

Minutes are intended to note (a) the date, time and place of the meeting; (b) those members of the public body who were present and those who were absent; and (c) the substance of all matters proposed, discussed and/or action was taken on. Minutes are not intended to be a verbatim report of a meeting. An audiotape recording of the meeting is available for inspection by any member of the public interested in a verbatim report of the meeting. These minutes are not final until approved by the Board of Regents at the June 2014, meeting.

**BOARD OF REGENTS and its
ad hoc UNLV PRESIDENT SEARCH COMMITTEE
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Thomas & Mack Board Room
University of Nevada Las Vegas Campus
4505 S. Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas
Friday, March 28, 2014

Members Present: Dr. Mark W. Doubrava, Chair
 Mr. Cedric Crear
 Dr. Jason Geddes
 Mr. Kevin Page
 Mr. Rick Trachok *{via telephone}*
 Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Others Present: Mr. Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor *{via telephone}*
 Mr. Scott Wasserman, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel
 to the Board of Regents
 Dr. Constance Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government
 and Community Affairs
 Ms. Christine Casey, Director, Human Resources

Faculty senate chair in attendance was Dr. Paul Werth, UNLV.

For others present, please see the attendance roster on file in the Board office.

Chair Mark W. Doubrava called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. with all members present. All of the institutional advisory members were present except for Ms. Phillips Johnson, Mr. Yackira and Ms. Young.

1. Information Only-Public Comment – Dr. Werth discussed three basic points: 1) success to the committee and institutional advisory members in choosing the next president of UNLV; 2) UNLV being in a remarkable position to make tremendous advances with the help of a good leader; and 3) a request to the voting members to be especially attentive to the voice of those employed by, or those studying at, UNLV, especially the faculty.

Mr. Conrad Wilson, Classified Staff Council, UNLV, thought the choice for president should be innovative, progressive and one who will work with every constituency of UNLV. He felt UNLV is an exciting Tier 1 University that should not stand still.

2. Information Only-Chair's Report and Introductions – Chair Doubrava provided general remarks and updated the committee members regarding the president search process. The Regents and institutional advisory members of the UNLV President Search Committee were introduced.

Chair Doubrava said the UNLV President Search will be transparent and the Open Meeting Law will be adhered to. He had each Institutional Advisory Member introduce themselves and describe their affiliation with UNLV.

Chair Doubrava stated the committee will appreciate the input from the institutional advisory members. He thanked them for accepting the assignment.

Chairman of the Board of Regents, Kevin J. Page, felt the institutional advisory members have strength. A lot of thought was given to get the best team possible. He heard rumors the UNLV president had already been selected, but assured everyone it is a misconception. He expressed his appreciation to all the participants.

Chair Doubrava had the Regents introduce themselves and share their experience with previous president searches.

Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, introduced himself. He said there will be a UNLV President Search website <http://www.unlv.edu/presidentsearch> where information will be available; committee bios, contact information, future agendas, approved minutes and, as decisions are made the site will be updated.

3. Information Only-Open Meeting Law (Agenda Item #4) – The committee discussed the Open Meeting Law as it relates to the president search procedure.

Mr. Wasserman explained the Open Meeting Law applies to all public bodies, which includes the members of the Board of Regents and any sub-committee. The guiding principle is all business is to be conducted openly at a public meeting. The meetings are noticed in advance and open to the public – who are invited to attend and participate.

Mr. Wasserman stated agendas are posted three business days prior to the meeting. A quorum of four of the six Regents must be present to conduct business. Discussion and action items are limited to those items on the agenda. All written materials given to the committee and institutional advisory members are part of the public record. All deliberations should occur at a properly noticed meeting. A summary of what has occurred at a meeting may be given to special groups, for example, to the UNLV Faculty Senate. Mr. Wasserman noted the meetings are recorded and made available to the public upon request. For some, this search may be different than others in that it is subject to the Open Meeting Law.

3. Information Only-Open Meeting Law (Agenda Item #4) – (continued)

Mr. Wasserman said as soon as the names of potential presidential candidates are made available to the committee, it is public information. This will be discussed further under the Search Consultant item on the agenda.

Mr. Wasserman indicated if anyone has opinions or concerns, to encourage them to attend a meeting and make their contributions during public comment. Written statements will also be accepted as part of the record. Nominees should be referred to the search consultant if that is the direction taken.

4. Approved-Search Consultant (Agenda Item #5) – The committee recommended approval to hire a search consultant to conduct the UNLV President Search.

Mr. Wasserman offered the pros and cons of using a search consultant. The Open Meeting Law requires applicants, by name, to become part of the public record. Without a search consultant, a person submitting a resume for consideration will go directly to the committee and become part of the public record, which may deter a candidate from applying. Search consultants screen all candidates which saves time going through all the resumes. By having a search consultant there will be no public exposure unless the person becomes a semi-finalist. Search consultants have a national network of contacts that may be looking for a president position. A consultant may also reach out to those they feel would be a good fit for UNLV. They also have expert knowledge of the process.

