

UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes
Western Nevada Community College
Carson City Campus
Room 209, Aspen Building
March 13-14, 1997

Members Present:

Ms. Shelley Berkley
Dr. Jill Derby
Mrs. Thalia Dondero
Dr. James Eardley
Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher
Mr. David L. Phillips
Mrs. Nancy Price
Mr. Howard Rosenberg
Mr. Tom Wiesner

Members Absent:

Mr. Madison Graves, II, Chair
Mr. Mark Alden

Others Present:

Chancellor Richard S. Jarvis
General Counsel Donald Klasic
Vice Chancellor John Richardson
Vice Chancellor Tom Anderes
President Joseph N. Crowley, UNR
President Carol Harter, UNLV
President Richard Moore, CCSN
President James Randolph, WNCC
President Ronald Remington, GBC
President James Taranik, DRI
President Kenneth Wright, TMCC
Secretary Mary Lou Moser

Also in attendance were Faculty Senate Chairs Peggy Urie, UNR; John Sagebiel, DRI; Larry Hyslop, GBC; Nancy Master, UNLV; Becky Seibert, System Administration; Joanne Vuillemot, CCSN; Richard Stewart, WNCC; Dan McClure, TMCC. Student Government leaders were also present: Dan Oster, UNR; Aaron Rosenthal, UNLV; Jennifer Lee, ASTM; Victoria Briscoe, GSA, UNR, Joyce Marshall, GSA, UNLV, and Susana Hernandez, ASCCSN.

Vice Chair Jill Derby called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. with all Regents present except Mr. Alden and Mr. Graves.

1. Introductions - President Remington introduced new ASB members Mr. Brian Dankowski, Vice President; Ms. Marlene Bauman, Senator, Winnemucca; and Ms. Stacy Monroe, Treasurer.

President Crowley introduced Mr. Albert VanGeelen who attended for GSA president Ms. Lea Williams.

President Wright introduced ASTM members Ms. Jennifer Lee, President; and Mr. Mike Walker, Vice President.

2. Chair's Report - Vice Chair Jill Derby reported on the recent Association of Community College Trustees meeting attended by herself and Regents David Phillips and Nancy Price. She described this meeting as very positive and outlined the community college priorities for the 105th Congress in the following areas: Appropriations, Tax Issues, Workforce Education and Training, Higher Education Act (HEA) Reauthorization and Welfare Reform issues.

Vice Chair Derby also reported that she and Mrs. Price met with the four congressional representatives while in Washington, D.C. and they are very supportive of these issues.

Vice Chair Derby commended UNLV and UNR for the success of their basketball teams as both teams advanced in the National Invitational Tournament. She stated they are both very fine teams and she also praised them for maintaining high academic standards as well.

3. Chancellor's Report - Chancellor Jarvis stated that his major area of activity this last month has been with the Legislature and that will be discussed under agenda item 6.

Presidents' Reports:

President Crowley reported on two articles in USA Today that featured activities at UNR. The first article discussed the return of social workers to the public sector and featured Ms. Marybeth Burroughs who is completing a Master's degree this spring. The second article reported on UNR student Ms. Melanie Watkins, who was selected for the All USA College Academic First Team. Ms. Watkins, a single-mother with a 3.86 GPA in Health Sciences, will receive a \$2,500 scholarship. Her goal is to attend Medical School.

President Harter reported that UNLV is conferring Emeritus Status to Dr. Claude Warren who has served as Professor of Anthropology at UNLV for twenty years. She also reported on the selection of Dr. Jeffrey Koep as Dean of Fine Arts; the selection of Mr. Harvey Wallmann, Director of the Physical Therapy Program, and Mr. Roy Pelton, Director of Social Work. President Harter reported that there have been over 500 inquires about the Law School from prospective students and faculty members. In response to this interest she stated that an informational brochure has been produced and is being disseminated.

President Remington reported that in two weeks GBC's new television station implemented by Sun Broadcasting will be opening. He stated that for the first time Elko residents will receive Nevada news and weather as opposed to Utah information. He also reported that GBC and UNR are in the final stages of negotiating a two plus two teacher education program, and he thanked President Crowley, Dr. Westfall, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Jane Nichols, Interim Dean UNR College of Education, for their support in this program.

President Taranik reported on the Nevada Medal dinners featuring Nobel Prize winner Dr. F. Sherwood Rowland of the University of California, Irvine which will be held in Reno and Las Vegas next week. He reported that 80 tables have been sold for the two dinners. He also reported on the selection of Dr. James Coleman, currently a Program Director at the National Science Foundation, as the new Executive Director of DRI's Biological Sciences Center effective June, 1997.

President Moore reported on the Learn and Earn program. He stated that Clark County School District has provided an additional \$50,000 to support the program. He further reported that many high school juniors and seniors wanting to enroll in college courses have difficulty paying for tuition and books and CCSD donated \$150,000 this week to assist 750 high school juniors and seniors to take college classes.

Mrs. Price entered the meeting.

President Wright reported that for the first time TMCC 's enrollment has passed 10,000 headcount with spring enrollment figures surpassing those of the fall. He also reported that the Washoe County School District has passed a resolution in support of the magnet high school to be located on the TMCC campus. This school will start with 75-100 students and will grow to as many as 500. He reported on a new training partnership with the Michelin Tire Company and on negotiations with a major aircraft maintenance facility considering relocation to Reno. President Wright asked the Board and the Chancellor to seek a reprojection of enrollment figures in the Governor's Biennial Budget based upon growth.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that he is aware of several institutions experiencing overprojected enrollments and that this is a powerful case that he is pursuing at the Legislature for all institutions.

President Randolph announced the retirement of his Administrative Assistant Mrs. Terry Taeubel who has served WNCC for 18 years and noted that she will be missed on the campus.

Mr. Phillips entered the meeting.

4. Approved Reassignment of Duties, Dr. Kenneth E. Wright - Approved Reassignment of Dr. Kenneth E. Wright as recommended by the Chancellor. Chancellor Jarvis recommended approval of the following assignments requested by Dr. Kenneth E. Wright, President of TMCC: That President Wright be awarded an administrative leave effective March 14, 1997 through June 30, 1997; that he be reassigned to a faculty position effective July 1, 1997; that he be awarded a professional development leave for the fall semester 1997; and that he assume a teaching assignment for the spring semester 1998. The details of the assignments for the leaves and instruction are to be arranged by the Chancellor.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that a process of evaluations is conducted for the presidents: annual and periodic. A periodic evaluation is conducted for those presidents approaching their final year of contract and he had been in the process of conducting a periodic evaluation for Dr. Wright at TMCC. Towards the end of the process he meets with the president and briefs him or her on the direction the evaluation is taking. As a result of that meeting with Dr. Wright, the Chancellor stated he had received a number of requests from the president which were presented to the Board and as stated above.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the reassignment as stated above.

Mrs. Price stated there were other people who wished to speak on this item but had felt it would not appear on the agenda until later in the day and asked that unless it was Dr. Wright's wish to discuss the matter at this point, she would request the matter be delayed.

Mr. Wiesner seconded the motion.

Mrs. Price asked Dr. Wright whether he had any problem with discussing the item at this time. Dr. Wright replied that

he did not. Mrs. Price stated that there were others who wished to address this item, specifically on the process and this evaluation, that there were serious concerns about the process, and she personally wanted clarification on the manner in which the evaluation is done. She continued that it was her impression that this was done by the Chancellor and that the recommendation for reassignment was because of the process of the evaluation not because this Board had approved anything or had discussed it, and that it went to and through the evaluation process solely on the basis of the Chancellor's evaluation. Mrs. Price continued that the evaluation process does not encompass rational, measured indicators. For example, is enrollment up' Is crime down' Is the budget in order' are there problems like others have had with bank reconciliation' Mrs. Price stated there is a difference in philosophy, but it had always been her impression that each campus had its own way of management and leadership.

Mr. Klasic stated he felt Mrs. Price was going beyond the scope of the agenda item inasmuch as it was not an agenda item to talk about the process of evaluation, rather that it was to discuss reassignment.

Mrs. Price stated that the question of reassignment came as a matter of what she termed a flawed evaluation process and before this is done she felt that it was important for members to know what the process is. She stated that she did not understand the process used, but it seemed to her that the Chancellor has the authority in this case, and questioned the Chancellor's role in hire and fire and what his role was in the evaluation process. She requested clarification of removing a president from office. Also, she stated she understood that it was not Dr. Wright's will to be removed, and that without a better process it undercuts the whole evaluation process.

Dr. Derby stated that the issue before the Board was for reassignment of duties which she understood Dr. Wright had requested. Dr. Derby asked the Chancellor to continue. Mrs. Price asked the Chancellor and Dr. Wright to comment on whether it was solely Dr. Wright's request or whether it was made under some sort of duress.

Chancellor Jarvis answered that he wanted to be absolutely clear that there was no element of duress in the procedure that was used to this point. He continued that the process he had followed has been approved by this Board, voted on and endorsed in March or April 1995. The process of periodic evaluation has been applied since that time to five presidents, with Dr. Wright being the fifth of those. The process has been followed in the same way in each of those five cases. He related there has been no change from the Board approved policy on the process for periodic evaluation of the presidents. Dr. Jarvis stated he took exception to the characterization that this is a removal of a president against his will. He continued that this is not a removal of a president, but is a request that came from Dr. Wright. Dr. Jarvis stated that he did not believe the request was against Dr. Wright's will but he asked Dr. Wright to respond should he wish.

Mrs. Price stated she wished to have the process summarized for her because she did not think she had given up any authority in this evaluation process.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that he was not aware of any passage of authority in this, and again reminded the Board that he had followed the process adopted by the Board. He summarized, stating that there are two types of evaluation: An annual review which he conducts without extensive, and generally without any, campus consultation that it is a matter between himself, the president and the Board. He continued that this was not that kind of review.

Chancellor Jarvis related that this was the second kind of review, the periodic performance evaluation. Continuing, he stated that the process is initiated by the president preparing a self-evaluation report. The president determines what goes into the report. The president is free to put into that report any amount of quantitative, objective, rational information as a measure of the president's performance of the institutional progress. The president's self-study report is at the president's discretion. The Chancellor distributes that report to a large number of constituents as defined in the policy. The Chancellor sends it to the leadership of each of the constituent groups and asks the

president to submit to him lists of names for people who are not office holders. To consult with the faculty, the Chancellor explained he contacts the Faculty Senate chairs for the last two years and the executive committee members for the last two years since this is a two-year review. For the students, the Chancellor contacts the student associations, and at the universities both the graduate and undergraduate associations are included, and are invited to a meeting. He invites responses in writing, by phone to him, or to have a meeting with him. If there are classified staff, the executive committee and chair of those councils for the last two years are included. The Alumni Association and Foundation executive committees are contacted as are the Advisory Boards if there is one for that particular campus. Also, community leaders and legislative leaders are contacted. The president is asked for a list of those from which the Chancellor can choose, and the Chancellor selects some others whom he knows are familiar with the president and he talks to the leadership in the Legislature and the Executive Office. Each of those individuals receives a letter stating that the president is under evaluation and a copy of the self-evaluation report is included for review, but the recipient may also address topics other than those in the report. Meetings are then set up on the campus, typically for two days, with scheduled meetings for each of the constituency groups, and that was done at TMCC. Sometimes people do not want to come to meetings; there are fears of retribution, or awkwardness or not being willing to share views with colleagues. Anyone who asks for a private meeting with the Chancellor is afforded that opportunity. This process can be extended then for several weeks as was the case at TMCC since there was a large number of people who wanted to set up meetings or phone calls or to send letters. The Chancellor extended the process through the beginning of March.

Chancellor Jarvis emphasized that there is no restriction on the information that can be fed into the presidential evaluation process and that it is at the discretion of each person who wants to participate. Dr. Jarvis stated that he does promise each person confidentially, whether when speaking one-on-one, written, or during phone calls. He indicated that material stays outside of recoverable situations and that he felt strongly that he needed to make such a promise.

