 9 of the 11 members of the Law School Study Committee, 7 of the 9 Regents, 2 pre-legal advisors, 10 State Officials, 3 University Officers, 3 Judicial College Administrators, 6 other influential Nevada citizens, 5 Chamber of Commerce Officials and County Commissioners, 3 individuals at the American Bar Association, 2 at the American Bar Foundation, the Association of American Law Schools, the National Association for Law Placement, 13 individuals at other Law Schools, 14 other individuals including 2 from the California Bar Examiners, continuing Education for the Bar in California, State Bar officials from various states, and a representative of the National Center for Educational Statistics.

In terms of student demand in Nevada, computer runs were obtained from the Educational Testing Service indicating the number of applicants, the number of acceptances, number of students matriculating in Law Schools, the states in which Nevadans attended Law School, and the GPA and LSAT score ranges. Data from ten other western states were obtained for comparative purposes.

To assess the supply and demand of lawyers in Nevada, information was obtained from the State Bar files concerning Nevada Bar admittees, where they were born and where they attended Law School.

To analyze national trends in legal education the ABA annual review of legal education in the U. S. was used and national trends in lawyer placement and demand were analyzed using National Association of Law Placement data.

Base population for law applicant pool and lawyer demand was extracted from population data provided by the State Planning Coordinator's Office and the National Bureau of Census.

Law School Feasibility Studies from other schools were reviewed for comparative purposes.

Dr. Smolley also reviewed the current arrangements for legal education and research in Nevada, noting that there are 3 ways in which this is currently provided:

- (1) The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) which involves 13 western states. Nevada commenced participation in the Student Exchange Program in Law in 1975, and provides for 18 entering students each year, expending \$117,000 annually for this purpose.

The number of applicants for WICHE support in Law numbers between 40 and 91 per year. The actual cost (both student and State cost) is higher than nonresident tuition.

- (2) Mc George, Southwestern, and Washington, D. C. Law Schools have programs oriented towards Nevadans.

- (3) Continuing Legal Education (CLE) effort is now being addressed by the Nevada Bar.

- (4) Legal research is currently carried out in four areas:
The Legislative Counsel has a staff of 12 attorneys;

the Attorney General has 42 attorneys in divisions other than criminal and highway doing research; the central legal staff of the Supreme Court has nine research attorneys; and Law Library resources include the Supreme Court Library with 55,000 volumes, the National Judicial College Library with 50,000 volumes, the Clark County Library with 40,000 volumes and the Washoe County Library with 25,000 volumes.

A third area addressed by the Study includes an explanation of the framework for determining Nevada's legal education needs; that is, the parameters of the issue, student demand, Nevada's demand for lawyers, the qualitative dimension, and resource requirements.

First, in assessing student demand, the study addressed the question of (1) access to legal education; (2) the affordability of that legal education; and (3) critical level of demand.

Secondly, Nevada's demand for lawyers was assessed; that is (1) the supply of lawyers, their number, distribution and quality; and (2) placement prospects -- the anticipated impact of economic and population changes in the State and the

impact of the national placement picture on Nevada.

The qualitative dimension relates to the benefits which may accrue to the State, University and the legal profession as a consequence of having a Law School.

In terms of benefits to the State, the opportunity to have a center of intellectual activity (the Law School can serve functions beyond the education and training of the professionals, for example, preserving and advancing the State's legal tradition, acting as a resource for critical perspective of legislative and judicial functions, etc.).

The benefits to the University, including the obvious one of adding a desirable dimension to the total program, would include the opportunities for collaboration, the internal resource which a Law School may offer for the conduct of University affairs.

The benefits to the legal profession include an opportunity for continuing education, teaching opportunities for lawyers in the State, the support for law students and a meeting ground for developing that network of contacts that assists on carrying on the business of Law in the State.

A final category within this framework is resource

requirements:

1. Cost - Is the cost reasonable and in keeping with the priority of establishing a Law School?
2. Support - Do the key people in the State see the importance of this type of activity?
3. Resource Availability - Are the funds available to support a Law School?

Dr. Smolley commented on the section of the study dealing with assessment of Nevada's legal education needs, pointing out that the first part of such an assessment has to do with student demands, and that both the national and the Nevada situations have been explored.

A review of the national situation reveals that Law School enrollments are leveling off. The number of unfilled places is larger than in previous years. For example, for the period 1973-78, 33 seats were unfilled in three schools; in 1979 there were 395 seats unfilled in seven schools. The

number of Law School applicants is declining and is projected to decline nationally. The LSAT administrations have decreased from 135,000 in 1974 to 111,000 in 1979. The 1980-1995 period projects from an 8 to a 23% decrease in the annual number of applicants during that period of time.

A review of the Nevada situation shows that Nevada ranks low in demand for legal education but high in acceptance rate. On this basis, the finding is that Nevadans have a reasonable access to a legal education, in addition to the fact that there are a large number of Law Schools within a 250 mile radius of Las Vegas and Reno.

The study shows that Nevadans pay significantly more for their legal education than students who can attend a Law School in their own state. The average resident tuition is \$743; the average nonresident and private tuition is \$3,035. The current State subsidy for law students is limited to the support provided a limited number of students through the WICHE program and has little impact in making Law Schools more affordable. Only 18 entering students each year are supported and they are chosen on an academic rather than a need basis. This supports 23% of Nevadans going to Law School; the national averages show that 24% of students

attending Law School receive financial aid.

Again, dealing with the Nevada situation, the number of Nevada law applicants is projected to increase significantly in the next 15 years. Dr. Smolley explained the several different methods used for projecting the number of law applicants, pointing out that all methods were somewhat speculative because of a number of factors which could impact the reliability of the projection. However, he stated that the study indicates that in general current arrangements meet the student demand for legal education, there is no evidence of unmet needs, and the national decrease in demand indicates that more spaces will be available in surrounding schools. He emphasized that all of this does not allow for the fact that some students may be discouraged from applying or matriculating because of cost, but that statistic is difficult to measure.

Dr. Smolley also commented on the findings of the study concerning societal demand for lawyers, noting that nationally, the supply of lawyers is increasing with an uncertain future market for legal services. In Nevada, the study shows a sufficient supply of well qualified lawyers. In terms of distribution, the lawyers are where the population is. In

terms of quality, there is no evidence of lack of quality.

Demand for lawyers in Nevada is expected to remain strong with societal changes indicating a greater need for lawyers.

Uncertainties stem from limitations on growth imposed by such things as water and sewer, the proposed MX missile site and the impact of the recession. Placement prospects for graduates of a Nevada Law School could be tight in the short term, uncertain in the long term.

Important in the assessment are the qualitative aspects; for example, the benefits to the State, the University and the profession. Although, as indicated, Nevada has substantial resources for legal research and review, the existing structure does not provide continuity, comprehensiveness and intellectual independence, since the research tends to focus on a day-to-day operation rather than long term, the concerns are directed to particular areas, and they are tied to the special interests of their organizations. Nevada's need for ongoing expert criticism of its legal process is likely to grow as the State grows.

Nevada attorneys would benefit from an academic resource; there would be more opportunities for consultation, for

specialization, and for interaction with academic lawyers, giving practicing attorneys the opportunity for additional perspective.

Dr. Smolley emphasized that although the student and societal demands, which are identifiable and measurable, make only a marginal case for a Law School, there are qualitative benefits that go beyond the student and society demand issues.

In discussing the establishment of a Law School and its characteristics, Dr. Smolley pointed out that there are several program requirements that are critical to its success. One is ABA accreditation. A second is to meet the Association of American Law School guidelines. Further, he suggested that a Nevada school should place additional requirements of quality and focus; that is, it must be of high quality and must emphasize Nevada law and training of professional skills. A Law School should be small enough to insure selectivity and should provide research and review of Nevada law. The governance of a Law School should be more independent than Departments or Colleges of a University.