Mr. Wasserman continued the drawback of hiring a search consultant is the cost. The institution bears the cost of conducting the president search, with the exception of Regents' and board staff travel. While it is an expense, it is also an investment in the future of the college. There is a degree of control taken from the committee going through the initial applications, which could possibly go into the hundreds. New board policy has been revised to charge the Chancellor with the initial narrowing of the pool of applicants. In consultation with the Chair of the committee, the Chancellor will work with the search consultant to narrow the pool. Mr. Wasserman continued there are also concerns expressed about consultants using a stale pool or having too many searches going on at the same time. This can be guarded against by questions put to the search consultants of how their pool is developed. There is an issue of transparency. Clearly there is more transparency when everything is done in the meetings, including going through the initial application process.

Chair Doubrava asked if there was someone who wanted to speak against using a search consultant. Regent Crear wanted to be certain the consultant brings in a wide variety of candidates. He asked if there will be a Request for Quotation (RFQ) sent to the consultants. Mr. Wasserman said if it is determined to use a search consultant then an RFQ will be issued between May 28 and May 31, 2014. He recommended everyone have clear directions and questions for the search consultant.

4. Approved-Search Consultant (Agenda Item #5) – (continued)

Mr. Wasserman said an impact of the Open Meeting Law is any time a discussion takes place about an individual, the person has to be provided notice before the conversation occurs. Generic remarks or general references are fine.

Mr. Hunt made a motion for the committee to hire a consultant and issue the RFQ. Mr. Wasserman noted the role of the institutional advisory members is to advise the Regents on all the matters that come before the committee. The Regents are the only voting members of the committee – motions are properly made by the Regents. The Regents have the constitutional responsibility to vote on all matters.

Regent Geddes moved approval to hire a search consultant to conduct the UNLV President Search.
Regent Crear seconded.

Mr. Evans asked about the appropriate time to express criteria for the search consultant to consider. Chair Doubrava stated the information would pertain to the Organization & Procedure item on the agenda. Mr. Wasserman added the information would be contained in the President Leadership Profile and given to the search consultant.

Mr. Bynum asked about the bidding process. Mr. Wasserman said the bids vary. The search consultant is not chosen by the lowest or highest bid, necessarily. Chair Doubrava, Chancellor Klaich and he will review the submissions and invite the best responses to make a presentation at the next meeting. The institutional advisory members will make a recommendation to the Regents and the Regents will vote to select a particular search consultant.

Mr. Clausen asked if using a consultant would save time versus the alternative. Mr. Wasserman said the alternative would take a substantial amount of committee time and it will save time to use a search consultant.

Mr. McKinley felt it would be vital to use a search firm and also to interview the actual person who will be conducting the search. Ms. Mulroy agreed with the suggestion of having the person conducting the search making the presentation to the committee.

Mr. Skancke does not care how much it costs – it is most important to get the best consultant and the best president. He advised to be deliberate, take the time necessary and spend the required funds to get it done.

Dr. Frink expressed interest about the diversity of the pool and asked about the Chancellor's role. Mr. Wasserman stated part of the process to assure the diversity of the pool is the contents of the President Leadership Profile, the direction given to the search consultant, and working with the Affirmative Action Officer to assure best practices are employed. Dr. Frink wondered if there was recourse if the pool is not diverse enough.

4. Approved-Search Consultant (Agenda Item #5) – (continued)

Mr. Wasserman said the question of assuring a diverse pool should be put to the search consultant and, if the pool is not diverse enough steps should be taken to address it.

Chair Doubrava called for the vote.

Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:37 a.m. and reconvened at 10:47 a.m.

5. Information Only-Organization & Procedure (Agenda Item #3) – The committee discussed the essentials of a president search, including the preparation of a President Leadership Profile, the method to be used to generate and screen applicants, including the method to be used to screen and select a search consultant, interviewing and checking references of semi-finalists, interviewing finalists, arranging on-campus visits and making a recommendation to the full Board of Regents (*Ref. UNLV PSC-3 on file in the Board office.*)

Mr. Wasserman stated the six steps to the president search process: 1) to appoint the Regents' President Search Committee comprised of six Regents. The international advisory members from UNLV are made up of five faculty members, three administrators, one classified employee, one undergraduate and one graduate student, one alumnus, and one Affirmative Action Officer, with 18 community members to round off the group; 2) determination of using a search consultant; 3) on May 2, 2014, the search consultant will be selected; 4) at the June 2, 2014, meeting the committee and the search consultant will work together to finalize the President Leadership Profile and set the parameters for the search; 5) the committee and institutional advisory members will interview and evaluate the candidates to determine who to bring forth and interview as finalists; 6) the Regents will have the constitutional duty to select a nominee, or nominees, taking into consideration the advice of the institutional advisory members, to recommend to the Board of Regents.