Chancellor Jarvis continued that the next step is to sit with the president and relate how the evaluation is going. That is the process that was essentially followed at TMCC. There is no hiring or firing by a chancellor; Regents hire and fire. The Chancellor brings forth to the Board an evaluation and a recommendation for a contract as a result of that evaluation.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that Dr. Wright led him to believe that it was his wish to submit these reassignment requests and he was honoring that request. He continued that he did not regard this as a resignation or a firing, and further stated that he hoped those members of the media who have so characterized it would phrase it otherwise. Dr. Jarvis emphasized that he was dealing with a request for reassignment.

Mrs. Dondero stated she had looked at the agenda item differently; that she had just thought it was wonderful that Dr. Wright was going to be a member of the teaching faculty because evidently the students like him and it was good that he had an opportunity to prepare his lesson plans for his teaching in the fall. She reiterated that she looked at it as a very positive step that he would remain on the teaching staff.

Dr. Derby thanked the Chancellor for his explanation of the evaluation process and stated that any further discussion of the process should come as an agenda item at a future meeting taking the advice of General Counsel regarding the Open Meeting Law. Mrs. Price asked whether it would be a discussion at the next meeting. Mr. Rosenberg stated he would support a discussion of the process as soon as possible, recognizing that the Board is dealing with two separate items this date. Mrs. Price stated that perhaps a special meeting could be called depending on Dr. Wright's response if it differs from the Chancellor's characterization. She continued that she has found over years on this Board that characterization of what someone said does differ depending on who is saying it and who is listening.

Mr. Phillips stated he did not know at this point whether Dr. Wright has a response; that there is an agenda item with a vote to approve or disapprove the reassignment and it is not about the process used or anything else. He continued that he had just read a letter from Dr. Wright requesting reassignment and he did not see an argument.

Mrs. Price stated that there is substantial discussion going on. Chair Derby stated that she would recognize people in order.

Ms. Jennifer Lee, President of ASTM, presented a petition. She stated they had learned late Wednesday night that Ken Wright was 'pushed' and he did not want a reassignment; that he would rather stay as president of the college; and that the students wanted him to remain as president of the college. Ms. Lee stated that the president works very well with the students, he began lots of great programs and if he is gone the programs will not be finished. She read the petition which is on file in the Regents' Office. Ms. Lee stated she found out probably two or three days before Chancellor Jarvis was on campus that he was going to be conducting this meeting but it was to be held when Ms. Lee was at work and could not be there, although she understood that the new Vice President of the student government was able to attend the meeting as well as the Phi Theta Kappa president. Ms. Lee stated she was unaware that she could schedule a personal meeting with the Chancellor and did not feel this was fair because Dr. Wright worked so well with the students and they did not want to see him go.

Ms. Rea Nelson, ASTM Treasurer, stated that Ms. Lee had circulated an informal petition on TMCC campus and does not have a formal record of whether all of the signers are students. Ms. Nelson stated she had signed the position, but later had asked that her name be removed from the petition and Ms. Lee had refused. Ms. Nelson stated that for the record she wanted the Board to know that she supports the Chancellor and Board position.

Mr. Lukas Loncko, International student from TMCC and president of the International Club, stated that Dr. Wright has been very supportive of the international students and of their meetings. Mr. Loncko stated that in his country, and most other foreign countries, it would be very unusual for a president to talk with the students on a personal basis as had Dr. Wright.

Mr. Dan McClure, President of Faculty Senate at TMCC, agreed with Regent Phillips' statement that the issue is a question for Dr. Wright and the Board's decision must be what is right for the institution. Mr. McClure stated that he was not speaking for the entire faculty because there is no consensus of opinion at TMCC, but speaking for himself, he felt it was best for TMCC to retain Dr. Wright as president and continue the programs he has begun. Mr. McClure pointed out that honoring the reassignment would put TMCC back into an 'acting' leadership capacity and they are swamped with people in acting positions inasmuch as every director in the academic area is in that capacity except for one position.

Mr. Andrew Bean, president protem of the Senate and friend of Dr. Wright, stated that Dr. Wright attends student government meetings and is very supportive of all student organizations, particularly the Hispanic organization and Phi Theta Kappa. He related that he felt Dr. Wright was the person for the presidency and wanted him to be able to stay.

Dr. Aurora Cortez, TMCC instructor for 22 years, spoke on behalf of Dr. Wright, stating that she was shocked to hear from a Legislator questioning what was happening at TMCC. She referred to an anonymous letter being circulated. Dr. Cortez commended the faculty at TMCC and expressed her pride in the College and stated she did not want any negative reports in the news media about the College. She delivered another anonymous letter to the Chair stating she did not want to keep it. She asked that Dr. Wright be allowed to remain as president.

Chair Derby stated that the Board receives a fair share of anonymous letters and her response to them and the

response of most of her colleagues is that if people are not willing to sign their names to a document they pay very little attention to them.

Ms. Claire Lutsinger, ASTM Senate and secretary of Phi Theta Kappa, spoke on Dr. Wright's involvement with student organizations. She related that it was through his encouragement that she ran for the Senate and for secretary of Phi Theta Kappa, and felt that Dr. Wright wants students to be involved in the College so that students have a voice. She stated she felt it was the Regents' job to listen to and be for the students.

Mr. Mike Walker, executive secretary of ASTM, spoke on behalf of Dr. Wright, stating that the evaluation process, which is what prompted the request for reassignment, was basically done with very little student input. He related that the students are the constituents of the president and are not employees as are staff and faculty, and there should be student input on how the president is perceived by the people paying to go to his college. He related the students had found out very late about the reassignment. Continuing, he stated that Ms. Nelson is an employee of the college on work study assignment.

Chair Derby asked the Chancellor to comment about the student input he received as part of the evaluation process. Chancellor Jarvis stated that in any evaluation process the student body is one of the major constituencies with which he consults in the periodic evaluation process. He contacts all organizations on the campus in the same manner: he writes to their leadership, sending them a copy of the president's report and asks them to respond to him in any way they find convenient. He stated that he has received written materials, scheduled a meeting with students leaders where they can bring other people if they wish. He stays open for subsequent contacts after the campus visits, which was also done at TMCC. Chancellor Jarvis stated that he does not believe in scheduling mass open meetings and does not do that with faculty, students, or the community. He related that his principle in this process of evaluation is that it be authoritative, analytical and accountable. He requests signed letters but does not read anonymous mail; he wants people to come to a meeting to say who they are and explain how they know the person who is being evaluated and on what basis they can evaluate the person. This process is used for all groups and individuals and is a consistent methodology.

Chair Derby stated the Board was inviting comments from students but not a debate among student leaders.

Mr. Wiesner asked Dr. Wright whether he had signed the March 5, 1997 letter and whether he wanted it to be on record just as he was requesting. Dr. Wright stated that several people during this discussion had used the term 'want'; that implied dealing with choices, and when a person has less than optimum choices the person chooses the one that is best for him. He related that he submitted the letter of request because TMCC requires significant change which he had embarked upon when he arrived about a year-and-a half ago; change requires taking risk and willingness and attitude to be able to make mistakes as the changes progress. Dr. Wright stated that he did not believe that is where he and the Chancellor disagree, but, he, Dr. Wright alone, knows why he submitted that request. Continuing, Dr. Wright stated that he does not feel he has had the support of the Chancellor for the last ten or twelve months, nor does he have the Chancellor's support now. Dr. Wright stated that the Board has sitting before it a very fine community college president and if this is going to be characterized as an evaluation of his, Dr. Wright's, performance, then he would defend it. He related that he has 27 years experience at the dean level and higher in community college experience and is only the 37th person in 52 years of operations to be named the distinguished graduate of the finest community college leadership program in the land. He continued that he had presided over three colleges, all of which have had significant objective improvement while he was there, including TMCC, and referred to his report given early in the day, which has come about after a very short beginning.

Dr. Wright stated that the kind of change required at TMCC is a slow, evolutionary change; the kind that if being done at a business would take four to seven years; that they require consistent application of sound management

principles, patience and persistence. Continuing, he stated that if he could not have that, he felt there was no point in embarking on that kind of program.

Dr. Wright stated that he and the Chancellor disagree on the evaluation process, and cited an article in the Wall Street Journal, November 29, 1996, titled 'Annual Agony' which states that every organization across the country is reexamining the question of performance review because there is a possible 90% failure rate of methods used for this review. He asked the Board to put together several things said this morning. He recalled the Chancellor had said people were given confidentiality. Dr. Wright stated he felt this was anonymity because people could say what they choose and it is not passed along. He related that several faculty had told him they were intimidated in the session from making positive comments they wanted to make; leading negative questions were asked. Dr. Wright stated that together with the comments by the chair of the Faculty Senate -- no consensus for years on the campus --then when negative questions are asked, negative answers will be given. Dr. Wright commented that if he were to use this process with every president at the meeting he could find negative comment from every one of their campuses and could find negative comment about Dr. Jarvis if he conducted such an evaluation process by just going to places knowing there was negative comment to be had and embark on a program where such comment was solicited. Dr. Wright stated this was not about evaluation, but was about what TMCC needs and it is up to the Board to decide what it needs. However, he told the Board that if they wanted an institution to change and to put the turmoil of the past five to seven years behind, then it had better embark on a program and stick with it, and the Board should support the leader. Dr. Wright stated he felt he had not been supported and therefore that was the reason for his request.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that he knows what Dr. Wright is saying; Dr. Wright has written a letter and the question now is, do you wish this letter to stand' Do you wish to withdraw it, knowing the full ramifications of knowing what this school needs' He explained that Dr. Wright must also make a decision. He again asked Dr. Wright whether he wished the letter to stand, yes or no.

Dr. Wright asked to consult with the leadership of the faculty and the student body before he answered the question. Dr. Derby called a two minute recess.

The Board recessed for approximately five minutes and reconvened with all regents present except Mr. Graves and Mr. Alden.

Dr. Wright stated he had always believed that a president's decisions are not his alone to make. He requested that the letter be withdrawn.

Dr. Jarvis stated that in view of the withdrawal by Dr. Wright, the agreements in that letter and the Chancellor's reply to Dr. Wright are now null and void, and that he, the Chancellor would complete the review as required by Board policy. The Chancellor requested the Board to schedule a special meeting to consider his report as required by Board policy and also would present an agenda item at that time for the consideration of the Board chair dealing with the current responsibilities and contractual status of Dr. Wright.

Mr. Bill Baines, Acting Director of Arts & Science at TMCC, stated he did not know where to begin in addressing the Board; that this decision is tearing up the campus. He related that an evaluation was conducted, that there was nothing coercive about the process, a decision was reached, and for the first time in a long time faculty felt they were on one track to move in some sort of positive direction which they have not done for the past year. He continued that now all of a sudden, they are back where they were. He stated that TMCC has all acting directors in instruction, and in fact, as a joke they are saying they will have a contest at the end of the year for Best Acting Director, which isn't really funny. Mr. Baines stated they can do nothing until they have leadership and stability. He

related that TMCC has been organizing for one solid year, and related that he had taken the acting director position for Arts and Sciences for a three-month period and he is now in his second year. He emphasized that somebody is not making decisions someplace; that a reorganization is a two-or-three year job, not a one-year job. He stated that a leader must put a deadline on a task and get the college moving. He continued that TMCC is 'dead in the water' and has been 'dead in the water' for the past four or five months and the Board is asking the campus to continue in this manner, and he felt it was 'absolutely reprehensible'.

Dr. Derby thanked Mr. Baines and stated that it was not the intention of the Board to tear an institution apart, but as an elected Board, it listens to the comments of the constituents around important issues.

Mrs. Gallagher stated that Dr. Wright certainly had the right to withdraw his letter but asked for a time frame to complete the evaluation. Continuing, she stated she agreed with Mr. Baines and that the longer this matter is held off the more upset there is for the campus, and she felt it was important that the Board must make a decision in a very positive way in a very short period of time. Dr. Jarvis stated that he would complete his report and have the meeting scheduled within two weeks.

Mrs. Price stated that to an extent she agreed with Mr. Baines, but for different reasons. She continued that there was turmoil which is what happens when you put in a rational management system, and she could speak to this because she teaches the concept of Total Quality Management versus the normal management seen in America, that is, the authoritarian type of management. She related that TQM requires a culture change and does take a long time, is difficult, and raises conflict, which is not a bad thing if one truly wants shared governance. Mrs. Price stated this is really a Regent problem, the Regents are the authority. She reminded the body that there was enormous conflict at the time of hire and it was a Regent problem, and the reason for the present turmoil is because the Regents did not address the problem as they should had done in the beginning. She stated she felt that for the Chancellor to give a recommendation within two weeks, that she has read this Board before, and that this would be pretty much a 'done deal' unless prior to that the Board, in a workshop setting, addressed the evaluation system and what it is the Board is doing and the fairness of the action. She continued, stating that the Board decides 'off the cuff' and there are many institutions that teach management and evaluation but the Board makes up the rules as it goes along. She emphasized that if the Board is to deal with this it must deal with the root causes before it continues with this process.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that he would like to take exception to Regent Price's phrase 'make up the rules as we go along'. He explained the process of the evaluation of the presidents was debated by this Board extensively, was adopted at their meeting in either March or April 1995; the process has been applied for four of the presidents prior to Dr. Wright; the process has not changed during that time; and to characterize it as 'made up as it goes along' is incorrect.

Ms. Berkley asked that when the meeting is scheduled to be cognizant of Easter break as she will be on vacation with her children from March 23 -30, and she very much would like to be a part of this process and presentation. Ms. Berkley stated that she came to the meeting prepared, and now was prepared, to vote in favor of this agenda item. Continuing, she related that as a member of this Board for a number of years, she has been listening to comments and did not want those comments cut off. She asked that if there were other people with opposing points of view, she welcomed them to say a few words of guidance, and did not feel that blaming the Regents for tearing a campus apart was the right thing to do if people were not willing to stand up and say publicly what they feel as did the faculty member and several students. She encouraged others to speak at this time if they had an opposing point of view.

Dr. John Clevenger, faculty member at TMCC, stated that he, too, did not know where to start. He related that he had been a teacher at TMCC since 1980 and has served in a number of roles at the college: Faculty Senate chair

twice, faculty committees, served in the Chancellor's office for a while. He contended that the Board had just seen illustrated what the problem is at TMCC. The Board had a process in which he had participated and had made comments to the Chancellor and that he made statements in that meeting that he would say to the president. He related he had even invited the Chancellor to invite the president to be in attendance to hear what he had to say. Dr. Clevenger related that he had asked for copies of the President's self-evaluation a number of times from the president's office, by e-mail, by phone at least three times with no one answering the phone even though the calls had been made during the 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. business hour. He stated that the e-mail was never responded to, so eventually Dr. Clevenger requested a copy of the document through the Chancellor's office. He related that at the College it was announced they were going to work as teams, they were going to move forward, they were going to do this or that, and then, at the last minute or under some other agenda, the agenda then changed – and the Board had allowed it to happen that very same way today. He cited that there was a request to be reassigned, and then, with various consultations, all of a sudden the request was withdrawn. He continued that this process just illustrated what he sees as a problem: that TMCC faculty and staff cannot get consensus, they hear one thing is going to happen, then another is going to happen, and when one thinks they are going in a direction it is learned that has now been changed. Dr. Clevenger stated this was not necessarily a reflection of the Board, but it was a reflection of the leadership, or to be blunt, the lack of leadership within the institution. He continued that TMCC seems to be continuously talking now about reorganization, and at the same time talking about not having leaders in place, which to him seemed rather backward. Dr. Clevenger stated that apparently there was a meeting the day before about reorganization and how it is continuing, which seems, again, out of place if there isn't leadership. Dr. Clevenger stated he could offer other illustrations, but felt this morning's actions demonstrated what has been going at TMCC. He stated he teaches chemistry and there has been difficulty about how student lab fees for this course are paid and used, and that he has been unable to track the fees. He stated this was not an accusation, but rather was a frustration on the part of a faculty member in trying to do a job. Dr. Clevenger related that getting a response from the president's office has been difficult. The request for response to his inquiry had been submitted December 1, 1996 and has not been fulfilled despite personally delivering the request to all the appropriate people from the president on down. There just has been no response.

Dr. Clevenger stated that he felt faculty members not now responding to the Board is that they do have opinions but they are all tired. Continuing, he related that it is much easier for him to be professionally stimulated through his professional organizations and his national work, than it is within the institution. He reiterated that the faculty was tired; that it was too hard to do things at TMCC, and every time a faculty member tries to do something he/she is criticized. He again stated that the Board was watching the process happen at this meeting that happens to those on the campus every time they attempt to do anything. Dr. Clevenger stated that TMCC has a lot of people who are incredibly talented, but who are incredibly tired.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that in education no one ever gets fired unless he wants to; that a person is always given a chance to resign, but when that is done, the problem is not solved. He continued that if the letter had, indeed, been honored there would always be a lingering doubt that someone was 'railroaded', and this was not the way to do business. He related that this decision was not going to be easy but it was vitally important that the process be carried to its conclusion. Dr. Rosenberg stated he did resent Regent Price's characterization of it being 'a done deal', and that he did not believe that it was. However, he related that he strongly felt the Board needs to complete the process so that all know what and why an action was taken and what they have to do to prevent it from happening again.

Mrs. Dondero requested to also have on the agenda a discussion of the campus. She related she heard from the testimony given that no one seems to know what is happening at the campus and in fact do not even know where student fees are going, which is wrong, and feels the Board should look at the problem as a total.

Dr. Wright stated that, 1) in response to John Clevenger, the president's office keeps logs of e-mail and he would invite an inspection of that log, and 2) the special appeal to the Board for a decision should be done as soon as possible. Dr. Wright stated the evaluation process itself has brought the institution to a standstill, that he has been involved in this process for three months when he began writing the self-evaluation. He related that the reorganization was to have been completed in January, and a number of things that would otherwise take place did not happen because of the evaluation process. Dr. Wright asked the Board to reexamine the process in light of two additional presidential evaluations coming up in the next year.

Dr. Derby asked the Secretary of the Board to schedule the special meeting as soon as possible allowing the Chancellor time for preparation. She thanked all who had participated in this difficult decision, and then called a ten-minute recess.

The Board recessed and reconvened at 10:20 a.m. with all Regents present except Mr. Graves and Mr. Alden.

Dr. Derby stated that this is the first meeting she has served as chair of the Board and recessed the meeting with a motion on the floor, for which she apologized. She stated that the motion on the floor is for Item 27 - Reassignment.

Mrs. Price called for a Point of Order, and asked whether the motion could be tabled or withdrawn. Mr. Klasic stated that the motion could be tabled, voted on, postponed to a different time or indefinitely, or withdrawn.

Mrs. Gallagher stated that before she withdrew the motion she would like to have General Counsel clarify what would happen if the motion is voted on and passes. Mr. Klasic reiterated the alternatives: 1) if the maker of the motion withdraws the motion, then the question is whether the person seconding the motion also wishes to withdraw the second. 2) if the second, or anyone else, objects to the withdrawal of the motion, then the question is put to the Board: does the Board wish to withdraw the motion? And a vote is taken. If the vote is in favor the motion is withdrawn. If the vote is against, the motion remains on the floor for Board action. Mr. Klasic noted that Dr. Wright has withdrawn the request. Normally, in a situation like this, if a request has been made and accepted it cannot be withdrawn without permission of the person who has accepted it; but, in point of fact, no acceptance of his request has been made by the Board, which is the purpose of the motion. Therefore, Dr. Wright has the right to withdraw the request and it may well behoove the Board to withdraw the motion.

Mrs. Gallagher, on advice of Counsel, withdrew the motion.

Mr. Wiesner stated he did not wish to withdraw the second, relating that Dr. Wright had signed the letter of March 5, 1997, and felt the Board should accept the letter of reassignment.

Dr. Derby asked the pleasure of the Board in whether they would support Regent Gallagher in withdrawal of the motion. Mr. Wiesner called for a roll call vote on the withdrawal of the motion. Mr. Klasic explained a 'yes' vote would be for withdrawal of the motion and a 'no' vote would be to not withdraw the motion. Mrs. Gallagher asked whether all were aware that this is a no-win situation. Mr. Wiesner stated there could be a win situation if Dr. Wright did not withdraw his request. Ms. Berkley stated that she was prepared to continue and would vote for the agenda item, relating that she had been involved with the same kind of situation on another campus where it was impossible to govern in a manner that was in the best interest of the institution, and ultimately she would make a decision based on what is best for the institution. She continued that she could not see where this fractured situation could ever get much better, so she was not sure how to vote, because voting no would be a mistake. However, to vote for this motion caused her concern about the decisions Dr. Wright had made today and felt the consequences might ultimately be very dire for him, which she would hate to see. Ms. Berkley stated that after hearing the debate she did not feel Dr. Wright could now go forward and adequately lead that institution.

Mr. Klasic stated that there was a motion on the floor for the purpose of accepting President Wright's request for reassignment, which he has now withdrawn. To vote in favor of that motion would put the Board in a cloudy legal position because the question of whether that was proper or not would be clouded. He continued that by the same token, under President Wright's contract, the Board has the right to reassign him at any time, and a motion to that effect could properly be made at this time if the Board so wishes. Mr. Klasic stated that if the Board wished to do that, he would advise against voting on this particular motion because he felt it would cause legal problems. On the other hand, if the Board wished to take the other action, it could do so. He stated he felt it was a proper part of this agenda because it is related, the Board has heard testimony on the matter and on their views as to whether Dr. Wright should or should not step down.

Chair Derby reiterated that the Board could then not make a decision on the withdrawal of the motion. A separate motion could be made by the Board to reassign Dr. Wright or any other terms they might wish.

Ms. Berkley stated that if the Board ultimately would go to a closed session and have a special meeting and go through the entire evaluation process, then the Board is not bound by this agenda item any longer so the options coming to the Board might be entirely different. Mr. Klasic stated that would be so. Mr. Phillips asked for further clarification inasmuch as the Board had a request, like an offer, to settle a dispute. Mr. Klasic stated that the request to withdraw the letter of reassignment had been made in the presence of everybody who is authorized to accept the offer.

Mrs. Dondero stated that in reading the agenda item there is no provision to allow anyone to withdraw a request, that the agenda item is just for an change of assignment. Mr. Klasic stated that the item is on the agenda and Dr. Wright has withdrawn his request. Mr. Wiesner stated Dr. Wright's letter only strengthens the reassignment recommended by the Chancellor since he withdrew his letter saying he does not agree with the reassignment, but it does not mean that the Board cannot act on the reassignment. Mr. Klasic stated that was his point. He pointed out that Mrs. Dondero was right in that the agenda item does not refer to the letter, it refers to the reassignment requested by Dr. Wright who now stated he is withdrawing the requests. However, that does not preclude the Board, arising out of this agenda item, from now taking action on his contract which provides that he can be reassigned at any time by the appointing authority. Therefore, once this motion is withdrawn, if the Board wishes to make another motion to voluntarily do this then the Board does have the right to have a motion for reassignment.

Mr. Wiesner withdrew the second.

Mr. Wiesner moved to follow the recommendation of Item 27 on the agenda: That President Wright be awarded an administrative leave effective March 14, 1997 through June 30, 1997; that he be reassigned to a faculty position effective July 1, 1997; that he be awarded a professional development leave for the fall semester 1997; and that he assume a teaching assignment for the spring semester 1998, with details of the assignment for the leaves and instruction arranged by the Chancellor. Mrs. Gallagher seconded.

Mrs. Price stated that this is exactly why the Board for 15-20 years has had the reputation it has had; that there is absolutely no reason to do this except for the will to win; and it's this will to win that started the problem in the hiring of the three presidents about two years ago. She continued that she has heard any number of times on this Board, 'Well, I'm not going to get into this fight because I know I can't win it.' And she asked that the Board consider going about this in a proper way; that there is a problem with evaluation. Continuing, she stated that to consider what was said before the Board today and to say that is an evaluation process, that it is not; and to do it in the manner in which the Board has been doing it has been a subject of discussion. She stated that the Board obviously knows there is an upheaval and to do something at this point without good discussion about the process and what is

happening and measured results, etc., would be a disservice not only to this president and this campus but to every other president who is going to be evaluated next. Mrs. Price stated there are all kinds of discussion of why this may be happening and that is not appropriate, but she continued that she was pleading with the Board not to take this action against this man.

Ms. Berkley reiterated that this is a Board approved process and something that did not crawl out from under a rock and wanted to remind Regent Price that she voted in favor of Dr. Wright. Continuing, Ms. Berkley stated that if there has been any discussion over the last few years to undermine him, to sabotage him, she was assuring Mrs. Price that she has never been a party to it, nor has she heard anybody else on this Board make any suggestion in that manner. Ms. Berkley stated she was going to vote against reassigning Dr. Wright because it has become very important to her to complete this process, but once the process is completed, she stated that if she felt that President Wright is not in a position to continue as president of this institution that she would not be voting for reassignment but would suggest there be a termination and not a reassignment. Therefore, Ms. Berkley stated, she was very appreciative of the risk he was taking at this time. Mrs. Gallagher stated that she has no feeling about winning or losing, but she felt strongly that it does have to do with TMCC; and that it has to do with Dr. Wright. She continued that she has a problem with what the Board is doing, not because the Board is doing it, but because Dr. Wright is forcing the Board to take action. Mrs. Gallagher stated she felt very much as does Ms. Berkley; that if the Board goes through this evaluation and finds that the Board feels that President Wright is no longer the one to lead this campus, then she feels he will be going out under a cloud, which she does not appreciate. Mrs. Gallagher related that she does not feel this Board is here to destroy anyone's career and she hates to be a part of it, but, the Board cannot protect someone who does not protect himself or does not want to be protected. Therefore, Mrs. Gallagher stated, so far as she was concerned this was President Wright's call and she feels this is a fairness issue. Mrs. Gallagher asked where the Board would be that it would change the evaluation process in the middle of an evaluation? What would the other presidents feel about being evaluated in that manner? She stated whether one likes this evaluation or not, the Board went through a lot of discussion and a lot of learning to come up with this evaluation process, and she can see no reason to change the process in the middle of the stream and that would not be fair.

Mr. Wiesner called for the question and to have a roll call vote.

Mrs. Price asked for a Point of Order. She stated the principle behind calling for the question is when discussion is through and is being repeated and since Mr. Rosenberg had indicated he wished to speak and he had not been a repeated participant in this, therefore, she felt he should be allowed to talk. Mr. Klasic stated that under Robert's Rules of Order, a call for the previous question requires a second. If it is seconded, that motion is not debatable; the question is then put as to whether the question under discussion should then be voted on immediately. Therefore, a vote is taken on the previous question and if that passes, then the body must immediately go to Mr. Wiesner's motion to vote it up or down. Mr. Wiesner acknowledged that Mr. Rosenberg wished to speak.

Mr. Rosenberg asked for a recess of five minutes 'to breathe'; that he was dealing with a man's life and he would like five minutes to think. Dr. Derby asked for a sense from the Board as to whether to recess. Mr. Wiesner stated it was all right with him, but to hold the recess to five minutes.

The Board recessed and reconvened with all Regents present except Mr. Graves and Mr. Alden.

Dr. Derby stated there was a motion on the floor for the reassignment of Dr. Kenneth Wright according to the provisions laid out in the agenda item (Item 27). There being no further discussion a roll call vote was taken.

Upon roll call vote of the Board, the motion carried. Yes: Dondero, Eardley, Gallagher, Phillips, Wiesner and Derby. No: Berkley, Price and Rosenberg.

During the roll call vote, when her name was called, Mrs. Dondero stated that she had come into the meeting planning to vote in favor of reassignment but felt the proceedings had put a large burden on the Board, but that she would vote in the affirmative. When Mr. Rosenberg was called upon for his vote, he stated he was not certain what the motion was. Dr. Derby explained the motion was for reassignment of Dr. Wright under the recommendation stated in Item 27 and that the Board did have the authority to reassign a president at any time. Mr. Rosenberg then voted no.

Mr. Wiesner asked whether the rules of the Board were that a chairman only voted in the case of a tie. Mr. Klasic stated that under Robert's Rules of Order the chairman can vote when it is necessary to reach a conclusion. In this case it requires six votes of this Board to take action. There were five 'yes' and three 'no' votes, therefore, the chair has a right to vote. Mr. Wiesner questioned that under most motions the chair does not vote, with Mr. Klasic replying that was the process the Board followed.

5. Approved the Appointment of Acting President of TMCC - Approved the appointment of Dr. John Richardson, who currently serves as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, as Acting President of TMCC, effective March 14, 1997 through June 30, 1998, at his current salary.

Mrs. Gallagher moved the appointment of the Acting President of TMCC as recommended by the Chancellor. Mr. Wiesner seconded. The motion carried.

6. Information Only: Legislative Report: - Chancellor Jarvis presented an update on the 1997 Nevada State Legislature. He reported on the major meetings where he and other system officers have given testimony. Although many other issues have been addressed by campus presidents and faculty, this report will be focused upon major System presentations.

Mr. Rosenberg left the meeting.

The Chancellor reported that at a February 10 meeting of the Senate Human Resources Committee and the Assembly Education Committee the System presented their planning report for the 1997-2001 as required by N.R.S. 396.505. A biennial report has been added this year in which the System reviews the last two year cycle. The Chancellor thanked his staff for preparing these reports in a very tight time frame.

At this hearing Presidents Crowley and Moore joined him in representing the System. The Chancellor presented an overview of where the System will be heading in the next four years. He thanked the presidents for stressing the challenges ahead for their campuses.

He stated that eleven questions were raised at this hearing and answers in writing have been sent to the committee members. These questions address issues regarding the continuation rates from high school to college, enrollment growth projections, the difficulty of transfer of credits and articulation, minority student admissions at the School of Medicine, the high tech centers proposed at CCSN, and the LCB audit.

Mr. Rosenberg returned to the meeting.

The Chancellor reported on the February 25 hearing before the joint money committees. The presidents of all seven institutions attended this six-hour meeting at which time they reviewed the Governor's budget request for the

System. Areas of particular interest at this meeting were the Gender Equity Issues, discussions regarding distance education and about removing it from the base budget and moving it to a separate bill. The Chancellor stated that support personnel must be included in the Governor's budget for distance education. Questions about the LCB audit and the System response, tuition, hazardous waste and enrollment issues were raised by the legislators. He stated that he did not detect that any part of the budget is closed off from discussion at this time.

Ms. Berkley left the meeting.

The Chancellor acknowledged the hard work by the presidents and his staff for their outstanding work in providing reports for the presentation. In addition, a data base has been established for tracking the legislative actions that the System is interested in for bill drafts, utilization of the WEB page to track hearings, and a number of staff are regularly attending the legislature. Currently, the System is closely following 45 bill drafts.

The Chancellor reported that on March 10 A.B. 191 was introduced regarding the school to work programs. He thanked Mr. Dick Kale and Dr. Jerry Barbee from WNCC for their testimony and support of this bill. Mr. Marc Cardinalli testified on A.B. 157 which concerns the removal of legal action from state district court to federal court, which the system does not support.

The next sub-committee hearings will be on April 2 which will involve all the UCCSN campuses and the System at which time issues raised by the joint money committees will be addressed.

Mrs. Price addressed a discussion which occurred at the February 25 meeting in which the Chancellor had stated that it was the legislature that wanted to raise tuition. She stated that her husband, Assemblyman Bob Price, raised the question because he was informed by her that the Chancellor indicated to the Education Committee that it was the Regents who wanted to raise tuition. She stated that her understanding was that at two times at the Regents' meetings the Chancellor stated it was the Legislature that wanted to raise tuition, and she commented at both of those meetings that she had never heard of a legislature doing that. She stated that at her meeting in Washington D.C. with the Senator's and members of the ACCT there was concern about the rising tuition; that it seems this Board does not move away from the principal it had two years ago from not raising tuition unless there were substantial reason and cause; and the Board does not have a system that automatically does that.

Mrs. Gallagher responded that the Board decided to raise student fees a little each year to keep from raising them a large amount every few years.

Chancellor Jarvis responded that a tuition and fee policy was passed last spring that formed the basis for the UCCSN budget request. Those fees reflect the tuition and fee policy passed by this Board. The questions Mrs. Price refers to go to the previous legislative session where the Board voted not to have a tuition increase. The Executive Budget, and then the legislative discussion of that budget, indicated there would be a gap in the System funding base given there was no increase in tuition forthcoming. He stated that he characterized that to Assemblyman Price in those terms. If he implied that anyone raises tuition other than Regents then he misspoke. The Regents, and only the Regents, can raise tuition.

Ms. Berkley returned to the meeting.

The Chancellor stated that there was a funding gap in the 1995 session. The Board revisited the question to fill the gap through an increase in tuition and fees.

Dr. Eardley asked if there was a chance that the legislature would fund us 100 % so the Board did not have to raise

tuition. The Chancellor stated that maybe there was a possible chance, but there was no discussion on this so far. Setting tuition and fees is the Board responsibility.

Mrs. Price responded to Dr. Eardley that the legislature two years ago funded 100 % of instructional costs. She reminded the Board that only 43% of that budget comes from legislative appropriation. Dr. Eardley stated that he understands that and further stated that about 18% are student fees and the balance comes from different sources.

7. Approved WNCC to Enter Negotiations for Purchase of Property - Approved WNCC to enter into negotiations to purchase property in Babbitt, Nevada. President Randolph reported that the property consists of one building totaling approximately 7,400 square feet, situated on seven acres of land. The buildings are owned by the school district and the land is owned by the county commission. The purchase price is \$1.00. Ref. D is on file in the Regents' Office.

Mrs. Roselyne Pirodeau, Coordinator, Hawthorne Center, stated that the purchase of this building is a wonderful opportunity for WNCC to have an actual campus in Hawthorne and there are a number of possibilities with the addition of this building. She promised to plant a rose garden on the campus.

Mr. Granvill Gage, Superintendent of Mineral County School District, stated that he and representatives from WNCC began discussion of this property as a possible campus in Hawthorne. The property is one mile from the other schools in the area. The building has seven classrooms, office space with reception space, a teachers' workroom and a break room. The structure is sound. The land is owned by the Army and once negotiations are completed it will then be turned over to MSCD. At that time MSCD will be able to enter into an agreement with WNCC.

The building should be vacated by December, 1998. He stated that he felt this is a good opportunity for WNCC.

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve WNCC to enter into negotiation toward purchase of property in Babbitt, Nevada. Dr. Eardley seconded.

Dr. Eardley asked why MSCD was moving out of this building and if it is structurally sound. Mr. Gage stated that a brand new facility is being built, and that the building is structurally sound.

Mrs. Price stated that a discussion at the Foundation meeting required an environmental impact study be conducted when purchasing property to identify any existing or potential problems and questioned whether the Board has a similar policy.

President Randolph stated that WNCC engaged an architect to inspect the building to ensure the building was sound. He did not look at asbestos and he did not test soil. He basically looked at the structure and facilities to see if they were sound.

Mrs. Dondero stated that she would assume that the county commission probably had regulations that needed to be adhered to. Mr. Gage stated that the Army did an environmental impact study on that entire property prior to entering into negotiations with the county. There is an underground fuel tank for oil heat. Some asbestos work has been done, and the three-year asbestos study has been completed.

Mrs. Price asked about costs to operate the building. Mr. Gage stated that electrical costs average about \$300 per month; water is \$150 per month; and power comes through the Army base, and the heat system is a diesel fuel

steam heat that is fairly efficient.

Motion carried.

Mrs. Price requested the Board consider adopting a policy on receiving property similar to that of the Foundations to perform an extensive environmental study in order to review problems. She stated that in the long run this would be cheaper than finding ourselves in an environmental situation that is extremely expensive to correct. Chancellor Jarvis stated that he will look into current Board policy regarding environmental studies and report back through a committee.

8. Information Only: Student Fees - Dr. Tom Anderes, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration stated that campus representatives will make presentations regarding the request for campus fee increases for 1997-98 for information and discussion with action to be taken no later than the Board's April 1997 meeting.

Mrs. Gallagher left the meeting.

Dr. Anderes stated that these fees are exclusive of registration fees and tuition paid by students. The increases requested are for fees related to residence halls, food service, health services, etc. The presentations made today are to help the Board get a sense of how these fees fit into the total cost of education for different categories of students and is for information only, however it will come before the Board in April for action.

Mrs. Price commended Dr. Anderes for putting together the information in such a way that the information is clear and helpful to the Board and not convoluted as in previous years. Dr. Derby agreed with Mrs. Price.

Mr. Phillips left the meeting.

Dr. Eardley requested policy clarification regarding Board approval of certain student fees outside of registration and tuition fees. Dr. Anderes replied that if a fee is under \$50 then the fee will not come before the Board, however, new fees or revision of an existing fee in the Handbook, must be approved by the Board.

Dr. Eardley requested a definition of a "pass through fee". Dr. Anderes stated that these fees generally are paid by the student for expenses to run the course, to purchase certain course materials. Dr. Crowley stated that it is Board policy that additional program fees are justifiable only if they are pass through fees. Mrs. Gallagher asked where these fees go with Mr. Rosenberg replying that they go directly into a department account and are used to purchase materials for the class for which they are collected.

Mr. Nick Paul, Dean of Student Services, at WNCC, reviewed the fee requests stating that he first addressed the costs for a student to attend a community college showing the budget differences between dependent students (family support received) and independent students (no family support received). This budget information is utilized for Pell Grant awards. Mrs. Price stated that recently she saw a nationwide comparative study of room and board costs to students and felt that Nevada was high compared to other states. Mr. Paul stated that since the community college did not have residence halls, figures were based on estimated costs in the Carson City area. These figures are for a year, not a semester.

Dr. Bob Ackerman, Vice President, UNLV stated that residence hall fees are higher than average because they are highly mortgaged and maintenance costs are included. About 5% of students currently reside in residence halls, and unfortunately some students were turned away this year due to not enough space being available.

Mrs. Price asked about the \$10 student activity fee assessed to graduate students. Ms. Joyce Marshall, GSA Senator, stated that \$8 is to support clerical person in the graduate student office and also for grants since they provide \$24,000 per year in grants. Mrs. Price asked for help with the student activity fee. She wanted to know if this was a different fee. Dr. Ackerman stated there is no student activity

fee, there is a distribution of part of the registration fee, but this is primarily a facility type fee. Mrs. Price stated that in 1987 there was a fee in which the majority went to the athletic department and a small percentage went to graduate students for research. Dr. Anderes suggested that this was a sub-set of fees for activities programs, that there is a breakdown of the registration fee by credit that is allocated to capital improvements programs.

Mrs. Price wondered if the fee had gone down, but now questions if there was an additional fee that existed before and asked Dr. Anderes to clarify this for her.

Mrs. Gallagher returned to the meeting.

Dr. Patricia Miltenberger, Vice President, UNR addressed how increases impact students. Mr. Price asked if the student health insurance was mandatory. Dr. Miltenberger stated that the \$57 student health services fee is mandatory and is charged along with orientation fees. This fee provides access to treatment at the student health center.

Mr. Dan Oster, ASUN President, stated that initially there was a strong voice of opposition to this fee by students; however, ASUN did a survey of students regarding the situation and had presentations regarding options and alternative plans available to students and after a lot of discussion the students chose the mandatory fee. He reported that use of the health center has increased since the fee has been charged.

Dr. Derby stated that she has received more calls from parents regarding this mandatory health services fee than any other fee. Mr. Rosenberg thanked Dr. Miltenberger for her explanation and requested that she write a letter to faculty explaining the difference between the optional student health insurance and the mandatory student health services fee so they can be clear in their understanding.

Dr. Anderes stated that three other institutions are requesting fee increases. President Moore reported that two students fee increases requested are for lab fees to cover printing costs in the computer labs and to increase the international student fee. President Remington reported that GBC is requesting an increase for the cost of student I.D. cards, which is not a mandatory fee. President Harter stated that UNLV is requesting a 1.5% increase in housing fees and changes to the refund policy to discourage students from "shopping around" for credits. President Crowley stated that UNR was requesting rate increases at the University Inn and on some rental apartments and houses on campus.

Ms. Berkley stated that she felt all the fee requests were reasonable and appropriate increases. Dr. Derby stated that the congressional delegation questioned these fees and she was very happy to receive this report.

9. Closed Session - Upon motion by Mrs. Gallagher, seconded by Mr. Rosenberg, the Board moved to a closed session in compliance with N.R.S. 241.030 for purposes of discussion of the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence, or physical or mental health of employee(s) of the UCCSN and citizens.

The Board moved to Closed Session at 12:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. with all Regents present except Mr.

Alden and Mr. Graves.

10. Approved the Academic, Research & Student Affairs Committee Report - Chair Shelley Berkley presented the following report on the Academic Research & Student Affairs Committee meeting held on March 13, 1997.

The following items were presented to the Committee for information only.

Elementary, Secondary And Higher Education Cooperative Initiatives:

Ms. Berkley reported that the campuses reported on three initiatives:

A.School to Higher Education Initiatives - A number of joint activities are underway between elementary and secondary education and UCCSN institutions. Ref. ARSA-3A on file in the Regents' Office for a listing by campuses.

B.Directions in Teacher Education - The Colleges of Education at UNLV and UNR are in the midst of considerations and actions regarding the structure, content and length of their teacher preparation programs. They are also reviewing the increasing need for elementary and secondary teachers in Nevada and steps they might take to help ameliorate this problem. Staff from both universities reported on teacher education developments at their respective university devoting particular attention to elementary/secondary teacher supply and demand issues. Ref. ARSA 3B on file in the Regents' Office.

C.Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Higher Education Grant Program - The UCCSN has received Eisenhower program grants from the federal government for a number of years to assist in improving mathematics and science instruction in elementary and secondary education. The grant program is administered by the Office of Academic Affairs in the System Administration Office. Dr. Mike Hardie presented a brief overview of the program and described the grant requests approved for the coming year. Ref. ARSA-3C on file in the Regents' Office.

UCCSN Workforce Development Council - Ms. Berkley reported that the UCCSN Workforce Development Council was established by Chancellor Jarvis on December 4, 1996. The mission adopted by this Council, at the direction of the UCCSN Chancellor, is to coordinate and communicate the participation of the universities and community colleges in workforce development activities including: education and training, staff development, teacher training, research and evaluation with the System, and with other entities.

More and more, UCCSN recognizes the urgency to become more competent, flexible, and responsive as a System to a broad array of workforce development needs, working collaboratively with other state and local agencies as it strives to provide the essential education and training to Nevadans. This advisory council was established to analyze programs and policies linked directly to workforce development activities in the State and make recommendations relevant to System participation while serving as a focal point for coordination, direction, and sharing of information as the System succeeds in its endeavors.

Dr. Robert Silverman, Director, related current activities of the Council.

Developmental Education - Ms. Berkley reported that Mrs. Dorothy Chase made a presentation on developmental education activities at the community colleges.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve the report. Mr. Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

10.1 Approved the 1997 Nevada Regents' Awards - Approved the nominations for the 1997 Nevada Regents' Awards. These awards will be presented in May 1997 and include a special medal and/or plaque and \$5,000.

A. Approved the Nevada Regents' Creative Award - Approved Dr. Carol Kimball, Professor of Music at UNLV as the Nevada Regents' 1997 Creative Award recipient.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve Dr. Carol Kimball, UNLV, as the recipient of the 1997 Nevada Regents' Creative Award. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

B. Approved the Nevada Regents' Researcher Award - Approved Dr. Warren Burggren, Interim Dean of the College of Sciences, UNLV as the Nevada Regents' 1997 Researcher Award recipient.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve Dr. Warren Burggren, UNLV, as the recipient of the 1997 Nevada Regents' Researcher Award. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

C. Approved the Nevada Regents' Teaching Award, Community College Faculty - Approved Richard F. Riendeau, WNCC, as the recipient of the Nevada Regents' Teaching Award, Community College faculty.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve Richard F. Riendeau, WNCC, as the recipient of the Nevada Regents' Teaching Award, Community College faculty. Mrs. Dondero seconded. Motion carried.

D. Approved the Nevada Regents' Teaching Award, University & DRI Faculty - Approved Dr. H. Eugene LeMay, Jr., Chemistry Department, UNR as the recipient of the Nevada Regents' Teaching Award for University and DRI faculty.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve Dr. H. Eugene LeMay, Jr., as the recipient of the Nevada Regents' Teaching Award for the University and DRI faculty. Mr. Rosenberg seconded. Motion carried.

E. Approved the Nevada Regents' Scholar Awards - Approved the following students as recipients of the 1997 Nevada Regents' Scholar Award as presented by each campus president:

- 1) UNR - Keith Flower, Graduate Student
Tasha Palmer, Undergraduate Student
- 2) UNLV - Sandra Phillips Johnson, Graduate Student
Michelle M. Wright, Undergraduate Student
- 3) CCSN - Doriayn Olivarra
- 4) GBC - Connie Thomson-Hornbarger
- 5) TMCC - Denise Abbey
- 6) WNCC - Lisa Nelsen

Ms. Berkley moved that the students named above be approved as the recipients of the 1997 Nevada Regents' Scholar Award for their respective campuses. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

10.2 Approved the Principles, Electronically Offered Academic Degree and Certificate Programs - Approved the principles of good practice for electronically offered academic degree and certificate programs.

Dr. John Richardson stated that these principles are designed to foster the interstate delivery of high quality

electronically-delivered courses or programs. Developed by the WICHE Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications, higher education institutions and the regional accrediting community, the principles provide students who enroll in Nevada or other western states' distance education courses with an assurance that the programs meet certain standards. Ref. A on file in the Regents' Office.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve the principles for electronically offered academic degree and certificate programs. Mr. Phillips seconded.

Chancellor Jarvis asked Dr. John Richardson to address two items raised in relation to this item. One is that Regents' current policy under Intellectual Property Provisions cover the development of electronic media materials, including course materials. Dr. Richardson responded that this was reviewed three years ago and it is believed that there are no additional policy statements needed by the Board in that area. At that time, the policy of assignment of faculty to engage in distance education (teaching load), release time or extra pay issues, were to be addressed at the institutional level. Therefore, System policies have not been adopted in that regard. It is felt those issues should be decided by the campus administrations and faculty senates to determine practices.

Motion carried.

10.3 Approved the General Education Articulation Agreement - Approved the General Education Core Requirements Articulation Agreement. This articulation agreement is for Associate of Arts degree graduates transferring to UNLV and UNR. Ref. B on file with the permanent minutes.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve the General Education Articulation Agreement as presented. Mrs. Dondero seconded. Motion carried.

11. Approved the Audit Committee Report - Mrs. Gallagher reported on the meeting of the Audit Committee held on February 19, 1997.

The following items were for information only:

Status of Institution Bank Reconciliations -Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit, reported that TMCC, CCSN, DRI, WNCC, and GBC have completed reconciliations through December, and that UNR, UNLV and the System have completed reconciliations through November. These are all in line with the 45-60-day reconciliation period.

Status of External Audit Findings - Mrs. Cardinal reported that the campuses have submitted action plans for the recommendations made in the Coopers & Lybrand report and, in fact, many of the recommendations have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. She reported that the A-133 report will be presented to the Committee at its May meeting.

Status of LCB Action Plan - Vice Chancellor Tom Anderes reported that the Business Officers and Controllers were reviewing the Action plan to interpret the recommendations into institutional procedures and the implications they will have on their present procedures. New policies are being written on the System level and will be presented for consideration as they become available. Dr. Anderes stated he has reviewed policies from other Systems and will be able to incorporate some of these and the procedures into the UCCSN policies and procedures.

Internal Audit Department Procedures - Mrs. Cardinal reported that Regent Alden has requested changes in the manner in which Internal Audits are performed. He has requested that the staff do a financial audit in conjunction with the regular audit. Mrs. Cardinal reported that the Internal Audit staff has always done a financial audit, it is a part of the working papers on each audit, but that it has not been made a special part of the report. Up to this time, only exceptions have been a part of the report to the Committee. She stated that the staff will include this with the report from now on. Mr. Alden had also asked that a budget be included. Mrs. Cardinal replied that it was not always possible to have a budget for a particular department if it was budgeted as a part of a larger unit.

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve the report. Ms. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

11.1 Approved the Internal Audit Report - Approved the following Internal Audit reports as contained in Ref. C on file in the Regents' Office.

- Cash Funds, UNLV
- Student Financial Services, UNLV
- Grants & Contracts, CCSN

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve the Internal Audit reports. Mr. Phillips seconded. Motion carried.

11.2 Approved the Audit Exception Report - Approved the Audit Exception Report for the period July 1, 1996 through December 31, 1996 as presented by Mrs. Sandi Cardinal, Director of Internal Audit. This report will be updated every six months and submitted for consideration.

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve the Audit Exception report. Ms. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

12. Approved the Campus Environment Committee Report - Chair Jill Derby reported on the meeting of the Campus Environment Committee held on March 13, 1997.

The following items were for information only:

Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act Reports - Campus representatives provided information on campus programs related to the Federal Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990. Passed in 1990, the intent of the act is to ensure that students and campus employees are aware of campus crime and crime prevention policies and procedures. The act requires that each institution prepare, publish and distribute an annual report containing such information.

Ms. Karen Steinberg, Deputy to the Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis, provided summary information of the UCCSN campus crime statistics for the most recent year 1995.

Campus Reports, Diversity Efforts - During the report on diversity on October 3, 1996, the institutions requested an opportunity to provide information to the Committee on initiatives relating to recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty. A representative from each institution provided a summary of the campus programs.

Dr. Derby stated Ms. Berkley chaired the Campus Safety sub-committee and Mr. Phillips chaired the Diversity sub-committee and that these reports provided a great deal of information. She also stated that she is very pleased with the efforts made on Diversity issues.

Ms. Berkley moved to approve the committee report. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

13. Approved the Investment Committee Report - Chair Jim Eardley reported on the meetings of the Investment Committee held on February 12 and March 5, 1997.

The following items were for information only:

Reviewed the Endowment Guidelines - The Endowment Guidelines, approved by the Board of Regents in June 1996, were reviewed by the Committee. The Guidelines give a great deal of responsibility to the Committee, including the hiring and termination of investment managers. Cambridge Associates are consultants and advisors to the Committee. It was pointed out that the Guidelines call for four Regents to be appointed to the committee. Dr. Eardley stated that Regent Graves, Chair of the Board, would be contacted with a request that one more person be added to the three-member committee. (Note: Mr. Graves will be serving as the fourth member of the Committee).

Placement of Funds - Campus operating accounts are 'swept' daily and the funds are invested in the Short-Term Common Fund according to Board approved Guidelines. It is important to maintain a balance in the style of investment managers so that they complement each other and to ensure that the portfolio is appropriately diversified. The System has investment in real estate, which the Committee had recently voted to liquidate. Cambridge Associates reported that this liquidation is in the early stages, and will take up to two years to complete. The System will begin receiving payments as the real estate in question is liquidated.

Performance Reports - Cambridge Associates reviewed each of the UCCSN money managers. They reported that UCCSN's strategy compares closely with other universities. Endowment funds are divided into domestic stocks, international stocks, real estate and fixed income. Discussion was held on the performance of Hellman Jordan Management Company, which has not been performing at the benchmark set by UCCSN. The Committee, which has been following Hellman Jordan's under performance closely for some time, voted to terminate the management agreement. They instructed Cambridge to begin a search for a new manager so that the Committee could meet within the next three weeks to interview prospective investment firms.

Operating Fund Guidelines - The Operating pool has grown from \$42 million in 1984 to \$142 million in 1996. In the past, 100% of the income earned was paid out. The new Operating Fund Guidelines require a Stabilization Fund of 5% so that in years when income is lower, the campuses can still realize a stable income. The Stabilization Fund is new for the System, and it will take a while to build the fund to the 5% of the Operating Fund amount. Inasmuch as campuses have budgeted for their full allocation for this fiscal year, and inasmuch as the System is into the end of the third quarter of the fiscal year, request was made by staff to delay making allocations to the Stabilization Fund until next fiscal year (July 1, 1997). Campuses and System Administration will then be able to better budget for their share minus the 5% for the Stabilization Fund.

The Committee agreed with the request but stated they felt the full Board of Regents should discuss the matter and directed that the item be placed on the Board agenda for the March 1997 meeting.

Clipper Fund - Staff reported that a change has been made from a commingled fund to a separately managed account for the Clipper Fund. The cost of the commingled account was \$200,000 a year. By moving this account to Wells Fargo, the System could realize a savings of \$26,000 this year. The funds will be managed the same but Wells Fargo will execute all transactions.

The Committee met on March 5, 1997 to interview three firms to replace Hellman Jordan Capital Management. After the interviews and discussion, the Committee voted to hire CADENCE (Capital Management) as the investment manager.

Dr. Eardley moved to approve the report. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

Mrs. Gallagher stated that she has attended many Investment Committee meetings and felt that this committee and Cambridge Associates are very diligent with the System's money.

14. Approved Stabilization Reserve, Investment Guidelines - Approved to return current year reserve to the campuses. Mr. Tim Ortez, Director of Banking and Investments, gave a presentation regarding the Investment Committee's guidelines for the stabilization reserve. In June 1996 three asset pools were established: short term, intermediate, and long term. This reserve is to act as a hedge against the market. Mr. Ortez explained that the stabilization reserve was \$1.9 million which is 1.3 % of the total operating pool on June 30, 1996. The committee's recommendation was to build a stabilization reserve to 5%, which would be approximately \$8 million. If this occurs it would reduce the investment income to each of the campuses, in excess of \$1.4 million this year. In light of what has occurred during the last six months, a new plan needs to be implemented over the next biennium.

Dr. Derby asked if the Investment Committee has considered this plan. Dr. Eardley stated that the committee has had this basic plan in mind but felt it should come to the full board to understand what has happened and to allow the university presidents to comment. She further questioned whether the 5% goal is still possible in one year or if this would have too much of a negative impact upon the campuses, perhaps it would be better to set a time line to establish the 5% level. Mr. Ortez replied that a time line has not been established, it needs to be discussed with the campus presidents.

Mrs. Price stated that previously an in-depth discussion occurred at the time the guidelines were established. She stated that there are no guarantees in life and that a short-fall should be everybody's backup plan. The committee worked very hard to put this plan in place. A back-up plan or alternatives need to be considered to make up any short-falls with such things as loans or paybacks in different areas. She would hope that the Board sticks to this plan and addresses any problems in some other way.

President Harter stated that the presidents have not been consulted in any way, that they assumed this revenue would be available this year, and it has been built in to the budgets. This is a negative surprise. President Crowley agreed, stating that he first learned of this plan in January. He feels it is a good idea to have a stabilization reserve, however, he is not sure a 5% reserve is a good number. He related that he does not support the 5% this year which would de-stabilize the institutions this year and he would recommend the dollars be returned to the institutions this year, which still leaves over \$200,000 in the stabilization reserve, and to re-visit the proposal at a later time after discussions are held with the campus presidents.

Dr. Eardley explained that when the committee first had discussions regarding the stabilization fund it was apparent that it would have a negative impact upon the campuses, particularly the universities, and it was decided that this reduction would not happen this year and felt there was time to discuss alternatives and related that Dr. Anderes and Mr. Ortez need to work with the campus presidents and work out a plan. The committee decided this must come before the Board since it is a delicate situation.

Dr. Derby clarified that today the Board would be voting on continuing discussions regarding the proposal and which will include the institutional presidents. Dr. Eardley stated the action would be to approve return of the funds this year

to the institutions then discuss plans with the presidents.

Mrs. Price addressed the comments from the presidents stating that she was surprised to learn they were not involved in the initial discussions. She can sympathize with those comments; however, when the committee set up this reserve plan, consultants were contacted, there were public discussions and a very long process was involved. The information was available to the presidents to the extent that anytime you invest money there are no guarantees, there might be a short-fall. She felt that there are alternative ways to make up the difference. She requested that the presidents not disrupt the process that was put in place at great expense and that the matter of how to make up this money be dealt with and suggested a payback.

Dr. Derby stated that the institutions are requesting that the Board return this money this year due to the impact and to study the situation further to reach mutually agreed upon goals in a longer time frame.

Mrs. Gallagher asked the two university presidents, that if this plan was to go into effect after this biennium, would they be better able to budget for it? President Crowley stated that if the Board stays with the current plan at this time it would be very painful to the institutional programs to implement since it is March and it is only three months away from the end of the fiscal year. He stated he understood Regents Prices' explanation of processes, however, he feels the reality is that for whatever reasons the presidents have not participated in the discussions of the Investment Committee for many years. He stated that to his understanding, discussion did not include the possibility of a significant loss of dollars the first year. Had he sensed that UNR would lose as much as \$340,000 he would have protested vehemently. He suggested that a process be established in which the institutions can participate in shaping the stabilization reserve fund in a way that they can strongly support.

Mrs. Gallagher asked if all the institutions are represented at the Investment Committee meetings. Dr. Eardley stated that this group of committee members have only been in existence for one year and that agendas go out to all campuses and that campus representatives need to attend these meetings.

Dr. Eardley moved to approve return of current year reserve additions to the campuses. Mr. Wiesner seconded.

Mrs. Price again objected and asked whether this is part of the plan and asked Dr. Anderes how this type of situation has been handled previously.

Dr. Anderes stated that discussions up to this point, and as interpreted by the institutions, is that this would be a "hold harmless year". They would receive the dollars this year and the stabilization reserve would enter into the next fiscal year at about \$2.1 million and the Board would have to come to a consensus on a policy that allows the stabilization reserve to continue to grow.

Mrs. Price asked if the budget based upon 1996 income would be the figure used forever. Dr. Anderes stated no, that one of the problems this year is that the T-bill rate is down and short term investments are not doing well. The institutions should not be guaranteed that they will receive the same amount of return each year. An absolute guarantee to the institutions should not be made to allow for the market's fluctuation but should be built into the future agreement and a policy developed that everybody is comfortable with. Clarification of the percent figure needs to be agreed upon by all institutions. He stated that everyone agrees that the stabilization reserve fund is important.

Dr. Derby stated that the motion allows for the committee to buy some time and after consultation a plan will be presented for discussion in the future. Dr. Anderes stated that this is correct and reiterated that this would be a "hold harmless year". A clear goal needs to be identified as to when the 5% level will be obtained for the stabilization fund.

Dr. Derby called for the vote. Mrs. Price asked for clarification of the motion. Ms. Mary Lou Moser, Secretary of the Board, stated the motion is to return the current year reserve additions to the campuses.

Motion carried.

15.Approved Consent Agenda

(1)Approved the minutes of the meeting held January 30-31, 1997.

Mrs. Price asked for a correction of the minutes, on page 106 concerning a document Mrs. Price had given to the assistant to the Secretary during the meeting.

The minutes state:

"For the record, Mrs. Price gave Ms. Joyce Chatigny, Assistant to the Board Secretary, a one-page document entitled 'Addition to Plan for Legislative Counsel Bureau Audit Response, Regent Nancy Price, January 29, 1997' which she specifically requested to be placed in the permanent minutes. (On file with the permanent minutes.) It should be noted that these materials were added without any indication or any discussion of their content at the meeting and they do not reflect the deliberations of the Board at the Meeting."

Mrs. Price stated that during the meeting and during the Chancellor's discussion on the audit she had indicated that the response to the audit was reactionary and that he should be more pro-active and had indicated she had a list of things that she was suggesting for future action and was part of the meeting, although she did give Ms. Chatigny a copy later. She stated she had also given Ms. Moser a copy; Ms. Moser stated she had not received the copy. Copies were not distributed to the Board during the meeting.

Mrs. Price moved to correct the minutes to have the list be typed in as a part of the minutes. Mr. Wiesner seconded.

Mrs. Price restated the motion: that if it can be shown in the tape recording of the meeting where she had made comments, she wished to have her comments put in the minutes.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that his recollection of the moment which Mrs. Price had made her statement concerning the materials was when he was standing at the podium giving an accountability workshop. He stated that Mrs. Price had not given him a copy of the materials. The materials specifically call for Dr. Jarvis to be fired and he stated he was certain he would recognize them had he seen them at the time, that the topic of the materials was something he would not readily forget. He reiterated that he had not been given a copy during the course of the meeting, therefore, he did not feel there had been opportunity for discussion. Mrs. Price stated she had said at the January meeting that the Chancellor should be proactive and that she had a list. She continued that as an elected member of this Board she requested that they be a part of the minutes.

Motion carried.

Inasmuch as there was some confusion on the content of the motion, further discussion ensued. Mr. Klasic advised that someone who had voted on the prevailing side could, if they chose, ask for reconsideration of the motion.

Mr. Wiesner requested reconsideration of the motion.

Chair Derby explained that Regent Price asked to have materials included in the minutes and the Chancellor had explained to the Board some of the information to be included.

Mrs. Gallagher stated this kind of request has come to the Board before and she felt some kind of statement should be made as to the legality of the minutes since they portray the actions taken in a meeting and information put forth in a meeting. She continued that she did not feel a Regent should ask that things be put into the minutes that had not been brought forth for discussion in the meeting. Mrs. Gallagher stated she felt the problem with Mrs. Price's request is whether it is a part of the actual meeting.

Mr. Klasic stated that the Nevada Open Meeting Law indicates that each public body shall keep written minutes of its meetings which include a number of items the last stating 'any other information which any member of the body requests to be included or reflected in the minutes.' He said he understood the debate here is over whether in fact there was discussion over this particular item or not, but any member of the body can ask that something to be included in the minutes. Mrs. Gallagher asked whether this would be true after a meeting has adjourned. Mrs. Price stated that she agreed that after a meeting is over materials should not be included, however, this particular time her request was during the meeting and she had asked that it be part of the record, and to her that meant typed into the body of the minutes and not an attachment.

Mr. Klasic stated that the Open Meeting Law is silent on whether the material has to be typed in or whether it is an attachment. Mrs. Price stated that an attachment should go out with the minutes, but attachments are kept in the office and some are attached and some aren't.

Chair Derby stated there was a motion for reconsideration of the previous motion. Mr. Wiesner asked Mrs. Price why it was so important and why it could not have been an attachment. Mrs. Price stated that the minutes are a legal document and an historical document and she felt it was important for people who look back, as she does, on how the Board arrives at decisions. She continued that aside from one item the Chancellor talked about, there were other items such as when a public officer leaves there be an audit, plus a whole series of things that have been under discussion and should be a part of the minutes. Mr. Wiesner asked Mrs. Price if she couldn't put them in the meeting this date for information. Mrs. Price stated she wanted also to eliminate the editorial comment that is on page 106.

Chancellor Jarvis stated that as an employee officer of the System he was making a presentation at the time Mrs. Price refers to. Continuing, he stated that he would not feel very good about attaching a document to the minutes which contains a reference to him, specifically to dismiss him, and which contains another reference to an employee of the System in the request by Regent Price to announce the retirement of the president of the University of Nevada, Reno, and also makes gratuitous comments about members of the staff. He added that if the Board wished to discuss a matter it was one thing, but to say that it was part of that meeting when it was not discussed is false. Dr. Jarvis stated he learned about the comments to dismiss him from an article in the Las Vegas Review-Journal the following day; that he did not learn about it at the meeting; that it was not part of the discussion; and he did not feel that is an ethical way to conduct business.

Mr. Klasic advised that the motion to reconsider must have a second and that motion for reconsideration must be voted upon.

Ms. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Klasic advised that the original motion made by Mrs. Price is back on the table.

Mrs. Price asked whether there would be a violation if the Board voted this motion down if it is indeed in the tape of

the January meeting. Mr. Klasic stated that he did not believe so, that whatever the vote, Mrs. Price's request had been met.

Mrs. Price restated her motion:

Mrs. Price moved to correct the minutes assuming that at the time of the last meeting she did indeed refer to this for further discussion and asked that it be a part of the minutes.

Dr. Derby asked Mrs. Price if essentially she had done that and she was requesting that inclusion at this time. Mrs. Price stated that it was and it would also include removing the comment on page 106.

Mrs. Price added that the editorial comment on page 106 be removed.

Regent Phillips stated it was his understanding that anything that is said, read, or introduced as an exhibit at the open meeting is part of the record already and asked why she would want to compound that as an exhibit now. Mrs. Price stated she had the document in question at the meeting and asked that it be included and it was not which is why she is asking to correct the minutes, therefore, she asked that the editorial comment be removed.

Mr. Klasic clarified by stating that Mrs. Price had asked at the January meeting that information she had be attached and is, in fact, attached to the minutes and it is attached to the permanent minutes, but Mrs. Price wants it typed in and not included as an attachment. Mrs. Price stated she hoped that it would be typed into the minutes although it is not a requirement; but there is an editorial comment in the minutes with which she personally disagrees and therefore finds the minutes incorrect. She continued that she thought she was quite clear at the time she made the request that it be attached. Dr. Derby read the passage from the minutes, which is quoted above. Ms. Berkley stated she felt that was an absolutely accurate representation of what transpired at that meeting and to rewrite the minutes to reflect something that did not happen is ridiculous and asked for the vote. Mrs. Price stated that her request is that the minutes be corrected to reflect what actually happened at that meeting.

Motion failed. Chair Derby stated that Mrs. Price had voted yes, the rest of the Board voted no.

16.Public Comment: Ms. Berkley asked to make a statement before she had to leave the meeting. She stated she had a news article from which she read the following sentence: 'She says she has witnesses who Berkley told of an unannounced emergency Regents' meeting just before the closed session. I've spoken to one who has confirmed Price's statement.'

Ms. Berkley stated she did not attend nor did she invite anybody or suggest that there was an unannounced emergency Regent's meeting before the closed personnel session. She continued that to the best of her knowledge she had breakfast with Regent Derby and also had dinner with Regent Derby the previous night and hoped that was not a violation of any Open Meeting Law. She related they did not discuss business but did discuss personal items because they are personal friends and like to visit with one another at Regents' meetings. Ms. Berkley read again from the article, 'A closed door attack was well planned.' Ms. Berkley stated she was a rather spontaneous person and did not plan her comments very well or very often, obviously, and to even suggest something like that is outrageous. Ms. Berkley referred to another comment in the news article: 'Regent Chair Madison Graves and Regent Shelley Berkley intentionally broke the Nevada Open Meeting Law.' Ms. Berkley declared she would never intentionally or unintentionally break the Nevada Open Meeting Law as it is something she holds very, very sacred and very important. She stated that even to suggest something like that is very insulting and outrageous to her.

Dr. Derby stated that the Board had moved ahead to item 23. Mrs. Price stated that the part about the emergency meeting was referring to January 5, not the closed meeting, and that the statement was incorrect. Dr. Derby asked for further Public Comment. None was forthcoming.

(2)Approved Emeritus, UNR

President Crowley requested Emeritus status for the following faculty member effective July 1, 1997:

Harold S. Sekiguchi, Professor of Managerial Sciences/Marketing, Emeritus

(3)Approved Emeritus, UNLV

President Harter requested Emeritus status for the following faculty member effective May 13, 1997:

Dr. Claude Warren, Professor of Anthropology, Emeritus

(4)Approved Emeritus, CCSN

President Moore requested Emeritus status for the following faculty member effective January 1, 1997:

William Sowle, Professor of Welding Technology, Emeritus

(5)Approved Advisory Board, School of Social Work, UNLV

Request was made for approval of the following as members of the UNLV School of Social Work Advisory Board:

Roberta West

Jim Arnold

(6)Approved Promotion or Assignment to Rank - Approved the promotions or assignment to rank as recommended by the campus presidents. Each candidate has been evaluated and reviewed in accordance with appropriate Board and campus policies. The Chancellor recommended approval of these proposals effective July 1, 1997. Ref. C-6 on file in with the permanent minutes.

A.University of Nevada, Reno - President Crowley recommended the following promotions:

Richard A. Bjur to Professor of Pharmacology, School of Medicine

*Michael Branch to Associate Professor of English, College of Arts and Science

*John R. Cannon to Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education

*Scott Casper to Associate Professor of History, College of Arts and Science

Christine Cheney to Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education

*John Cobourn to Rank III in Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

*Gale Craviso to Associate Professor of Pharmacology, School of Medicine

*Mary P. Dodds to Rank III in Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

*William P. Evans to Associate Professor of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Human and Community Sciences

Joanna Frueh to Professor of Art, College of Arts and Science

*Jack P. Hayes to Associate Professor of Biology, College of Arts and Science

*James M. Henson to Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering

*Guy A. Hoelzer to Associate Professor of Biology, College of Arts and Science

*Edward Keppelmann to Associate Professor of Mathematics, College of Arts and Science

John R. Koetting to Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education

Kerry Lewis to Associate Professor of Speech Pathology/Audiology, School of Medicine

*Jerry Neufeld to Rank III in Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

Chris Pritsos to Professor of Nutrition, College of Human and Community Sciences

*Mary Reid to Rank III in Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

Michael Robinson to Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education

Tracy Veach to Professor of Psychiatry/Behavioral Science, School of Medicine

William H. Welch to Professor of Biochemistry, College of Agriculture

*David Wilson to Associate Professor of Nutrition, College of Human and Community Sciences

Note: Mr. Rosenberg abstained from the vote on certain individuals at UNR.

See motion at end of Consent Agenda B for a list of those individuals.

B. University of Nevada, Las Vegas - President Harter recommended the following promotions:

*Gennady Bachman to Associate Professor of Mathematical Sciences, College of Sciences

*Stephen Carper to Associate Professor of Chemistry, College of Sciences

*Alice Corkill to Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, College of Education

*Victoria Dale to Associate Professor of Dance, College of Fine Arts

David Dickens to Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts

Shirley Emerson to Professor of Counseling, Greenspun College of Urban Affairs

*Ericka Engstrom to Associate Professor of Communication, Greenspun College of Urban Affairs

*Joanne Goodwin to Associate Professor of History, College of Liberal Arts

*Zheng Gu to Associate Professor of Tourism & Convention Administration, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration

*Mark Guadagnoli to Associate Professor of Kinesiology, College of Health Sciences

Vernon Frank Hodge to Professor of Chemistry, College of Sciences

*Mark Hoversten to Associate Professor of Architecture; College of Fine Arts

Richard Hoyt to Professor of Finance, College of Business

*Mayumi Itoh to Associate Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts

*Todd Jones to Associate Professor of Philosophy, College of Liberal Arts

*Richard Lapidus to Associate Professor of Marketing, College of Business

*Marta Laupa to Associate Professor of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts

*Michael Lugering to Associate Professor of Theatre, College of Fine Arts

*Rodney Metcalf to Associate Professor of Geoscience, College of Sciences

Maria Meyerson to Professor of Instructional & Curricular Studies, College of Education

M.L. Miranda to Professor of Anthropology, College of Liberal Arts

*Charles Moseley to Associate Professor of Public Administration (Health Care Admin. Program), College of Business

*Dawn Neuman to Associate Professor of Biological Sciences, College of Sciences

Hal Rothman to Professor of History, College of Liberal Arts

*Robert Schill, Jr. to Associate Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering, Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering

*N. Clayton Silver to Associate Professor of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts

Carol Stivers to Associate Professor of Music, College of Fine Arts

*Sherri Strawser to Associate Professor of Special Education, College of Education

*Peter Stubberud to Associate Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering, Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering

*Michael Sullivan to Associate Professor of Finance, College of Business

*James Swayze to Associate Professor of Accounting, College of Business

*Wanda Taylor to Associate Professor of Geoscience, College of Sciences

Donna Weistrop to Professor of Physics, College of Sciences

*Joel Wisner to Associate Professor of Management, College of Business

C.Desert Research Institute - President Taranik recommended the following promotions:

Jenny B. Chapman to Rank III, Water Resources Center

Weixin Cheng to Rank III, Biological Sciences Center

Mark C. Green to Rank III, Energy & Environmental Engineering Center

Darko Koracin to Rank III, Energy & Environmental Engineering Center

Yiqi Luo to Rank III, Biological Sciences Center

W. Alan McKay to Rank III, Water Resources Center

Patricia A. Walsh to Rank III, Energy & Environmental Engineering Center

Barbara Zielinska to Rank IV, Energy & Environmental Engineering Center

*Also recommended for Award to Tenure.

(7)Approved Tenure - Approved award of tenure as recommended by the campus presidents. Each candidate has been evaluated and reviewed in accordance with appropriate Board and campus policies. The Chancellor recommended approval of these proposals effective July 1, 1997.

Ref. C-7 on file with the permanent minutes.

A.University of Nevada, Reno - President Crowley recommended award of tenure to the following:

*Michael Branch, English, College of Arts and Science

*John R. Cannon, Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education

*Scott Casper, History, College of Arts and Science

Carolyn Chapman, Educational Leadership, College of Education

*John Cobourm, Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

*Gale Craviso, Pharmacology, School of Medicine

*Mary P. Dodds, Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

Jeffrey Englin, Applied Economics and Statistics, College of Agriculture

*William P. Evans, Human Development and Family Studies, College of Human and Community Sciences

*Jack P. Hayes, Biology, College of Arts and Science

Christopher Henry, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, Mackay School of Mines

*James M. Henson, Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering

*Guy A. Hoelzer, Biology, College of Arts and Science
*Edward Keppelmann, Mathematics, College of Arts and Science
*Jerry Neufeld, Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture
*Mary Reid, Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture
George E. Taylor, Environmental Resource Sciences, College of Agriculture
Jeffrey Thompson, Physics, College of Arts and Science
*David Wilson, Nutrition, College of Human and Community Sciences
Joyce Woodson, Cooperative Extension, College of Agriculture

B. University of Nevada, Las Vegas - President Harter recommended award of tenure to the following:

*Gennady Bachman, Mathematical Sciences, College of Sciences
*Stephen Carper, Chemistry, College of Sciences
*Alice Corkill, Educational Psychology, College of Education
*Victoria Dale, Dance, College of Fine Arts
*Ericka Engstrom, Communication, Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
*Joanne Goodwin, History, College of Liberal Arts

*Zheng Gu, Tourism & Convention Administration, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
*Mark Guadagnoli, Kinesiology, College of Health Sciences
*Mark Hoversten, Architecture, College of Fine Arts
*Mayumi Itoh, Political Science, College of Liberal Arts
*Todd Jones, Philosophy, College of Liberal Arts
*Richard Lapidus, Marketing, College of Business
*Marta Laupa, Psychology, College of Liberal Arts
*Michael Lugering, Theatre, College of Fine Arts
Davey Marlin-Jones, Theatre, College of Fine Arts
Jane McCarthy, Instructional & Curricular Studies, College of Education
*Rodney Metcalf, Geoscience, College of Sciences
*Charles Moseley, Public Administration (Health Care Admin. Program), College of Business
Bahram Nassersharif, Mechanical Engineering, Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering
*Dawn Neuman, Biological Sciences, College of Sciences
*Robert Schill, Jr., Electrical & Computer Engineering, Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering
*N. Clayton Silver, Psychology, College of Liberal Arts
Alan Simmons, Anthropology, College of Liberal Arts
Bryan Spangelo, Chemistry, College of Sciences
*Sherri Strawser, Special Education, College of Education
*Peter Stubberud, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering
*Michael Sullivan, Finance, College of Business
*James Swayze, Accounting, College of Business
*Wanda Taylor, Geoscience, College of Sciences
Mary Warner, Art, College of Fine Arts
*Joel Wisner, Management, College of Business
John Young, Kinesiology, College of Health Sciences

C. Community College of Southern Nevada - President Moore recommended award of tenure to the following:

Prakash N. Phalke, Computing & Info Tech
Ramat Shabahang, Applied Science & Tech

D.Great Basin College - President Remington recommends award of tenure to the following:

Genie Goicoechea, English

E.Truckee Meadows Community College - President Wright recommended award of tenure to the following:

John Scally, Arts and Science
Thomas Tooke, Counselor

F.Western Nevada Community College - President Randolph recommended award of tenure to the following:

Ursula Carlson, Arts/Sciences & Developmental Education
Franklin S. Carman, Arts/Sciences & Developmental Education
Gary Eugene Evett, Fallon Campus
D. Jean McNeil, Arts/Science & Developmental Education
Kenneth Sullivan, Library & Media Services

*Also recommended for Promotion or Assignment to Rank.

Note: Mr. Rosenberg abstained from the vote on certain individuals at UNR. See motion at end of Consent Agenda B for a list of those individuals.

(8)Approved Allocation of Grants-in-Aid, 1997-98 - Approved N.R.S. 396.540 provision which provides for tuition waivers for "students from other states and foreign countries, not to exceed a number equal to three percent of the total matriculated enrollment of students for the past preceding fall semester." Board policy provides for similar grants-in-aid for the same number of students for the payment of in-state registration fees.

Based upon enrollment figures for Fall 1996, the officers have requested the following allocation of Grants-in-Aid for Fall 1997-98:

IN STATEOUT-OF-STATE

UNR

Athletics 75115

Music 60 45

Other197 44

Unfunded1 38151

TOTAL370355

UNLV

Athletics 137137
Music 82 82
Other 36 16
Unfunded 1323323
TOTAL 578558

CCSN

REGENTS 750
Other 6
Unfunded 1 0
TOTAL 756

GBC

REGENTS 72
Other 24
Unfunded 1 44
TOTAL 140

TMCC

REGENTS 237
Other 25
Unfunded 1 43
TOTAL 305

WNCC

REGENTS 98 0
Other 16 0
Unfunded 1 56154
TOTAL 170154

1 Inadequate state support to fund total number of waivers

(9) Approved Handbook Change, Early Studies Program, UNLV - Approved Handbook Change, Title 4, Chapter 16, Section, Admission Requirements for Students in High School, UNLV, as contained in Ref. C-9 on file with the permanent minutes.

15. Approved the Consent Agenda (continued)

(10) Approved the following Interlocals/Easements:

A.Parties: Board of Regents/UNR and the Las Vegas Valley Water District (Interlocal).

Purpose: Investigation of selected land subsidence in the Las Vegas Valley.

\$\$: \$165,000 to UNR.

Effective Date: 2/1/97 to 1/31/98.

B.Parties: Board of Regents/UNLV and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (Interlocal).

Purpose: Revision of the Environmental Manager Certification Examination.

\$\$: \$35,382 to UNLV.

Effective Date: 2/15/97 to 6/30/98.

C.Parties: Board of Regents/CCSN and Nevada Power Company (Grant of Easement).

Purpose: 3-Phase Power for southwest corner of the building at the Sahara West Center.

\$\$: \$1.00 to UCCSN/CCSN.

Effective Date: Date approved by Board.

D.Parties: Board of Regents/DRI and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (Interlocal).

Purpose: Technical support for the Bureau of Air Quality PM2.5 Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Program.

\$\$: \$29,903 to DRI.

Effective Date: 3/1/97 to 6/30/97.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he wanted to vote on the Consent Agenda with the exceptions listed below and requested they be moved to reflect Consent Agenda B. Mr. Rosenberg stated he had voted on these individuals in the College of Arts & Science at UNR.

CONSENT AGENDA B

(6)Approved Promotion or Assignment to Rank

A.University of Nevada, Reno

Michael Branch, College of Arts & Science

Scott Casper, College of Arts & Science

Joanna Frueh, College of Arts & Science

Jack P. Hayes, College of Arts and Science

Guy A. Hoelzer, College of Arts and Science

(7)Approved Tenure

B)University of Nevada, Reno

Michael Branch, College of Arts & Science
Scott Casper, College of Arts & Science
Jack P. Hayes, College of Arts & Science
Guy A. Hoelzer, College of Arts & Science
Edward Keppelmann, College of Arts & Science

Mr. Rosenberg moved approval of the Consent Agenda with the exceptions of those individuals from UNR listed in Consent Agenda B above. Dr. Eardley seconded. Motion carried. Mrs. Price voted no.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of Consent Agenda B as listed above. Dr. Eardley seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Rosenberg abstained. Mrs. Price voted no.

17. Approved 1997 Honorary Associate Degrees - Approved the 1997 Honorary Associate Degrees as recommended by the Presidents.

Honorary Associate, CCSN

Kenny Guinn
Otto Merida
Sandy Miller
June F. Whitely

Mr. Phillips moved to approve the 1997 Honorary Associate Degrees for CCSN as recommended by the President. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

Honorary Associate, GBC

Marcia Bandera

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve the 1997 Honorary Associate Degree for GBC as recommended by the President. Mr. Phillips seconded. Motion carried.

Honorary Associate, TMCC

James Elston

Mrs. Dondero moved to approve the 1997 Honorary Associate Degree for TMCC as recommended by the President. Mrs. Price seconded. Motion carried.

18. Approved 1997 Honorary Doctorate Degrees - Approved the 1997 Honorary Doctorate Degrees as recommended by the Presidents:

Honorary Doctorate, UNLV

Stanley E. Fulton

Mr. Wiesner moved to approve the 1997 Honorary Doctorate Degree as recommended by the President. Dr. Eardley seconded. Motion carried.

Honorary Doctorate, UNR

Evelyn de la Rosa
Andrea Pelter

Mr. Rosenberg moved to approve the 1997 Honorary Doctorate Degrees as recommended by the President. Mr. Phillips seconded. Motion carried.

19. Approved Distinguished Nevadans - Approved the 1997 Distinguished Nevadan Awards.

Distinguished Nevadans, Southern Nevada

Donna Jo Hanley Andress
Robert N. Broadbent
Jerry Cade, M.D.
Paul J. Christensen
Brian Lee Greenspun

Mrs. Price moved to approve the 1997 Distinguished Nevadans, Southern Nevada. Mr. Wiesner seconded. Motion carried.

Distinguished Nevadans, Northern Nevada

John S. Livermore
William & Myriam Pennington
Helen Rutherford
Roland D. Westergard

Dr. Eardley moved to approve the 1997 Distinguished Nevadans, Northern Nevada. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

20. Approved Gifts, UNLV - Approved acceptance of the following gifts to UNLV:

A.A \$3,705,000 gift has been offered through the UNLV Foundation from Robert and Diane Bigelow. This gift will endow a chair to be housed in either the College of Science or the College of Engineering. The Bigelows will build this endowment fund with several gifts over the next few years. They have also agreed to make an annual gift sufficient in size to fund the position until such time as the endowment fund generates enough income to fund it.

B.A \$4 million gift has been offered through the UNLV Foundation from an anonymous donor. This gift will be used for the construction of a music building. The announcement of the donor will be made at a later date.

Mrs. Gallagher moved to accept the gifts to UNLV. Dr. Eardley seconded. Motion carried.

21. Approved United Way Grant, Learning & Earning Program, CCSN - Approved the United Way Grant, Learning and Earning Program developed by CCSN in direct response to the United Way's request to assist in reducing the high school drop-out rate in the Clark County School District.

This program is designed as a direct intervention strategy to provide students with homework supervision and paid work experience. Ref. E is on file in the Regents' Office.

President Moore stated that he is very pleased with this program and CCSN will receive \$100,000 per year from United Way.

Mrs. Dondero moved to approve the United Way Grant, Learning & Earning Program. Mr. Phillips seconded. Motion carried.

22. Approved Sale of Property, UNR - Approved request to sell 13 acres of university property to the Nye County Commissioners. The property has been appraised at \$160,000 and the Nye County Commissioners have agreed to purchase the land at the appraised value. Ref. F on file in the Regents' Office.

Dr. Eardley moved to approve the sale of property. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

23. Approved Resolution, FEMA - Approved a resolution for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) which authorizes UNR to file for assistance for damages caused by the recent flood to the Main Station Farm, Stead Campus and J. Dow Wetlands in Lassen County. Ref. G on file with the permanent minutes.

Mr. Rosenberg moved to approve the resolution. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

24. Approved Appointment, Interim Vice President, CCSN - Approved the appointment of Ruell Fiant as Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration, effective March 3, 1997. The college will initiate the process for a permanent Vice President by the end of FY 1997.

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve Ruell Fiant as Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration, CCSN, effective March 3, 1997. Dr. Eardley seconded. Motion carried.

25. Approved Appointment, Vice President, UNR - Approved the appointment of Dr. David Westfall, Vice President for Academic Affairs, UNR, effective immediately.

President Crowley stated that recently the university completed the search process for the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs. Interim Vice President David Westfall emerged from the process with strong consensual support across the campus. He has performed very well in an interim capacity for the past nine months.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that he is a member of the UNR faculty, however, he did not feel his voting on this item would

be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Rosenberg moved to approve the appointment of Dr. David Westfall, Vice President for Academic Affairs, effective immediately. Mr. Phillips seconded. Motion carried.

26. New Business - None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Mary Lou Moser
Secretary of the Board