A Law School should strive to enroll 85 students each Fresh-

man year, and graduate 80 of them. A Law School should develop analytical and professional skills and the curriculum should emphasize legal problems and opportunities in Nevada. A Law School should have an excellent Dean and faculty (one Dean, one Associate Dean, one Assistant Dean, and 13 full-time faculty). In-state tuition should be in the range of \$550 to \$1,000 annually.

Dr. Smolley went on to discuss the requirements for a law library, noting that it should have an initial collection of between 40,000 and 60,000 volumes, have a head librarian and three full-time assistant librarians. A simple, but adequate, Law School building was estimated at approximately \$4.5 million, with acquisition of a minimum library estimated at \$1 million. In 1980 dollars, the annual operating costs for a Law School were projected at \$1,245,318, with gross cash outlays for the preopening year and through the first three years of operation estimated at \$8,455,786.

Dr. Smolley advised that a Nevada Law School would require on-going support from the State, and suggested that when looking at other sources of funds in terms of operating expenses, the University of Nevada, with its current support, could not support a Law School. However, he pointed out

that the State appears to be capable of providing the financial support necessary. Uncertainties exist because of Question 6, and whether or not the Legislature would consider the Law School as worthy of support.

Construction should be completed within four years to meet accreditation requirements.

In terms of location, a school located in Reno would have certain institutional advantages by virtue of an affiliation with the National Judicial College, and proximity to the seat of State government. A school located in Las Vegas would have advantages because of the size of the community and its projected growth rate. Las Vegas would benefit from a law library. Reno is closer to another Law School than Las Vegas is, and the opportunity for private donations has been focused in Las Vegas. The question of location, however, should be determined as part of an overall plan for the two Campuses and in conformity with the Board's commitment to two fully comprehensive Universities.

Dr. Smolley suggested that establishing a Law School would not significantly improve the access of Nevadans to legal education.

A State-supported Law School would, however, make legal education more financially feasible for the individual Nevada student.

A Law School would not greatly affect the supply of lawyers in Nevada since the supply is currently adequate. This conclusion does not include an assessment of whether it is better to have these lawyers trained in Nevada.

The opportunities for a Law School to increase the competence of the Bar is limited. There are strict standards of admission to the Bar which has the effect of controlling the quality.

A Law School would offer a valuable critical perspective on legislative and judicial functions.

Without the enhancement of current programs, a Law School would have limited impact on the quality of the University of Nevada.

A Law School would improve continuing legal education only if special provisions were made to accomplish this goal.

The impact of a Law School on the State would be strong; the impact on the profession and the University would be less certain.

Dr. Smolley commented on the alternatives available to meet Nevada's legal education needs. One alternative would be an expansion of State assistance that is available to Nevada students, such as increasing the number of WICHE scholarships each year; creating additional subsidies for other students attending both WICHE and non-WICHE schools; removing support of law students from the WICHE program and establishing one comprehensive State subsidy program encompassing a set number of students attending Law Schools of their choice.

A second alternative suggested in the report is the establishment of a private Law School or a branch of an existing Law School within the State; however, Dr. Smolley suggested that this incurs the same problems that a State Law School would face.

A third alternative would be to establish a legal institute as part of the University System, to serve as a study center

for Nevada law and policy. Such a structure could offer coordinated externships and could be administratively supervised by the University.

In concluding his presentation, Dr. Smolley recalled the two key questions which had been raised:

1. Is a Law School feasible and desirable and in what time frame?
2. What are the alternatives to establishing a Law School at this time?

Conclusions reached are:

(1) On the basis of traditional feasibility analysis, the University of Nevada should not establish a Law School at this time, for the following reasons:

- a) Student opportunity for legal education is satisfactory.
- b) The demand for lawyers is such that there appears to be a sufficient number currently, they appear to

have appropriate expertise, and it appears that there will be an appropriate supply of lawyers in the future.

- c) The projected Law School enrollment appears marginal to make a Law School viable.
- d) The cost of establishing and maintaining a Law School must be applied against the benefits which would be received.
- e) The issue of priority is important. Since the cost benefit is marginal, what priority is placed on a Law School? Interviews indicated that the interest in a Law School is mixed. Issue is the question of what the role of professional education is in Nevada and how does a Law School fit in with the overall issue of professional education in the State.
- f) There is an uncertainty about the future because of the recession, dependence on natural resources, etc.

(2) Dr. Smolley pointed out, however, that public policy considerations may make establishment of a Law School desirable, despite the results of traditional feasibility analysis. Such public policy considerations may carry more weight than the cost effectiveness, for such reasons as:

- a) Self-sufficiency - to what extent should Nevada generate and house its own expertise, and develop its own capability to transmit this expertise.
- b) Development of quality - by attracting high-quality legal academicians to the State and by providing longer term consideration of legal issues concerning Nevada.
- c) Benefits to State government, University and to the legal profession must be carefully considered.
- d) Short-term investment and long-term gain; that is, benefits which accrue from a Law School require time for establishment and growth. Is the cost benefit such that the State is willing to invest the capital in order to prepare for the eventuality

that a Law School may be necessary in the State in the future.

- e) Correction of specific areas of deficiency in providing educational opportunities at reasonable cost.

Dr. Smolley suggested that of the alternatives offered, the two most feasible appeared to be (1) the expansion of State subsidies for legal education; and (2) establishment of a legal institute that organizes an external program for training in Nevada law and contributes associated research.

Dr. Smolley suggested the following four steps be taken in carrying out the recommendations contained in the report:

- (1) Adoption of the report as a basis for public debate as to what is the validity of the qualitative arguments;
- (2) Determination by the Board of Regents and the Legislature of the relative value of the qualitative benefits versus the cost required;
- (3) Determination of the Law School priority with respect

to other professional programs; and

(4) Make a decision on the recommendations by approving one

of two alternatives:

(a) Establish a Law School as part of the University

of Nevada and determine the location of that Law

School in the context of plans for developing

other professional schools.

(b) Adopt alternative course of action for meeting the

needs for providing legal education.

Following the conclusion of the presentation of the Law School Study by the consultants, Chairman Cashell asked for comments from the members of the Law School Committee.

Judge William Beko, presented the following comments and recommendations of the Law School Committee, noting, however, that others on the Committee might wish to add their own comments.

(1) Initially, the Committee commends Cresap, Mc Cormick

and Paget, Inc., for its excellent report. Every facet

of our feasibility request has been thoroughly investigated and analyzed. Individual members of the Committee may not concur with some aspects of the report; however, we unanimously agree that CMP's contractual requirements have been satisfactorily completed.

(2) At the present time, there does not appear to be a lack of student opportunity for Nevada residents who desire legal education at institutions out of the State; however, those students pay substantially higher tuition fees than residents of those states which have established Law Schools, and those costs may be expected to increase to the point where legal education will be limited to those who have substantial private funds.

a) There is no known method through which it may be accurately ascertained how many Nevada residents are deprived of a legal education because of the current excessive cost. The relationship between admissions and matriculations of Nevada residents supports the conclusions that the number of resident students denied the opportunity of a legal education is significantly higher than most studies suggest.

(3) State financial support through subsidy requires an immediate reevaluation. Nevada is not currently supplying adequate financial support to its students of graduate professional schools. Emphasis should be put on those programs to provide an incentive to Nevada residents to return to Nevada upon completion of their graduate degrees.

a) Implementation of this recommendation is dependent to an extent upon the early preparation and adoption of a University Master Plan for professional graduate schools wherein the need for programs such as Veterinary Medicine, Dentistry, Architecture, Law, etc. can be properly addressed, priorities and probably locations established, and the necessary funding appropriated by annual budget requests on a systematic basis. This Committee is confident that such a Master Plan will also reflect that Nevada has largely ignored its responsibility to graduate level professional education.

(4) Despite the conclusions of the report that Nevada does not need a Law School at this time, a significant num-

ber of the members of the Committee feel that there will be a need for a Law School in the future, and that if that need is to be met on a timely basis, immediate steps should be undertaken to plan for the funding, planning and designing the necessary buildings, recruiting an administrative and teaching staff, and other essential details. With legislative approval and support a necessity, it is expected that a minimum of two to three years would be consumed in this process if initiated immediately. When established, the Law School Committee recommends as follows:

- a) The Law School must be a small school, but of high quality and capable of surpassing all present requirements for ABA approval.
- b) It must be a State institution, having the strong, active support of State administration, the Legislature, and the Board of Regents.
- c) The Committee is agreed that substantial benefits would accrue to the State, to the University, to the Legislature, and the Courts, as well as the people of this State from the establishment of a

Law School.

d) It is the consensus of the Committee that the suggested alternatives would not meet the needs of this State. The overall costs of such programs would far exceed the total tuition costs for a greater number of students at a Law School out of the State.

(5) It should be pointed out that Law, as a career, is no longer as attractive to College graduates, as evidenced by the decline in admission applications and the vacant seats in 1st year classes at ABA approved Law Schools. However, it is also apparent that Nevada's need for lawyers, especially in some specialties, is expected to continue. While the applicant pool is small at this time, an appreciable increase is anticipated if a Law School is established in Nevada.

Mr. John Foley stated that in his view, the Board of Regents is now faced with the decision of where the Law School should go since this is tied to a decision on what is going to happen to the Medical School. He referred to an agreement which he said was reached when the Medical School was

approved by the Legislature that the Law School would go to Las Vegas. He stated that, in his opinion, the Law School would be an important addition to the University and should go to the Campus not having the Medical School. Mr. Foley suggested that there would have to be some intense effort to reduce costs as much as possible since he did not believe the Legislature would fund a project of the size envisioned, and suggested that some alternatives be considered, such as a tie-in with an existing accredited school. He suggested that the appropriate sequence would be to determine the question of location, explore the possibility of a tie-in with another school, get the first year started, and then approach the people who would contribute to its continued financial support.

Judge Hug commented on the quality of the CMP report, which he agreed was excellent, and suggested that the real value of the report was not in the conclusions reached but in the framework it provides for further analysis and discussion, pointing out that all of the considerations which should be made are included.

Judge Hug stated that he supports a Law School for Nevada, believes the State can afford it, but cautioned that it

would be a mistake to proceed without legislative support.

He agreed with Mr. Foley that the Law School should be in Las Vegas, adding that he did not believe it would be advisable to even consider moving the Medical School since the physical facilities are in Reno, many of which have been constructed from funds provided for that specific purpose, and the faculty and staff have been recruited to Reno. Although it would be nice to have a Law School associated with the Judicial College, it would also be very beneficial to Las Vegas to have access to a law library which would be the center for legal education, including continuing education, as is provided by the Judicial College in the northern part of the State.

Judge Hug pointed out that it cannot be proved, in presenting a request to the Legislature, that there is a critical need for a Law School since qualified students are getting into schools elsewhere. However, the cost to Nevada students is greater and the State is not providing a complete educational opportunity at a reasonable cost to citizens.

Establishment of a Law School must be a matter of priority and must be viewed in context with the other needs for education. It cannot interfere with ongoing programs of the

University and should not interfere or compete with other legitimate demands for State resources. However, he urged that the planning for a Law School proceed.

Ms. Frankie Sue Del Papa concurred in the comments by Judge Beko that a Law School must be viewed within the context of a professional school Master Plan and urged that this planning process be completed. She stated that she personally did not feel that State support is available at this time and agreed with the conclusions in the report that Nevada is not ready for a Law School at this time, but supported the recommendation that planning be initiated. She also recommended that the University look closely at the alternatives, particularly at a subsidy program based on need as well as merit.

Judge Addelmar Guy commented on the projected growth of the State, and suggested that at some point it must be decided that there will be a Law School. He urged that a priority be placed on the establishment of a Law School and that planning be initiated. He expressed his belief that a State University must serve the needs of the people and that the Board of Regents must accept the responsibility to provide leadership in the educational field and must convince the

Legislature of the necessity of providing legal education to the students of Nevada.

Mr. Weisbart commented on the need expressed in the study for immediate action with regard to State subsidies. He suggested that this is critical at this point and should receive some attention in the next legislative session.

Mr. David Cowells, a resident of Las Vegas, spoke concerning his support of a Law School from his perspective as a student commuting to the San Fernando College of Law.

President Goodall stated that he agreed with the comments concerning the importance of keeping a balanced system of higher education, and believed that the distribution of graduate and professional schools is extremely important.

Dr. Goodall suggested that not enough emphasis had been placed on the potential demand of part-time students who will never go out of the State for their education, adding that the report overstated the difficulties involved in creating a school that can respond to that kind of need.

Dr. Goodall also suggested that the report overstated the difficulties in creating a Law School, adding that even

though he does not advocate a private school, he believed there would be an effort in the next five years to establish a private school in Nevada if one were not established as part of the University.

President Goodall recommended that:

- (1) The Board reaffirm its position that Nevada ought to have a Law School at an appropriate time;
- (2) That it be located with the concept of balance high in terms of the priorities that have been set; and
- (3) That the Board be cognizant of the fact that there will be an effort to create a private Law School in Nevada, and be ready to respond to it when it comes.

Mr. Cashell thanked the Committee for their efforts on behalf of the Law School Study and the guidance and consultation freely and effectively provided to the management firm conducting the study.

Mr. Cashell then recommended that: (1) the University initiate planning for a Law School, agreeing that the appro-

appropriate location appeared to be Las Vegas; (2) that the development of a Master Plan be commenced immediately; and, (3) that the Board of Regents undertake the development of a proposal to the Legislature for expansion of a student subsidy program, either through WICHE or outside of that program, to alleviate the cost of students going outside the State for professional graduate education.

In response to a question concerning the subsidy program, Judge Beko stated that in his opinion, any additional money provided by the Legislature ought to go into a subsidy program rather than WICHE, since the report has indicated that it is more costly with the WICHE program than a more direct subsidy program. Judge Beko also stated that it was the Committee's opinion that an effort should be made to provide this subsidy program immediately, so that assistance can be provided while the planning for a Law School is proceeding.

In response to a further question concerning the Committee's recommendations, Judge Beko confirmed that a Master Plan was considered essential to further planning. In summary, he said, as a first priority, a subsidy program should be established, with the second priority being the development

of a Master Plan for professional schools.

Mr. Buchanan moved that the members of the Law School Committee be invited to continue as an Advisory Committee to the University in the planning for a Law School. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc Bride, carried without dissent.

Mr. Ross moved that the Law School Study be accepted. Motion seconded by Mr. Mc Bride, carried without dissent.

35. Master Plan for Professional Schools

As indicated in the agenda, at the time the Board directed that the 1975 Law School be updated, it also directed the development of a Master Plan for Professional Schools. Proposals were requested from three firms: Booz, Allan and Hamilton, Arthur D. Little Company, and Cresap, Mc Cormick and Paget, Inc. Proposals were received from the latter two firms and copies were made available to the Regents.

Mr. Buchanan suggested that consideration be given to relocating the Medical School to Las Vegas if Washoe Medical Center does not give the University some type of commitment to support the School. If a decision is made to relocate

the Medical School, a consequence of that decision would be to locate the Law School at UNR. He suggested that prior to preparing a feasibility study for professional schools, the question of the location of the Medical School be resolved.

Mr. Cashell stated that it appeared that the relationship between the Medical School and Washoe Medical Center is approaching resolution. He urged that the development of the Master Plan proceed and consideration of the Law School and location of the Medical School occur within that context.

Chancellor Baepler referred to the proposals received for the Master Plan for Professional Schools and recommended that, if the Board determined to proceed, the firm of Cresap, Mc Cormick and Paget, Inc. be retained. However, he pointed out that the study would look at several high cost programs, such as Dentistry, Veterinary Science and Optometry -- programs with a limited appeal in terms of number of students who apply, in relation to a Law School or an Architectural School. If, as the study just completed indicates, the State is not ready for a Law School, it is clear that these high-cost professional schools are many years in the future. When professional programs are considered, it is obvious that the Board would choose to go

with a Law School and an Architectural School, both of which are less expensive and have broad student appeal, and he did not believe, therefore, that it was worth spending \$60,000 to have someone tell the University what it already knows. Furthermore, he stated, there are people within the University System who can develop a priority list and a recommendation for locations.

Mr. Mc Bride disagreed, pointing out that no decisions can be made about priorities or locations if the University has not developed justification for a program on which a decision for priority or location is necessary. He urged that a Master Plan be developed in an organized fashion, suggesting that long-range planning cannot be done in a piecemeal fashion. Mrs. Whitley agreed.

Dr. Crowley expressed concern that preparation of a Master Plan for professional schools by an outside consultant, at the same time an internal long-range academic Master Plan is underway by each of the institutions, would create two different sets of priorities. He suggested that perhaps it would be more appropriate to incorporate the professional schools study into the present effort which is being done internally. If there is a need to do survey work or collect

extensive data, the research centers at each of the Universities could then be utilized at a modest price. Then, in the event outside consultants are required, consideration could be given to their employment. He urged however, that the study be done internally so that programs and schools could be looked at together.

Chairman Cashell expressed concern that no apparent progress had been made in the development of institutional Master Plans even though the lack of such planning had been identified in January. He suggested that the Campuses and the consultants work together for a complete study, including the professional schools.

Dr. Baepler reported that a completion date for the Master Plans had been set for December 1, noting that the institutions have just completed their self-study for accreditation and are, therefore, in a good position to proceed with their academic planning.

Mr. Ross suggested that the Campuses be requested to submit their Master Plans on or before December 1, and then perhaps a professional consulting firm could be employed to address the feasibility of those plans.

Mr. Cashell pointed out that somewhere along the line these institutional Master Plans need to be brought together or they would not be beneficial to the University System as a whole. At this point, he suggested, it is difficult to see how an integrated Master Plan will be possible without some overall coordination.

Chancellor Baepler stated that in the past decade it has been difficult to get the Campuses to plan constructively when, almost without exception, every proposed new program has failed to be funded.

Chairman Cashell suggested that requests for funding might be more successful if they are supported by an integrated Master Plan.

President Crowley stated that although he would not oppose the Regents contracting with CMP, he believed there was a great deal of expertise internally and that expertise should be utilized by the Regents.

Mr. Cashell asked if the involvement of an outside consultant would lend credibility to the planning process and per-

haps expedite the completion of the Master Plan.

Dr. Baepler responded by stating that having someone come in to give the Board the sequence and location of professional schools does not mesh with the planning process.

Mr. Buchanan agreed, stating that the institutions are willing to bring their Master Plans to the Board and it is the Board's responsibility to merge those Master Plans into one System Plan. He further stated that he did not see any urgency to development of a Master Plan since no new professional schools have been budgeted for the next biennium.

Mr. Cashell expressed his unwillingness to proceed with planning for a Law School, even though he supported the establishment of one within the University, until it can be evaluated within the context of a full Master Plan.

Mr. Buchanan again argued that a Master Plan is not warranted at this time, rather, it should wait until each of the institutions presents its Master Plan, suggesting that the Board would then have the next two years to review those before proceeding further. Mr. Buchanan also suggested that if Question 6 passes, any master planning done will have to

be drastically altered.

Mr. Mc Bride reported that he has not been able to confirm that anyone has yet started on his Master Plan. He also recalled that one of the big criticisms in the accreditation reports was directed to the lack of long-range academic Master Plans. He also expressed concern that there was apparently no coordination from the System toward the completion of the Master Plans.

Mr. Cashell agreed, suggesting that employment of an outside firm might provide the necessary impetus. Mr. Cashell further suggested that CMP work with the institutions in the development of their Campus Master Plans, and then proceed to the next step of development of the professional schools Master Plan as an integral part of the total plan for the System.

Mr. Buchanan objected, stating that if the Regents wish to have the Master Plans for each of the institutions assessed, someone should be retained who has expertise in the matter. He also objected to the expense of having an outside agency look at every institution.

Mr. Cashell suggested that if the institutions themselves cannot proceed with the development of Master Plans, then some other means must be found to do the job, including the expenditure of funds.

Mr. Ross moved that the institutions continue with their internal planning, that the Chairman be authorized to negotiate with CMP for a broader-based Master Plan review to include all phases, and that the Regents get a report concerning this negotiation at the next meeting. Motion seconded by Mrs. Whitley.

Mr. Buchanan commented that by asking for outside help it appears that the Regents are saying that their Administrators are not capable of developing a Master Plan for their institutions and that they need outside help to do it. He stated that he disagreed, suggesting that they be asked to proceed, then if they cannot do the job, look for outside help and possible new Administrators.

Chancellor Baepler stated that each institution must complete its own Master Plan, that Plan must then be compared with the other institutions', and after any problems which surface are worked out, the collective institutional plans

must then be merged into a System Plan.

Mr. Buchanan agreed, stating that it was at that point that the Regents would evaluate it, and if they do not then agree with the Plan they should look for outside help.

Mr. Ross defended his motion, suggesting that it offered the compromise of asking Administrators to proceed with their individual plans, after which outside help may be obtained.

Mr. Cashell asked how far along each of the Master Plans were.

President Murino reported that the DRI plan is expected to be completed by the end of the Summer. If the December target date is not timely enough for the Board, and the Regents were to so indicate, the Presidents could take steps to accelerate the process. He suggested that the institutions be allowed to complete their plans, integrate them and if there are deficiencies at that point, a consulting firm would be appropriate.

Mr. Cashell again expressed concern that no progress has been made to comply with the Board's request.

Dr. Baepler pointed out that it is not uncommon for an institution to take two or three years, with involvement of faculty and Deans, to develop something as critical as an Academic Master Plan, suggesting that if it does not take a substantial amount of time and personnel, you do not have an effective plan.

Dr. Crowley stated that there has been no progress for several reasons: the recruitment and appointment of an Academic Vice President, and the completion of the reorganization. He also stated that he believed nothing had been done because the sense of urgency expressed by the Board had not, until now, been adequately communicated.

Mr. Cashell pointed out that six months of the time allowed had already passed, and that what was projected to be accomplished in a year will now have to be done in six months. He requested that the planning proceed and that progress reports be provided at the next meeting, and that no new programs should be approved for any institution until the Master Plans are complete.

Mr. Buchanan moved that this item be tabled until the

August 19 meeting, at which time each institution would present a progress report on its Academic Master Plan and a timetable for completion with a draft by December and a final copy by June, 1981.

Mr. Cashell objected to waiting until June, 1981, stating that he believed it important that this be completed prior to the Legislative Session. He requested the target date for completion remain at December, and that an initial progress report be filed at the August 29 Board meeting, with monthly progress reports thereafter.

Mr. Buchanan accepted the amendment. Motion seconded by Dr. Lombardi, carried without dissent.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 A.M.

Bonnie M. Smotony

Secretary of the Board

06-27-1980