Dr. Wilde heard the target date for appointment of the new president was identified as August 1 or September 1, 2014, which does not seem to be achievable. Chair Doubrava explained there would be no delay – nor rush to the process. The consultant will help determine the timing. Most important is having the right president for UNLV.

Mr. Bynum wondered if it would be a violation of the Open Meeting Law if those serving as an institutional advisory member may have verbal or email discussions. Mr. Wasserman said it would be an issue if there was a quorum of 19 institutional advisory members having those discussions. The issue arises when there is a dialogue with two or three Members and then one of those Members has a conversation with two or three other Members until 19 Members have been contacted – it is called serial communication. Mr. Wasserman suggested having all deliberations occur in the meeting room.

5. Information Only-Organization & Procedure (Agenda Item #3) – (continued)

Mr. Boughner was curious about the search process as it pertains to existing employees of the university system. Mr. Wasserman indicated, with the exception of the acting president as noted in his contract, any other member of the community may apply by providing information to Chair Doubrava or himself. When the search consultant is selected the information will be forwarded to the search consultant.

Chair Doubrava restated the search consultant RFQ will be sent out. The responses will be reviewed by himself, Mr. Wasserman and Chancellor Klaich to determine the three or best responses to come to the May 2, 2014, meeting to give a presentation. The search consultant will be chosen at that meeting. Regent Page asked for names of search consultants who have worked well. Mr. Hunt felt the search consultant who worked on the UNLV provost search did a very good job.

6. Approved-President Leadership Profile – The committee and institutional advisory members discussed desired characteristics of candidates to include in the President Leadership Profile for the UNLV president position.

Mr. Wasserman introduced Ms. Christine Casey, Human Resources, who will be listening to the President Leadership Profile comments in order to make revisions and present a draft at the May 2, 2014, meeting for review.

- Chair Doubrava thought the student body numbers had to be updated.
- Regent Geddes offered a handout (*on file in the Board office*) with proposed changes to the UNLV presidential prospectus. He felt the addition of System collaboration and economic development with the Nevada System of Higher Education partnering on the state plan for economic development would be very helpful.
- Regent Wixom expounded on how important the statements are because a good consultant will go back and listen to the recording of this meeting and review the minutes.
- Mr. Boughner added it would be wise for consultants to look at the prior record that already exists in order to draw on an enlightening history.
- Dr. Meana felt including the major initiatives/projects UNLV is undertaking should be included, along with a discussion of the Tier 1 drive.
- Mr. Evans would like to see specific language of the economic development piece tying to the global economy by UNLV producing students who survive and thrive in a global economy.
- Ms. McMillan thought a strategic plan outlining UNLV initiatives would be helpful.
- Ms. Hicks would like to see decision making more strongly worded and on a higher perspective. Leaders have to make very difficult decisions.
- Mr. Hunt thought three bullet points having an impact on UNLV is making sure anyone considered has real experience in a big capital improvement project (considering the stadium); experience in either obtaining or sustaining a Tier 1 institution; and experience regarding the initiation of a medical school.

6. Approved-President Leadership Profile – (continued)

- Dr. Frink would like stronger language for a president who will understand, support, embrace and encourage faculty governance.
- Mr. Bynum wondered why there was no mention of a degree as a presidential requirement. Dr. Frink indicated faculty are very concerned about the candidate having a scholarship background, research experience and grant achievement. Dr. Rosser supported Mr. Bynum and Dr. Frink about the candidate having a terminal degree and research experience. Dr. Mobley agreed and added there is a skill set which needs to be defined to reflect the terminal degree and it might be in the skill set that defines the degree more specifically than a certain degree.
- Dr. Fain cautioned not to be too narrow with the degree requirement because some potentially good candidates might be eliminated. Regent Crear concurred about not being too narrow because those who are qualified will be weeded out through the process. Mr. Ladd would not want to narrow the pool. Mr. Hunt thought it important the criteria raise the issue of concern, but does not cut someone from consideration.
- Mr. Rogers felt there are questions of a rich understanding with and without the degree. He cautioned about making the degree a criterion initially, but it does not mean it is not important and it does not mean it should not be weighed throughout. The questions should exist at the forefront but the requirement does not necessarily provide an obligatory benefit.
- Ms. Smith believed in the interest of retaining someone, the person should have a demonstrated ability to build a strong team, trust his/her team, and delegate.
- Regent Wixom stated Las Vegas presents unique opportunities and unique challenges. The next president should communicate effectively with the community and understand the nature of the driving forces, both socially and economically. Mr. Hunt concurred with Regent Wixom. The explosive growth of UNLV occurred during the tenures of those presidents who had a unique ability to motivate the community, to enhance the university and to raise money.
- Regent Crear would like a candidate to express concerns for students – will there be more dorms, will there be a commuter campus, and so forth.

7. New Business –None.

8. Information Only-Public Comment – None.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Prepared by: Nancy Stone
Special Assistant and Coordinator
to the Board of Regents

Submitted for approval by: R. Scott Young
Deputy Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents