

**UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes
May 14-15, 1992**

05-14-1992

Pages 85-130

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA

May 14-15, 1992

The Board of Regents met on the above date in the Pine Auditorium

Jot Travis Student Union, University of Nevada, Reno.

Members present: Mrs. Carolyn M. Sparks, Chairman

Mrs. Shelley Berkley

Dr. Jill Derby

Dr. James Eardley

Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher

Dr. Lonnie Hammargren

Mr. Daniel J. Klaich

Members absent: Mr. Joseph M. Foley

Mrs. June F. Whitley

Others present: Chancellor Mark H Dawson

President Anthony Calabro, WNCC

President Joseph Crowley, UNR

President John Gwaltney, TMCC

President Robert Maxson, UNLV

President Paul Meacham, CCSN

President Ronald Remington, NNCC

President Jim Taranik, DRI

Mr. Donald Klasic, General Counsel

Mr. Ron Sparks, Vice Chancellor

Mrs. Karen Steinberg, Acting Vice Chancellor

Ms. Mary Lou Moser, Secretary

Also present were Faculty Senate Chairmen Bill Baines (TMCC), Carolyn Collins (CCSN), Richard Egami (DRI), Michon Mackedon (WNCC), Ed Nickel (NNCC), Ellen Pillard (UNR), Becky Seibert (Unit), Robert Skaggs (UNLV), and Student Association Officers.

Vice Chairman James Eardley called the meeting to order at 11:25

A.M. Thursday, May 14, 1992, with all Regents present except

Regents Foley, Klaich, Sparks and Whitley.

1. Introductions

President Crowley introduced Dr. David Lightner, who is the recipient of the Regents' Researcher Award for 1992, and Ms. Alana Kroll, who is the recipient of the Outstanding Student of the Year Award for 1992.

Chancellor Dawson introduced Ms. Kathy Odinski, President of Nevada Adult Education Association, who presented Vice Chairman James Eardley the Nevada Adult Education Association's Accommodation Award for outstanding accomplishments in adult education, and the Mountain Plains Adult Education Association's Accommodation Award for outstanding contributions for the advancement of adult education in Nevada. In addition, Ms. Odinski presented a demographics book of the 8 Western States to Vice Chairman Eardley and Chancellor Dawson.

President Crowley introduced ASUN President Samantha Dollison and newly elected Faculty Senate Chairman Ellen Pillard.

President Maxson introduced newly elected Faculty Senate Chairman Bob Skaggs, newly elected CSUN President Joel Kostman, student leader Mike Kennedy, and outgoing Faculty

Senate Chairman Lori Temple.

President Taranik introduced Faculty Senate Chairman

Richard Egami and outgoing Faculty Senate Chairman Lonnie

Pippin.

President Meacham introduced newly elected Faculty Chairman

Carolyn Collins and outgoing Faculty Senate Chairman Candace

Kant.

President Gwaltney introduced newly elected ASTM President

Charlie Covington and outgoing ASTM President Kay Adair.

President Remington introduced newly elected ASB President

Jennifer Stevenson, outgoing ASB President Tammy Robinson,

and Faculty Senate Chairman Ed Nickel who will serve a

second consecutive term.

President Calabro introduced newly elected USA President

Debi Green, outgoing USA President Jayne Podratz, and

Faculty Senate Chairman Michon Mackedon.

2. Approved Consent Agenda

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

(1) Approved the minutes of the special meeting held March 24, 1992 and minutes of the regular meeting held April 9-10, 1992.

(2) Approved the gifts, grants and contracts, listed in Ref. C-1, filed with the permanent minutes.

(3) Approved to grant a third year of leave without pay for Dr. Mohammed Yousef, Professor of Biological Sciences at UNLV.

(4) Approved the following appointments to the Management Information Systems Advisory Council at UNLV:

Paul Padilla, Las Vegas William Robinson, Las Vegas

Ron Jones, Las Vegas Herb Peebles, N. Las Vegas

Steve Chapin, Las Vegas Davan Weddle, Las Vegas

Tim Mc Carthy, Las Vegas James J. Ratigan, Las Vegas

Randy Ranck, Las Vegas Ron Quenzler, Las Vegas

Jim Boyd, Las Vegas Ernie Piece, Las Vegas

(5) Approved the following appointments to the Public

Administration Advisory Committee at UNLV:

Dolores Brosnan, Las Vegas Donald L. Shalmy, Las Vegas

William Curran, Las Vegas Jon Sjoberg, Las Vegas

James Devlin, Las Vegas James Spinello, Las Vegas

Phillip Lowry, Las Vegas Carolyn Usher, Las Vegas

Nikolas, Mastrangelo, L.V. Steve Waugh, Las Vegas

Patricia Mulroy, Las Vegas Janet Weise, Henderson

William Noonan, Las Vegas

(6) Approved the following appointments to the Board of

Directors of the Accounting Circle at UNLV:

Gary Acord, Las Vegas B. Michl Lloyd, Las Vegas

Wes Allison, Las Vegas Amelia Morton, Las Vegas

Selma Bartlett, Henderson Reuben Neumann, Las Vegas

Bob Beers, Las Vegas Tomoo Okada, Las Vegas

John Campbell, Las Vegas Diane Radunz, Las Vegas

Chris Coquillard, Las Vegas Ken Sawyer, Las Vegas

Verlie Doing, Searchlight Michelle Stickney, L. V.

Louis Du Bois, Las Vegas Dan Towbin, Las Vegas

Juan Garcia, Las Vegas Joel Towbin, Las Vegas

Weldon Havins, Las Vegas Joseph F. Zerga, Las Vegas

(7) Approved the following appointments to be Professional Accounting Advisory Council at UNLV:

John Back, Jr., Las Vegas Robert L. Kreml, Las Vegas
Wm. Broadus, Manassas, Va. B. Michl Lloyd, Las Vegas
Diane S. Conant, Las Vegas Wayne A. Label, Las Vegas
Jon M. Donnell, Las Vegas William Luthy, Las Vegas
R. Flaherty, Tempe, Ariz. Scott Y. Mac Taggart, L. V.
Gregory J. Gale, Las Vegas Leland D. Pace, Las Vegas
Jim Griffin, Henderson L. Ralph Piercy, Las Vegas
Pat Johnson, Las Vegas Bruce E. Ward, Las Vegas
William Wells, Las Vegas

(8) Approved the appointment of Mr. A. J. Dubuc, Jr. to the CCSN Advisory Board.

(9) In an effort to further market UNR's logistics program, the Board of Regents approved the establishment of a National Advisory Board at UNR.

The purpose of this Board not only would be to assist in the placement of our students, but also to provide expertise to our program as we expand nationally and

incorporate a global perspective into the program.

In addition, the Board approved the following appointments to the Center for Logistics Management National Advisory Board at UNR:

Bryce Adolph, San Francisco, California

Robert V. Delaney, St. Louis, Missouri

George Gecowets, Oak Brook, Illinois

Harry Goldberg, San Jose, California

Patrick Guerra, Sunnyvale, California

Bernard J. Hale, Irvine, California

Omar K. Helferich, East Lansing, Michigan

Warren Merz, Dearborn, Michigan

Ed Root, Toledo, Ohio

Richard J. Sherman, Elk Grove Village, Illinois

Dennis Young, Lansing, Michigan

(10) Approved the following appointments to the TMCC Advisory Board:

Janet J. Berry, Reno (Replaces Joan Kenney)

Walt Katai, Reno (Replaces Paul Bible)

Gordon Krammer, Sparks (Replaces Fred Laing)

Carol Miller, Sparks (Replaces Carlos Romo)

(11) Approved the addition to the Handbook, Title 4,
Chapter 17, Section 11, Special Course Fees at WNCC:

ENG 258 - Ashland Theatre Festival \$60.00 per course

(12) Approved the Handbook changes, Title 4, Chapter 17,
Sections 17.3, Apartment Rentals, and 18.1 and 18.2,
The College Inn at UNR:

A. Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 17.3, Stead Residence
Hall Rates

(Entirely deleted)

B. Title 4, Chapter 17, Sections 18.1 and 18.2, The
College Inn

See Ref. C-11, filed in the Regents' Office, for
documentation.

(13) Approved the following interlocal agreements:

A. UCCSN Board of Regents/UNR and the Nevada Department of Wildlife (Interlocal Contract)

Effective Date: March 1, 1992 to June 30, 1997

Amount : \$350,000 to UNR over six year period

Purpose : Study of genetic makeup of black bass in Lake Mead.

B. UCCSN Board of Regents/UNR and the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (Interlocal Contract)

Effective Date: January 1, 1992 to September 30, 1992

Amount : \$24,000 to UNR

Purpose : Water Pollution Control Program.

C. UCCSN Board of Regents/UNR and the Nevada Department of Wildlife (Interlocal Contract)

Effective Date: March 1, 1992 to June 30, 1997

Amount : \$641,856 to UNR

Purpose : Riparian hydrology research.

Dr. Derby moved adoption of the Consent Agenda and approval of the prepared agenda with the authority to change the order of items as specified throughout the meeting. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

3. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Dawson reported that he is establishing a Multi-Year Contract Committee to review the current guidelines and policies and will report back to the Board at the June meeting. The Committee members are as follows:

Dr. Jill Derby

Dr. James Eardley

Mr. Joseph M. Foley

Mrs. Carolyn M. Sparks

Dr. Joseph Crowley (to serve as Chairman)

Dr. John Gwaltney

Dr. Robert Maxson

Dr. Paul Meacham

Chancellor Dawson stated that the purpose of the "Chancellor's Report" was to inform the Board of Regents of events

that take place throughout the System. He informed the Board that President Calabro has earned the nickname "Crash Calabro" by trying to ride a bike and walk his German Shepherd at the same time.

4. Approved the Appointment of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Approved the appointment of Dr. John Richardson as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UCCSN, at the annual salary of \$114,200, without employee paid retirement, with an automobile allowance of \$6000 per year within the 50-mile radius of Reno, effective July 1, 1992. The position will be on a one-year appointment and renewed annually.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the appointment of Dr. John Richardson as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UCCSN, at the annual salary of \$114,200, effective July 1, 1992.

Dr. Hammargren seconded. Motion carried.

5. Approved the Appointment of Dean of Instruction, NNCC

Approved the appointment of Mr. William Bonaudi as Dean of Instruction at NNCC, at the annual salary of \$70,071, with

tenure as Biology Professor, and moving expenses from Reno.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the appointment of Mr.

William Bonaudi as Dean of Instruction at NNCC, at the annual salary of \$70,071, with tenure as Biology Professor.

Dr. Derby seconded. Motion carried.

6. Approved Handbook Addition, Criminal, Safety and Security

Video Surveillance, UCCSN

Approved the Criminal, Safety and Security Video Surveillance Policy. The proposed policy was developed by the UCCSN Surveillance Policy Committee, Chaired by UNLV Faculty Senate Chairman, Lori Temple, with membership that included Regents, Administration, faculty, Campus law enforcement representatives, and students from the System. Inasmuch as the Surveillance Policy Committee finalized the policy at its meeting on May 7, 1992, the following was distributed:

Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 13

Section 13. Covert Video Surveillance

The use of covert video surveillance for anything other than a criminal investigation on the Campuses of the University and Community College System of Nevada is prohibited. This policy shall not interfere with the legitimate use of video taping for academic purposes.

Dr. Temple stated that she had received positive responses from all faculties or Faculty Senate Executive Committees on the proposed policy. Mr. Dave Hollenbeck, UNLV Director of Public Safety, stated that he and Mr. Ken Sjoen, UNR Chief of Police, are in agreement and feel it is a fair policy for the System.

Dr. Hammargren moved approval of the Handbook addition regarding Covert Video Surveillance. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

7. Approved Retention of Assistant to Chancellor for Community College Concerns

Approved the continuation of Doug Burris as Assistant to the Chancellor for Community College Concerns from July 1, 1992 through June 30, 1993. The compensation is to be paid from the Regents' Special Project funds. Chancellor

Dawson stated that the \$100,000 amount listed in the agenda was not quite correct. The salary was to be \$102,787, with employer-paid retirement. It was his intent that the compensation package be at the same level as the System Office Vice Chancellors. He said that UCCSN will be seeking permanent funding from the next legislative session for this position. The Chancellor stated that as UCCSN looks to the coming year, it needs the support of Mr. Burris in the following areas:

- 1) Completion of the development of the process for Community College academic master planning.
- 2) Development of support positions for Community College issues during the legislative session.
- 3) Pursue the role and involvement of the Community Colleges in areas related to the economic development of Nevada.
- 4) Further enhance the System's involvement and coordination with other State agencies, e. g., State Department of Education.

- 5) Give direction to the design of staff development needs,
e. g., workshops, etc.

- 6) Assist the Colleges with the design of their plans for
transfer support services and individual transfer guar-
anty contracts.

- 7) Assist the System with the formal introduction of TQM
(Total Quality Management) programming.

- 8) Support the Community Colleges of the System in their
development and expansion of the high school/Community
College articulation (program coordination) such as 2+2
and tech prep.

- 9) Assist with the exploration of options available to
support distance learning needs.

Dr. Derby moved approval of the retention of the Assistant
to Chancellor for Community College Concerns at UCCSN until
June 30, 1993, with compensation as recommended by the
Chancellor to come from the Regents' Special Projects Funds.

Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

8. Approved Emeritus Appointments

Approved the following emeritus appointments as recommended

by the Presidents:

A. University of Nevada, Las Vegas - President Maxson recommended:

Richard Brooks, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology,
effective June 30, 1992

Sheilagh Brooks, Emeritus Distinguished Professor of
Anthropology, effective June 30, 1992

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the Emeritus appointments
at UNLV. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

9. Approved Recommendations for Award to Tenure

The following recommendations for tenure have been forwarded
for Board consideration.

Note: The titles stated in this agenda item are descriptive
only. Faculty are tenured in institutions, and not
in particular employment positions.

A. University of Nevada, Reno - President Crowley recommended the following award to tenure, effective July 1, 1992, to the following:

*La Verne M. Jeanne, Anthropology, Arts and Science

B. University of Nevada, Las Vegas - President Maxson recommended award to tenure, effective July 1, 1992, to the following:

*Hans-Hermann Hoppe, Economics, College and Business and Economics

*Also recommended for Promotion or Assignment to Rank.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of Award to Tenure for UNR and UNLV. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

10. Approved Recommendations for Promotion or Assignment to Rank

The following recommendations for promotion or assignment to rank have been forwarded for Board consideration.

A. University of Nevada, Reno - President Crowley recommended the following promotion, effective July 1, 1992:

*La Verne M. Jeanne to Associate Professor of Anthropology, College of Arts and Science

B. University of Nevada, Las Vegas - President Maxson recommended the following promotion, effective July 1, 1992:

*Hans-Hermann Hoppe to Professor of Economics, College of Business and Economics

*Also recommended for Award of Tenure.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of Promotion or Assignment to Rank for UNR and UNLV. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

The open meeting recessed at 12:00 P.M. to move into Foundation meetings, and reconvened at 1:10 P.M. Thursday, May 14, 1992, with all Regents present except Regents Foley, Hammargren, Sparks and Whitley.

11. Approved Tenure on Hire, UNR

Approved tenure on hire for Dr. Chaitan P. Gupta, Chair of Mathematics Department, effective July 1, 1992.

This request complies with the Board policy adopted April, 1992.

President Crowley stated that he was aware that Chairman Sparks had some concern about the number of tenure on hires which UNR has recently brought forward to the Board, but he assured the Board that all tenure on hires have been for leadership positions and these Departments could not have recruited these people without granting them tenure.

It is a very small percentage of hires that he has requested tenure on hire and reminded the Board that UNR recruits during the Spring season.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the tenure on hire for Dr. Chaitan P. Gupta, Chair of Mathematics Department at UNR, effective July 1, 1992. Dr. Derby seconded. Motion carried.

12. Report and Recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee

A report and recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee meeting, held May 14, 1992 were made by Regent Jill Derby, Chairman.

(1) Information Only: Report on Status of Campus Plans -

The Chancellor's Office of Academic Affairs has requested each Campus to prepare a presentation to the Committee on the status of their academic master planning activities. Each Campus provided an update.

On behalf of the four Community Colleges, Mr. Doug Burris, Assistant to the Chancellor, reported that the design of the master planning activities for the Community Colleges is similar to the Strategic Directions Report, which was previously discussed, along with the Community College mission statements which were approved at the April 9-10, 1992 Board of Regents' meeting. In accordance with Dr. Harold Enarson, consultant on UCCSN mission statements, the Community College mission statement is broad and would provide a good work plan. Mr. Burris stated that the academic master planning activities for Community Colleges would be completed over the next two-year period in

order to consider the biennial budget plans. It is the Community College directive to focus on the process, with the academic master plan being a continual activity. The Community Colleges will report on an annual basis which will address the reflection on the stated goals, accomplishments and additions to the plans no later than November 1, 1992.

Upon questioning, it was explained that there are two plans being developed by the institutions at this time: Physical Master Plan and Academic Master Plan.

Mrs. Karen Steinberg, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, stated that over the next two-month period, she is hopeful that several recommendations will be presented by the Academic Affairs Council to the Board for its consideration regarding suggestions presented by the consultants to the Board. She emphasized that the process will take approximately two years and that the stated strategic plans will pull the two plans together.

Dr. Robert Hoover, UNR Vice President for Academic Affairs, distributed a document entitled, "Strategic Vision Statement and Decision Process, May 13, 1992",

which is filed in the Regents' Office. He highlighted the document which addressed: Planning Assumptions; The Vision - An outstanding, small, land-grant University addressing local, state and regional problems; Milestones for Establishment of the Vision and Priorities; and Possible Vision Priorities. He stated that UNR will report back to the Board on its progress in January 1993.

Mrs. Gallagher questioned how new programs would be initiated prior to January 1993, and President Crowley stated that program reviews will begin after January 1993 and will be linked to the Academic Master Plan.

Dr. Eardley questioned whether "in-service" programs were being implemented to develop quality teachers, and Dr. Hoover replied that there are three ways in which UNR teachers are evaluated: 1) student evaluation, 2) effectiveness of teacher on providing knowledge and creating a learning environment in the classroom, and 3) assessment program. He stated that UNR provides each student an opportunity to evaluate the teachers. President Crowley cautioned the Committee by stating that student evaluations are im-

portant, but are not the only criteria to evaluate teachers. He explained that the current student is the starting point of assessing teachers, but the assessment of alumni is also important due to the fact that the alumnus would probably have a different opinion after his/her formal education.

Dr. John Unrue, UNLV Provost and Senior Vice President, explained the process which UNLV is undertaking at this time. A committee on master planning has been formed and it is projected that all Campus units will have developed five-year plans to be completed by Fall 1992. He stated that no new programs are slated until after the report to the Board in the Fall.

Dr. Derby stated, that as Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, she is appreciative that institutions are withholding all new programs until the master academic plans are developed.

Dr. Bill Bishop, DRI Vice President of Research, stated that although DRI is not a degree-granting institution, it is developing a master academic plan which will be coordinated with the two Universities and will be re-

ported to the Board after deliberations with the Universities.

Mrs. Gallagher expressed her appreciation to all the institutions for their efforts in making the academic master plan a reality.

(2) Information Only: Academic Affairs Retreat - Chairman

Derby stated that the Academic Affairs Council and the Academic Affairs Committee are developing an agenda for an Academic Affairs Retreat on academic planning.

Mrs. Karen Steinberg, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, stated that she would like to discuss this retreat with the new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and will inform the Committee members of the time, date, place and agenda in the near future.

Chairman Derby suggested the agenda address the process which Campuses use in developing new programs.

(3) Information Only: Discussion of New Program Approval -

At the April Board meeting, the Committee began a discussion concerning approval of new program proposals and the relationship of the approval process to the Board criteria of Campus role and mission

statements and academic master plans. Chairman Derby stated that it is her understanding that some new programs cannot wait until the academic master plan is completed. Mrs. Karen Steinberg, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, stated that the Academic Affairs Council has discussed this issue several times and has determined that it is important for the planning process to continue along side the academic master plan. The preference would be to hold all new programs until the plans are in place, but offer an option to bring forward a limited number of new programs with additional criteria on why it is necessary and how resources will be secured to fund the new program. She informed the Committee that UNLV has several programs on hold at this time, UNR has 3 or 4 programs, and the Community Colleges have no new programs at this time, but will probably have a few in the Fall.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the report and recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Klaich extended his appreciation to Mrs. Karen Steinberg for

an "incredible" job which she has undertaken as Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Mrs. Gallagher concurred and Dr. Derby added that during her service it has been a very critical time for Academic Affairs throughout the System.

Chancellor Dawson introduced Mary Warejcka, Education Reporter for the Reno Gazette-Journal.

Dr. Hammargren returned to the meeting.

13. Approved UCCSN Code, Disciplinary Procedures, and Handbook

Change, Discrimination Grievance Procedures, UCCSN

Approved amendments to the UCCSN Code, Chapter 6, Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community, and to the Board of Regents' Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 9, Grievance Procedures as Related to Equal Opportunity, as contained in Ref. G, filed with the permanent minutes.

These amendments have been circulated to the Chancellor, the Presidents and the Faculty Senate Chairs for comments in accordance with Section 1.3.3 of the UCCSN Code.

General Counsel Klasic stated for the record that the proposed UCCSN Code changes are not expressly sexual harassment policies, but apply to all forms of discipline in the System. However, sexual harassment problems and complaints have inspired the changes that are being brought forward for Board consideration. In July 1991, General Counsel Klasic proposed a solution to the delayed process of addressing disciplinary and grievance procedures, whereby UCCSN would follow the University of Washington's model by eliminating the faculty from the process. General Counsel Klasic explained that by having faculty serve on the committees, no sooner would the committee/panel be formed, then a faculty member would either leave on sabbatical or for the Summer, or to take another job. However, the Faculty Senates had a problem with eliminating faculty from the committees and suggested that the procedures be changed to speed up the process. In retrospect, General Counsel Klasic agrees with the Faculty Senates and the proposed UCCSN Code changes emanated from the Faculty Senates' concerns. They suggested that a time limit of six months be enforced, from the beginning of the complaint to the end of the complaint.

General Counsel Klasic proceeded by highlighting some of the proposed changes.

1) Ref. G, Page 4 of 13, is not a change to the UCCSN Code, but to the Board of Regents' Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 9, Discrimination Grievance Procedures, which is a different procedure from the discipline procedure. In the past, so many complaints were filed on sexual harassment with the Affirmative Action Officer and the question became whether to follow this procedure or to follow the UCCSN Code, Chapter 6 procedure. The problem with following this procedure is that it is impossible to discipline under the Handbook procedure. The proposed change would give the Affirmative Action Officer, in consultation with the institutional President, the flexibility to decide in certain cases, primarily where discipline is the goal that is to be sought, and give the Officer the opportunity to avoid the Handbook procedure and go directly into Chapter 6. This would eliminate the time problem.

2) Ref. G, Page 5 or 13, UCCSN Code, Chapter 6, Section 6.2.4, Sexual Harassment, is a new policy. The Faculty Senates suggested that a procedure be implemented that would separate the parties so that there would

be no retaliation and the uncomfortable and difficult problems that exist when the accused and the victim work closely together. Upon further discussion with the Faculty Senates who wished for a more flexible procedure, General Counsel Klasic proposed the above referenced language and amendments to Section 6.5, Administrative Leave (which used to be titled "Immediate Suspension"). A new policy, Section 6.5.1(c), allows UCCSN to remove a person from the institution with leave with pay. A quick 10 day administrative hearing would be called as to whether it is proper to put the person on leave.

3) Ref. G, Page 9 of 13, UCCSN Code, Chapter 6, Section 6.12.3, appointment of the Special Hearing Committee, has additional language added to the policy. General Counsel Klasic explained that in the past the Hearing Committee consisted of the Faculty Senate Grievance Committees, but what is actually needed is to select a special and independent panel for these matters. The persons selected to serve must fulfill his/her obligations to the panel. In addition, the Administration must also allow these persons time to perform his/her obligations to the panel.

4) Ref. G, Page 13 of 13, UCCSN Code, Chapter 6, Section 6.15, Records, has additional language added to the policy. General Counsel Klasic reminded the Board that this policy not only deals with sexual harassment cases, but all disciplinary proceedings. The current policy is that everything in a disciplinary matter is confidential with the exception of a decision of the President. General Counsel Klasic proposed the following language:

"All reports and decisions reached after hearings or appeals held under this chapter are declared to be public records subject to the provisions or exclusions of the public records laws of the Nevada Revised Statutes as they may be interpreted by the courts."

General Counsel Klasic stated that a "balancing test" would be implemented by the courts. This is a judge-made rule that determines what to do when an open record request is made. It considers the interest of the public in knowing the affairs of their public institutions vs. privacy rights. Upon the court's

decision the institution would be directed to release or withhold the document.

General Counsel Klasic offered the following scenario to help explain the proposed language. When a hearing under Chapter 6 has been declared, particularly a termination hearing, a special Hearing Officer is appointed from outside the System. The special Hearing Officer makes findings of fact, conclusions of law and a decision, which is contained in a report. The report is forwarded to the President of the institution. Then a faculty panel, after it hears the report of the Hearing Officer, and assuming that the decision is guilty, decides the penalty or makes a recommendation for the penalty. This is also sent to the President of the institution. General Counsel Klasic proposed that the report of the Hearing Officer, together with the decision of the President, would then be revealed, not the investigative files or raw data.

General Counsel Klasic stated that the Faculty Senates are generally in agreement with the proposed changes, although UNR's and TMCC's Faculty Senates oppose this particular section. He stated that Nevada's Open

Meeting Law does not pertain to these cases, and the hearing panels are not subject to the Open Meeting Law because they report to a single person, the President (single bodies, such as the President, are not subject to the Open Meeting Law). In addition, minutes are not prepared at these hearings, and therefore are not subject to the Open Meeting Law.

General Counsel Klasic stated that a question was raised about revealing the names of the complainants who have made sexual harassment complaints. Again, he reminded the Board that the proposed policy is not limited to sexual harassment cases, but all discipline matters. There is much case law that would allow UCCSN to use the balancing test and to delete the names of complainants who have complained of sexual harassment so as to protect their privacy.

General Counsel Klasic stated that the remainder of the proposed changes are essentially time procedures, either to speed up the process or put time limits on the selection of committees, the business of exercising peremptory decisions, and, finally, the hearing.

The Campus Advisory Committees on Status of Women have been contacted with regard to the proposed policy, and General Counsel Klasic had only received comments from the TMCC and UNR Committees. He met with each Committee and discussed their concerns. He stated to the Committees that he would report to the Board about their discussions and conclusions. He reported on the following:

- 1) Both Committees agreed not to delay any further the action in adopting these proposed changes.

- 2) Both Committees were concerned about the necessity to have somebody monitor sexual harassment. General Counsel has indicated that the Affirmative Action Officer should already be handling this issue. The concern is that there are 8 or 9 Affirmative Action Officers throughout our System, with different priorities, staffs, budgeting requirements, and training. It was determined that the Affirmative Action Officers must be told that they must have a more active role in monitoring these matters. General Counsel Klasic agreed, but did not feel it necessary to change the UCCSN Code to that effect. He suggested that the Campus Advisory Committees on Status of Women be

directed, with their Presidents, to address the issue to the Affirmative Action Officer. Or, alternatively, assuming the Board establishes a permanent Status of Women Committee, the Campus Advisory Committees could approach the Board's Committees with a proposed directive to take care of the issue.

It was pointed out that it would be very difficult for Affirmative Action Officers to monitor a sexual harassment problem in a hearing if, in fact, they were excluded from the hearing. The UCCSN Code, at this time, does exclude everybody from a hearing except the parties, their attorneys and the witnesses as they come into the hearing. General Counsel Klasic indicated that he would be prepared to provide a UCCSN Code change at a later meeting that will allow the Affirmative Action Officers to attend the hearings on all discrimination matters (not just sexual harassment, which is a form of sexual discrimination, but all discrimination matters; i. e., race, sex, national origin, religion, etc.).

3) Both Committees believed that a person who has been victimized by sexual harassment ought to have an

independent advisor or advocate to support him throughout the process. Upon clarification by both the UNR and TMCC Committees, it was explained that this "support" person be an employee that is essentially funded by UCCSN. The person(s) ought to be chosen by the Campus Advisory Status of Women Committees and trained by the Committees. The "support" person would be present in the hearing, if only to offer a hand, a friendly face, and console the victim.

The UNR Committee indicated that it did not anticipate that this person would participate in the hearing nor be present during the entire hearing, but be present during the time the victim was present.

General Counsel Klasic indicated that he would be prepared to provide a UCCSN Code change at a later meeting.

- 4) The TMCC Committee was concerned that there ought to be an option to monitoring matters, such as sexual harassment complaints, apart from the Affirmative Action Officer. This person may be the one, rather than the Affirmative Action Officer, to perform this

monitoring. General Counsel Klasic suggested that this could be worked out either individually or from a policy directive from the Status of Women Committee.

5) Both the UNR and TMCC Committees wanted to clarify that the hearings were administrative in character and not subject to the rules of evidence. General Counsel Klasic explained that the UCCSN Code currently provides that they are administrative in character and that the rules of evidence are not the rules UCCSN follows in this particular matter. In addition, he explained that these matters are not totally under UCCSN's control, because the greater the property right at stake, the greater the formality that is necessary. General Counsel Klasic offered his services in educating the panel members.

6) The UNR and TMCC Committees wanted to clarify the time limits for bringing charges. General Counsel Klasic stated that there is not a statute of limitations for bringing charges under Chapter 6 of the UCCSN Code. However, with respect to the Affirmative Action procedures, Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 9, Affirmative Action Grievance Procedures, there is a 180-day statute

of limitations. It is the responsibility of the Affirmative Action Officers to educate the public as to this particular matter.

Mr. Klaich stated that he felt a very short statute of limitations on sexual harassment complaints is eminently fair to the complainant and to the accused, so that each of them will have a contemporaneous opportunity close to the incident to have it resolved. Dr. Derby stated that the reason for this is that there has been an environment and climate that has made it difficult for a victim to come forth. Mr. Klaich stated that by delaying the reporting of such incidents it does not help anyone involved. Delay neither makes it easier nor makes the fact of anything more or less provable. He felt that the ad hoc Committee on Status of Women has taken a very strong and powerful position on this issue and has said that sexual harassment is absolutely impermissible conduct with UCCSN. So he believes that there is reason to move more into the mainstream of reporting and disposition of these cases and that a short statute of limitations is clearly within the mainstream.

UNR Faculty Senate Chairman Ellen Pillard stated that there are some states which have gone to removing the statute of limitations altogether for sexual abuse allegations as it relates to children. Although UCCSN's situation is different, we are not talking about "children, but we are talking about students", who in many instances may not be as captive as children are, but are also not fully empowered adults in many instances. In addition, employment situations that are inequitable which have mitigated against the employee filing the sexual harassment complaints is a real concern and issue. Historically, although it may be ideal to have a short statute of limitations and prompt disposition of complaints, the reality is that there is a long history in which people have been unwilling to make complaints and Ms. Pillard felt that a short statute of limitations mitigates against changing the history.

7) The UNR and TMCC Committees both questioned the protection rights of the complainant against retaliation for bringing a complaint forward and General Counsel Klasic indicated that he would be able to provide a UCCSN Code change at a later meeting.

8) The UNR and TMCC Committees both requested clarification on whether the Handbook procedures or the UCCSN Code were applicable in regard to these matters. General Counsel Klasic indicated that this issue was addressed in his opening remarks.

9) The UNR Committee indicated that there ought to be a victim's rights provision, but agreed that UCCSN would allow the Affirmative Action Officers to monitor these cases and if an advocate or advisor is provided as a support person that would automatically take care of this issue.

10) The UNR Committee felt that UCCSN ought to suspend without pay the accused during the preliminary transmission of the complaint from the Affirmative Action Officer to the President for disciplinary action. General Counsel Klasic indicated that under the U. S. Supreme Court ruling of "Cleveland Board of Education vs. Loudermill", the UCCSN cannot suspend without pay. There needs to be a due process hearing held first.

The TMCC Committee indicated that perhaps the suspen-

sion should be with pay. General Counsel Klasic referred to a couple of court cases that indicated that in addition to a property right there is also a "liberty" interest, that when a person's reputation has been challenged by an accusation of wrongdoing which could affect that person's future employment, action cannot be taken without a due process hearing. The proposed language states that the accused would be placed on administrative leave with pay for which a due process hearing would be held within 10 days.

11) The UNR and TMCC Committees were concerned with the provision regarding the separation of the victim and the accused. General Counsel Klasic stated that the proposed language is flexible in this regard. It may be proper, in some instances, to remove the victim from the situation and then again, it may be proper, in other instances, to remove the accused.

12) The UNR Committee was concerned about the formal resolutions or settlements that are reached. General Counsel Klasic indicated that settlements are very vital and important in reaching conclusions. It is his policy to always consult with the victims and to

always take their wishes into consideration in reaching the conclusions. If any settlement is reached that is unacceptable to the victim, that victim always has the right to file a complaint with the Nevada Equal Rights Commission, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor and the Office of Civil Rights, without expense to that victim to have an investigation.

General Counsel Klasic recommended that the proposed changes to the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 9, and to the UCCSN Code, Chapter 6 be adopted.

Dr. Derby agreed with General Counsel Klasic that these changes needed to be made, but felt that there is still much revision to the UCCSN Code that needs to be done. She invited members of the Campus Advisory Committees to address the Board at this time with their concerns.

Dr. Helen Jones, Director of Women's Center at UNR, suggested that students should be included in a meaningful way in this process, such as on the hearing committees. She also suggested that the Board direct each institution to develop a sexual harassment policy that sets out what that institu-

tion is going to do that it can be responsive to the local needs of those institutions and conform to the process. She felt that by having a support person for the victim to help explain what is actually happening would remedy the power imbalance that students and staff often feel. She mentioned that Chapter 6 is a limited provision, but under Chapter 8 it could address a pattern and practice of harassment over a period of time and often will make for a stronger case. She suggested that both procedures be explained to the complainant and that an amendment be made to the proposed language that the decision is made in consultation with the complainant. She suggested that a presumption statement be written into the proposed language that would relay that every effort will be made to transfer the accused person and that the complainant is not always the person who is transferred.

Dr. Jackie Kirkland, Dean of Student Services at TMCC, stated TMCC's Committees felt very strongly about the support person that would be assigned to the complainant and, in addition, would have the additional responsibilities of helping to monitor the case, such as timelines, following procedures, advising the complainant of the progress of the case and ensuring that the process continues, if necessary.

She suggested that an independent advisor be selected from a pool of faculty (6-8 persons) who would be trained and selected by the Committee on Status of Women. The complainant or the Committee would select this independent person and would not involve any additional funds. She felt that there is a need for education on the Campus as to what the procedures are and what rights and responsibilities and/or limits either the victim or the accused may have in the case. She suggested that they may be the responsibility of the independent advisor. Dr. Kirkland stated that TMCC is very concerned about the providing of protection for the victim from further harassment or retaliation in the very early stages of the complaint process, particularly with respect to students. She recommended that the Board direct the Campuses to develop and formalize a plan for dealing with sexual harassment to include some of the points that have been discussed as well as to specify that this pool of internal independent advisors be educated and be brought along to work with the victims and that students be made aware of the process on the Campuses. It should be publicized through posters or catalogs or whatever means necessary. She also recommended that the changes that have been proposed be adopted at this Board meeting and that the additional changes be dealt with at either the June or

the August Board meeting.

UNR Faculty Senate Chairman Ellen Pillard commended General Counsel Klasic for the proposed changes in the UCCSN Code, Chapter 6, and for the input he had enabled the faculties to lend to this process. She stated that it was her understanding that all of the Faculty Senates have supported UNR in its concern about the records provision, Section 6.15, in which the Hearing Officer's report is made public. Since this section of the UCCSN Code deals with a variety of grievances, not just sexual harassment, many of the grievances are not matters of public interest. She felt there are a lot of ways that risk personal and confidential information if names are simply deleted from the report. For example, if there are only three faculty members in a Department, one could possibly be identified even if the name were deleted from the report. She suggested that in regard to the release of statistics as it relates to sexual harassment, she wanted it clarified that it is not "summary" statistics. The public, UNR and the Board of Regents has a right to know summary information about the number of complaints, resolution of complaints that clearly protects the confidentiality of those involved, however, is it necessary to identify the disciplined person? She urged the

Board of Regents to pass the proposed language, with the exception of Section 6.15 until better language is developed.

General Counsel Klasic agreed with Mrs. Pillard that by just releasing the document one could do a great deal of damage to a person who is found not guilty. He explained that the released document would include the decision and the report explaining as to why this person was found not guilty.

General Counsel Klasic stated that the proposed language represents almost word for word the current case law on open records in the State of Nevada relative to closed investigations. It would be irresponsible to ignore this language.

Mr. Klaich requested General Counsel Klasic to report back to the Board on the issue of statutes of limitations as to what other agencies have utilized. He felt that the statutes of limitations are not necessarily to protect anyone or to disadvantage anyone, but rather to interject a timely resolution to the problems.

Mr. Klaich requested further explanation of the Open Meeting Law and the Open Record Law, and General Counsel Klasic explained that the Open Meeting Law contains a specific statute which states that when a meeting is held, a public body is required to write minutes. In a personnel session, the statute then specifically states those written minutes are confidential. This statute protects the persons involved. However, there is no protection under the Open Record Law. It states that all public records are open, but it does not define a public record. This is where the determination by the "judge-made laws" comes into play. The courts have determined that while the investigation is in progress, privacy is maintained, but once the investigation is over and there is no danger to anyone of criminal prosecution, then it becomes open.

President Gwaltney questioned the legal liability of the support person that attends the hearing committees and would these persons be protected? He also questioned whether UCCSN has any responsibility to defend those individuals who conduct themselves in a fashion unbecoming to established procedure, such as leaking information on the case. General Counsel Klasic responded that as long as the support person is behaving in the scope of public duty

and is acting properly at the hearing, he is protected. He stated that the support person is privileged from suit as long as he is actively paid, and protected from suit in the sense that he will be defended by the institution. However, if a person violates the policy and releases a document that ought not to be released, that person will not be defended and will probably be disciplined.

Dr. Derby questioned whether action on Section 6.1 could be delayed after the May 20 Legislative Study Committee meeting which General Counsel Klasic previously mentioned would be held to discuss the Open Record Law. General Counsel Klasic responded that it probably wouldn't do UCCSN any good to wait. He felt that the proposed language is the law as it stands right now and he would advise releasing documents right now because of the Nevada law, despite the current UCCSN Code policy.

It was General Counsel Klasic's understanding that the Nevada Press Association is amenable to the concept that personnel records are to be confidential.

Chairman Sparks entered the meeting.

Dr. Derby questioned Section 6.12.3 which refers to the appointment of the Special Hearing Committee with 15 faculty members, both academic faculty and administrative faculty, and whether there is a guarantee of balance between the constituents on that Committee. General Counsel Klasic responded that sometimes it is difficult to find people who would be willing to serve on the Committee, and that once the 15-25 persons are located it is the responsibility of the Faculty Senates to determine whether it is a balanced group or not. Then the 9 persons are selected randomly. These 9 persons go before the defendant's attorney and complainant's attorney, who then exercise the peremptory challenges of selecting two apiece, making it a 5 person Hearing Committee. He once again reminded the Board that this Committee not only addresses sexual harassment cases, but all disciplinary cases.

President Crowley indicated that UNR's Bylaws will be forthcoming to the Board to increase the size of the panel and that the Bylaws already provide for a balance between administrative faculty and academic faculty.

General Counsel Klasic stated that he had a difficult time devising different panels for different disciplinary cases.

Dr. Derby suggested that language be developed that underscores the importance of a balanced Committee as a matter of guidance. Dr. Derby clarified that when she refers to "balance", she means gender balance. Dr. Derby stated that a gender balance is particularly important to sexual harassment cases. It was also suggested that in such cases as student sexual harassment, students should serve on the panel as well.

Dr. Derby stressed the importance of the Affirmative Action Officer and staff to be sensitive and supportive to victims who come forth with complaints, although their primary responsibility is institutional compliance. Mr. Klaich felt that maybe the Affirmative Action Officers are not trained to emotionally assist victims, and that if an ombudsman or support person is selected UCCSN should be very careful who it selects and how they are trained before liability is questioned for that person and the institution. He is not in favor of giving the Affirmative Action Officer additional responsibilities. General Counsel Klastic indicated that he would be able to provide a UCCSN Code change at a later meeting.

Dr. Derby felt that the action taken at this meeting and at

the June Board of Regents' meeting regarding the UCCSN Code changes is not an end to these issues, but will be an ongoing process. She felt that some of the issues may be brought before the Status of Women Committee, working in conjunction with the Campus committees.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the amendments to the UCCSN Code, Chapter 6, Rules and Disciplinary Procedures for Members of the University Community, and to the Regents' Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 9, Grievance Procedures as Related to Equal Opportunity. Mrs. Gallagher seconded.

Mr. Klaich requested General Counsel Klasic to prepare a list of refinements to the changes on the basis of the questions raised by the various Campus committees and Board members that were brought forth during the discussion.

USA President Debi Green asked the Board to reconsider the approval of UCCSN Code 6.12.3 (a) and (c) by removing the proposed language requiring that if a student is involved in the action that a student representative be on the Hearing Committee, or if a graduate student is involved, a graduate student representative. General Counsel Klasic

stated that he had difficulty with the suggestion for the following reasons:

- 1) It was complained that in a previous matter, a faculty member could not be judged by a panel of his peers if a student was on the Committee, and

- 2) In structuring the panel so as to guarantee that a student serve on the Committee, that would cause difficulty when the "balancing" of the Committee, as discussed earlier. (If peremptories are exercised there is a change that the student may be excluded from serving on the Committee.)

General Counsel Klasic also stated that there is no guarantee that UCCSN can get a student to serve because of conflicts with class schedules. Faculty will be released from their duties to serve on the Committee, but with students it is difficult because of class exams or class schedule conflicts or Summer break. The motive behind these proposed language changes is to speed the process, and by including a student it may in fact delay the process.

ASTM President Charlie Covington strongly felt that a stu-

dent should serve on the Hearing Committee. The protection of the student and faculty is equal.

Dr. Derby stated that she felt very strongly about the student involved when his/her fate is involved in the outcome of the hearing. She requested that this issue be addressed at the next meeting.

Mrs. Berkley voted no on the above motion. Motion carried.

Chairman Sparks resumed the gavel; Dr. Hammargren left the meeting.

14. Approved Handbook Change, Program Review, UCCSN

In April, 1992, the Board of Regents' Academic Affairs Committee recommended an amendment to the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 14, Section 3, Program Review, to provide for an annual report to the Board on existing program review and allow for additional program reviews as the Board of Regents deems necessary, as contained in Ref. D, filed in the Regents' Office.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the Handbook change regarding

Program Review. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

15. Approved Handbook Additions, Articulation, UCCSN

Approved additions to the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 14,

Sections 14.2, 18.3, 15.2 and 11.2, as contained in Ref.

E, filed with the permanent minutes.

At the Board of Regents' Workshop on Articulation held in

April 1992, 4 recommendations were proposed by the UCCSN

Articulation Board to enhance the transfer process and

increase communication among all Campuses.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the Handbook additions

regarding Articulation. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion

carried.

16. Approved Spring 1992 Enrollment Report

Mrs. Karen Steinberg, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic

Affairs, presented the official Spring 1992 and 1991-92

net annual enrollment reports, as contained in Ref. F,

filed with the permanent minutes.

The Spring enrollment report shows the UCCSN continuing to grow faster than it had been forecasted. For full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, the UCCSN grew 10.6% from Spring, 1991 to Spring, 1992. She noted that the percentage increase in FTE enrollments is greater than the percentage increase in headcount enrollments, which indicates more full-time students are enrolling at UCCSN. This is becoming a "trend" for UCCSN. She cautioned the Board that the headcount enrollment format is still in a transition stage and that her office is still in the process of retrieving greater detail from the Campuses. Mrs. Steinberg reviewed the following State supported headcount and FTE enrollment figures for each institution as follows:

	Spring 1991	Spring 1992	Change
UNR FTE	7,843	8,283	5.6%
Headcount	10,841	10,853	0.1%
UNLV FTE	11,273	12,097	7.3%
Headcount	16,859	18,039	7.0%
CCSN FTE	5,183	6,525	25.9%
Headcount	14,453	16,336	13.0%
NNCC FTE	788	912	15.7%
Headcount	2,461	2,965	20.5%

TMCC FTE	3,256	3,622	11.2%
Headcount	8,717	9,413	8.0%
WNCC FTE	1,683	1,770	5.2%
Headcount	5,203	4,929	-5.3%

Vice Chancellor Sparks stated that there has been a 9.5% increase over the budgeted enrollment figures and estimated that some 800 more students than were budgeted entered the UCCSN institutions.

Dr. Hammargren returned to the meeting.

Upon questioning, Vice Chancellor Sparks indicated that UCCSN is approximately 40 faculty positions added and approximately \$2 million short this fiscal year. The added student fees from the increased enrollments will be helpful in meeting these discrepancies.

Dr. Eardley moved approval of the Spring 1992 Enrollment Report. Dr. Derby seconded. Motion carried.

17. Approved Handbook Addition, Anti-Drug Policy

Approved an addition to the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3,

Section 27, Anti-Drug Policy, as contained in Ref. H, with amendments to remove the word "alcohol" throughout the document, and to replace the word "must" with the word "may" in paragraph 7.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the Anti-Drug Policy as amended. Mrs. Gallagher seconded.

UNR Faculty Senate Chairman Ellen Pillard stated that UNR has its own policy which is much different than the proposed language. She felt that the proposed language was punitive and that paragraph 7 language weighted on punishment.

General Counsel Klasic stated that the proposed language was adopted from the U. S. Congress and Nevada Legislature's language, and emphasized that every State agency must have a stated policy; it is required by law.

Discussion was held regarding the word "alcohol", and Mrs. Gallagher stated that, to her knowledge, drug treatment centers consider alcohol as a drug, and it is the most often abused drug in our society.

Mrs. Steinberg informed the Board that in order to obtain Federal grants, it is absolutely necessary to have this policy in place.

Motion carried.

Mrs. Gallagher left the meeting.

18. Approved Land Acquisition/Land Use Plan

Regent Hammargren requested the Board to reconsider its motion on providing funds for a developmental plan for BLM land and to expand the motion to include acquisition of the property. The land in question is now owned by Clark County and is located at the end of the runway of the Las Vegas Airport.

Dr. Hammargren stated that several developmental corporations in Las Vegas have contributed to this project: The Collins Brothers firm; ESI Engineering Inc.; Americana Realty; Jones, Jones, Close & Brown; and attorney David Crosby. He stated that Mr. Crosby has been coordinating the petitioning process with the County.

The law firm of Robert A. Fielden, Inc. has been hired by the State Public Works Board to provide information on UNLV's comprehensive master plan. The process undertaken included interviews with the faculty, students, neighborhood citizens. The physical master plan will, of course, be driven by the academic master plan.

Dr. Hammargren stated, "In all probability, based on existing land use ratios and the size of current buildings anticipated for FTE's of beyond 20,000 might have to be served through satellite Campuses." He suggested that such programs as research, continuing education and conference centers be located at peripheral sites. At this time, UNLV is in a land-lock situation. The University Park concept would help relieve this situation. Dr. Hammargren envisions the University Park as a research park, with the Spruce Goose Museum as an attraction.

The need to address the Spruce Goose acquisition is that the application to Disney and the Aero Club of California must be in by May 15, 1992, which is a separate issue from the land acquisition.

Dr. Hammargren stated that an additional piece of property

(56 acres) for an aerospace museum has been donated to UCCSN. He mentioned that he has received numerous letters of support for the aerospace museum to be located in the Las Vegas area.

Chairman Sparks questioned where the designated future parking would be developed in relation to the future University buildings for classroom and research, and Dr.

Hammargren stated that there are 118 acres (half of the present size of UNLV Campus) and that he was just showing the various options available.

Chairman Sparks questioned if this land has been cleared for human habitation, and Dr. Hammargren responded that there were legal problems that were holding up the petitioning process - a civil war script stating that the land belonged to someone else, but this has just been settled in the Federal courts. In regard to the noise level, the projected site for classroom buildings is less noisy than the UNLV Campus. He clarified that the proposed land was never at the end of a airport runway. If the Spruce Goose is not obtained by UCCSN, the land would be designated for other University development projects.

President Maxson stated that UNLV is very interested in obtaining additional land. If UCCSN could obtain the land without the commitment to produce the Spruce Goose within a period of time and without any financial commitment, UNLV would be very interested in the land. He suggested that UNLV pursue this land, without financial obligations, and make request for educational purposes.

Dr. Hammargren stated that the U. S. Congress is deliberating about establishing a Smithsonian West, and he suggested that this land could be a possible site.

Chancellor Dawson requested clarification on the motion for providing funds for the development plan. He requested that the Board of Regents' money be available to spend in pursuing the acquisition of this property, not just for a land use development plan. The previous motion was very restrictive to just the development of the land use portion.

Chairman Sparks indicated that the Board of Regents have put forward \$10,000 and UNLV has put forward \$10,000 for pursuing the land.

Dr. Hammargren moved approval of the money already allocated

be used for acquisition of the land with UNLV to pursue the land acquisition. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

General Counsel Klasic mentioned the statement in a letter from Robert L. Mc Caffery, filed in the Regents' Office about pursuing the land and getting Howard Hughes Flying Boat (Spruce Goose). General Counsel Klasic did not interpret the above motion as authorizing the Board to obtain the Spruce Goose. It is his understanding that the motion is for using the money to acquire the land for whatever proper purpose this Board will later determine. Chairman Sparks confirmed, but added that UNLV will seek acquisition of the land on behalf of the Board of Regents.

The open meeting recessed at 4:07 P.M. and reconvened at 8:15 A.M. Friday, May 15, 1992, with all Regents present except Regents Berkley, Foley and Whitley.

19. Approved an Easement, CCSN

Approved a Grant of Easement for drainage purposes on CCSN Henderson Campus. General Counsel Klasic recommends approval upon review of documents.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the easement for drainage purposes on CCSN Henderson Campus. Mrs. Gallagher seconded.

Motion carried.

20. Information Only: Discussion of Regent Committees

The Board discussed a possible Bylaw change regarding the Status of Women Committee. General Counsel Klasic presented three alternative drafts, filed in the Regents' Office, and recommended that the Board accept Alternative 2. He explained that Alternative 2 represented the spirit and intent of Article VI of the Bylaws to restrict standing committees to Board membership only, while also allowing a format by which non-Regents could advise the Regents on important issues. It is similar to the Board's Research Affairs Committee's structure.

General Counsel Klasic explained that he did not favor Alternate 3 because of the possibility that non-Regents, acting together or in alliance with a minority of Regents on the Committee, could outvote a majority of Regents on the Committee, thereby imposing their views on both the Committee, and ultimately, the rest of the Board.

Standing committees are committees of the Board and it would be improper, in General Counsel's view, for non-Regents to dictate the Board's agenda.

General Counsel Klasic commented that Alternative 1 represents the committee structure used for all the Board's standing committees, except the Research Affairs Committee.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of Alternative 3 as drafted by General Counsel Klasic, with the numbers "8" in the first blank and "4" in the second blank. Dr. Derby seconded.

Motion carried.

General Counsel Klasic requested that this approval be considered as the first reading of a change to the Regents' Bylaws. His request was granted.

21. Information Only: Discussion on Foundations

General Counsel Klasic reported on UCCSN/Foundation relations. His report is filed with the permanent minutes.

He stated that there have been several questions raised in the media about the relationships between the institu-

tions of the UCCSN and their supporting foundations. As a result of these questions, he gave opinions on the following, which can be reviewed in further detail in his report, filed with the permanent minutes:

- 1) The effect of the Ethics in Government Law on the operations of, and the relationships between, the UCCSN institutions and the foundations.

- 2) Whether the foundations were private corporations or public agencies subject to the laws generally governing the operations of public agencies.

At the suggestion of Chairman Sparks, General Counsel Klasic called a meeting of UCCSN institutional Presidents, financial officers and foundation contacts for the purpose of receiving input in order to enable him to reach some conclusions leading to an opinion on these matters. This meeting was held at the System Administration Office in Reno on May 11, 1992.

General Counsel Klasic reached the following conclusions:

- 1) The foundations should not be making direct payment of

funds to support UCCSN programs or employees. To prevent violations of the Ethics in Government Law and to ensure the Board's constitutional control over the administration of the State University, foundation funds should be donated to the Board of Regents and the Board of Regents should be responsible for the disbursement of the funds in accordance with the conditions of the gift.

2) The foundations are private, non-profit corporations and as such are not subject to the requirements of the Open Record Law, the Open Meeting Law, the State personnel laws, the State and University purchasing regulations or any of the other laws and regulations applicable to government agencies. At the same time, however, it might be the better part of wisdom for the foundations to voluntarily disclose nonsensitive records pertaining to their support of UCCSN programs and employees.

Dr. Eardley stated that the reason why UCCSN has established institutional foundations is to generate private money for Campus projects that normally would not receive State funding. He questioned who was the ultimate authority

over the foundations, whether it's the Regents, Presidents or others. He stated that he is very concerned about the reporting methods in regard to actual gifts or pledged gifts. He requested a standard reporting system for all foundations within the System. He stated that if the institutions are spending donations without the acceptance of the gift by the Board of Regents, it is going against the System's policy. Foundations should not be spending money that has not been formally given to the institutions and accepted by the Board of Regents. In addition, he felt that there should be a more standardized method for allocating perquisites to Presidents of the institutions, such as housing allowance, car allowance, etc.

Mr. Klaich complimented General Counsel Klasic for a superb job relating to the foundations which resulted in an extremely positive outcome. He felt that this was a positive discussion in a negative context. He stated, "I believe we're having this discussion because of a mean-spirited attempt to discredit Bob Maxson by somehow implying that he was profiting by this foundation or receiving funds that had not been approved by the Board, which is absolutely untrue." He resented the implications to the contrary and further stated, "I think there has been

a cloud cast over these foundations that somehow they are clandestine organizations that are pulling the strings of the University, which I categorically reject." The reason for foundations to be in existence is to harness the enormous energies of the communities that the System institutions serve to better those institutions, which they have served well and have had enormous success. He felt that the Board should be thanking these individuals publicly rather than casting aspersions at what they are doing. He extended his thanks to all the foundation officers for doing exactly what the Board has instructed them to perform, which is to make our institutions better for our students to learn. He recommended approval of General Counsel's recommendations as contained in the report.

Chairman Sparks recommended that an ad hoc committee be established to create a specific reporting form that is universally used among all of the foundations in order to receive funds. She noted that a list of gifts is presented to the Board of Regents' at each meeting for its acceptance.

Mrs. Gallagher also resented the implications that have been directed to the Presidents and the foundations, be-

cause they have performed exemplary work. "It is incumbent upon this Board of Regents to be very supportive of the foundations and the people who work for the foundations."

She commended General Counsel Klasic for an excellent report. She recommended that the recommendations which General Counsel Klasic proposed should be approved by the Board. She stated that she resented the amount of time that the Board has spent on these issues when there are so many other very important issues to address.

Chairman Sparks directed the Chancellor to inform the foundations of the recommendations proposed by General Counsel Klasic and to establish an ad hoc committee to address the foundation issues. General Counsel Klasic stated that he expected full cooperation from the foundations in regard to his recommendations.

Dr. Eardley stated that he is very supportive of the foundations and that anything he said was for clarification purposes, not to attack the foundations.

22. Approved Handbook Addition, Bylaws, UNLV

Approved an addition to the Handbook, Title 5, Chapter 6,

Section 4.6, Faculty Senate Committees Authorized at UNLV,
as contained in Ref. J, filed in the Regents' Office.

Dr. Eardley moved approval of the Handbook addition regard-
ing UNLV Bylaws. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

23. Approving Naming of Building, UNLV

Approved the naming of the College of Health Sciences build-
ing the Rod Lee Bigelow Health Sciences building at UNLV.

President Maxson stated that Mr. Bigelow has donated a \$1.5
million grant to the UNLV Foundation for this purpose.

Dr. Eardley moved approval of the naming of the College of
Health Sciences building the Rod Lee Bigelow Health Sciences
building at UNLV. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

24. Approved Lease of Land, Sports/Medicine Facility, UNR

Approved the leasing of land for a Sports/Medicine Facility
at UNR. The Reno Orthopedic Clinic (ROC) is currently
negotiating with the University of Nevada, Reno to build
a Sports/Medicine Facility on the Campus. This Facility
would work in cooperation with the University academic

Departments and would build and remodel some facilities for the Athletic Department. This Facility would be located on the University property which would be leased to the clinic for \$1 a year. After a period of time, the building would become the property of the University. The initial proposal for the Sports/Medicine Facility was distributed and is filed in the Regents' Office.

Chancellor Dawson requested permission to seek approval for the project from the Interim Finance Committee and the State Public Works Board.

Mr. Buz Moore, Physical Therapist, spoke in opposition to the project. He felt that UNR would lose a great deal, such as referral for profit, which would mean that local physicians would not gain from patient referrals.

He further stated that he was a great fan of UNR and would seek help from the Wolf Pack Boosters to aid UNR in building a new training center. He further stated that rehabilitation is a multi-dollar business and if the Board should allow this transaction to transpire, the ROC would take business away from other physical therapists in the area.

Mr. John Sandi, ROC's attorney, stated that his client, ROC, has been involved with student athletes over the years and has funded a trainer to work with high school personnel. He felt that it would be in the best interest of the University to work with ROC in light of the institution moving into NCAA's Division I category. He clarified that ROC will not be the sole provider, but that other physicians and physical therapists can be included.

Upon questioning, Vice President Ashok Dhingra explained that 1/2 of the proposed building would be used by the UNR Athletic Department and the other half (7000-8000 sq. ft.) would be utilized as a medical clinic and office space, x-ray facilities, and neck/spine/extremity rehabilitation facility.

Mrs. Gallagher questioned whether the student athletes would have a right to choose his/her own physical therapists, and Mr. Sandi responded that there will be no exclusive contract for ROC and that Dr. Jerry Dales, Team Physician, has stated that he will cooperate with ROC. Mr. Sandi also stated that UNR will have ultimate authority.

Dr. Eardley posed the following questions:

- 1) With the Board of Regents being a public body, can other agencies be involved, other than ROC, to lease land from a public institution?

- 2) What is referral for profit? And how does it correspond with State laws regarding monopolies?

- 3) Who initiated this proposal?

Vice President Dhingra responded to questions 1 and 3 by stating that, yes it has been done before and approved by this Board and the Governor; and it was a joint effort by the two entities, although it was initiated by ROC.

Mr. Moore explained that referral for profit is when a physician refers a patient to another office and receives a profit. He does not condone referral for profit.

President Crowley stated that this project is a high priority for the UNR Athletic Department.

It was explained that the student athlete who is injured is covered under an insurance policy provided by UNR.

President Crowley stated that before any steps were taken, concerns were raised how Dr. Jerry Dales, Team Physician, would react. Athletic Director Chris Ault spoke with Dr. Dales and the project was explained to him and he was told that UNR very strongly wishes to continue working with Dr. Dales. President Crowley stated that if Dr. Dales disagreed with the arrangement, he would be inclined to reject the proposal, however, Dr. Dales did agree. (Dr. Dales volunteers his time to the team.)

After a lengthy discussion, Dr. Derby stated that she felt she needed more information before voting on this issue. She felt that it was a good will of community, but it had created much tension and she did not feel comfortable with making a decision at this time.

Mr. Klaich stated that he, too, was concerned by the comments made regarding this issue. He informed the Board that he is good friends with both Mr. Moore and Dr. Dales, but noted that only one person has spoken against this proposal. Mr. Klaich stated that he has spoken directly to Dr. Dales who did not speak against this project. It was noted that ROC will work with the University School of Medicine to

plan a Sports/Medicine Program; the Physical Education Department to establish a joint Bio-Mechanical Program; and the College of Human and Community Sciences to enhance the Physical Therapy Program. Mr. Klaich stated that this was a tremendous step forward for the Sports Program at UNR, and he strongly supported the proposal submitted by ROC and urged the Board to approve the proposal.

President Crowley stated that the final documentation will be reviewed by General Counsel Klasic and signed by the Chancellor, if approved.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the proposed Sports/Medicine Facility at UNR. Mrs. Berkley seconded.

Dr. Hammargren questioned what the actual land was worth and what the actual investment would be on this property. He requested a sounder proposal be brought before this Board before approval.

President Crowley stated that the Board has entrusted the Chancellor to make sound business practice decisions. And he assured the Board that ROC will pay its share of expenses, such as utilities, etc.

Dr. Rick Mullins, orthopedic physician, stated that he has worked with Dr. Dales. He stated that he was concerned about this proposal. UNR has a good medical group working with them now, and he would hate to see it jeopardized. He indicated to the Board that Dr. Dales is concerned about this project, although there is no other medical group the size of ROC that could make such an offer to UNR.

Mr. Sandi reiterated that the documentation would be non-exclusive, that Dr. Dales will remain as UNR's Team Physician, that the student athlete could choose his/her own physician, that there would not be time arrangement, that this is a charitable gesture on the part of ROC, and that it will be a totally ethical proposal.

Chairman Sparks asked President Crowley if this issue could be delayed until further information is received, and President Crowley stated that he is aware of the concerns proposed by the community, but did not feel it was necessary to survey every physician in the area regarding this issue. He believes that this proposal is in the best interest of UNR and would hate to miss this opportunity.

It was clarified that the student athlete would probably not have the opportunity to choose a physician during an emergency, but would be able to choose a physician for rehabilitation and minor injuries. President Crowley responded to a question that UNLV does have a MS in Physical Therapy and it was his understanding that it has received over 300 applications for admission to the program, with several applications from the northern part of the State. UNR has a Bachelor of Science Program and is hopeful that someday UNR can establish a Masters Program in Physical Therapy.

Mrs. Berkley stated that she would vote in favor of the proposal because it demonstrates a new and creative way to build new buildings on the Campuses. It is a marriage between the private sector and the University.

Chairman Sparks requested that the final documentation be brought before the Board for its approval. General Counsel Klasic stated that UNR will have the option to purchase the building after 50 years and if it is unable to do so, then ROC can lease it back to UNR.

Regents Derby and Hammargren voted no. Motion carried.

Chairman Sparks indicated that Chancellor Dawson would report back to the Board after he meets with the Interim Finance Committee.

25. Approved Concept of Waiver of Out-of-State Tuition, UNLV

Approved in concept to waive out-of-state tuition for Navajo students on the Navajo reservation who are recommended by Mr. Peterson Zah, President of the Navajo Nation, and meet UNLV admission requirements.

General Counsel Klasic did not recommend approval. To adopt this policy would open the University of Nevada to a reverse discrimination suit. Under the U. S. Supreme Court's decisions, preferences can be shown to minority groups only when there has been a history of discrimination by the institutions against the minority group in question. Preference in that case is needed to offset the discrimination. The discrimination must be specific. General Counsel Klasic is unaware of any history of specific discrimination by the University of Nevada against Navajos. General Counsel Klasic also stated for the record that the agreement is addressed to the "System" and suggested that input from

other institutions is necessary.

President Maxson explained that the Navajo Nation is 250,000 strong and it has made similar arrangements with other Colleges around the country. He projected that approximately 10-15 students per year would take advantage of this proposal. It would provide a cultural diversity on the Campus and felt it was a positive matter, although he deferred his remarks to General Counsel Klasic's legal concerns.

General Counsel Klasic recommended denial of the request.

He mentioned that Nevada does not even have a Navajo Reservation. He cautioned the Board that if all factors are equal, then the minority background could be reviewed, but it does not meet the requirements. He stated that there were other ways to approach this issue.

Dr. Hammargren questioned whether there were any scholarship funds that could be designated to the Navajo Nation, and it was stated that there was a "Native American Scholarship" fund.

President Peterson Zah thanked the Board for the opportunity to address this issue. He explained that at one time the

Navajo people did not believe in formal education, but now believes it is a way to achieve as a nation and to survive.

There are government agreements in Arizona, Utah and New Mexico that waive out-of-state tuition. The Navajo tribe does not have the facilities to send its young people to learn higher education. In 1983 there were approximately 1133 Navajo students, now there are approximately 5000-6000 students.

Mrs. Berkley stated that she was in support of the request and asked General Counsel Klasic if he had researched this issue with Universities in other states, and he responded that both New Mexico and Utah have the Navajo Nation within their states and that Colorado advised not to proceed with this request. Although there are U. S./Navajo Nation agreements, the U. S. Supreme Court has its own standards - they can and the stated government can't. In regard to WICHE, it is a reciprocal agreement. He stated that this request is not the way to handle this issue and he offered to report back to the Board with other alternatives.

Mr. Klaich requested that the item be tabled and that General Counsel Klasic, Chairman Sparks and President Maxson discuss this issue further and report back to the Board.

Mrs. Gallagher moved to approve in concept the waiving of out-of-state tuition for Navajo students living on the Navajo Reservation who are recommended by Mr. Peterson Zah, President of the Navajo Nation, and meet UNLV admission requirements, and that Chancellor Dawson and General Counsel Klasic explore different ways to accomplish this request with the assistance of Affirmative Action Officers. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

Mrs. Gallagher and Mr. Klaich left the meeting.

26. Approved Naming of Building, School of Medicine

Approved the naming of the new Speech Pathology and Student Health Service building, to be opened this Summer, in honor of Nell J. Redfield.

The Nell J. Redfield Foundation has been a generous donor to the School, and to the University in general. The most recent gift, \$400,000, will permit UNR to have a fully functioning building at the time of opening.

Dr. Eardley moved approval of the naming of the new Speech

Pathology and Student Health Service building in honor of

Nell J. Redfield. Dr. Hammargren seconded. Motion carried.

27. Approved Reciprocal Exchange Program Waivers, UNR

Approved to waive the tuition and fees for the Samantha Smith Undergraduate Exchange Program participants. The University participates in the congressionally authorized Samantha Smith Undergraduate Exchange Program. In recent competition, four University of Nevada students were selected as scholarship recipients and are spending the Spring 1992 semester in Czechoslovakia or Poland. The host Universities in these countries are providing free tuition and room and board for UNR students.

As part of the Samantha Smith Undergraduate Exchange Program, UNR is hosting four Eastern European students, two for the Spring 1992 semester and two in the Fall 1992 semester. UNR's obligations under the program are to provide free tuition and fees and room and board for these students. Room and board arrangements for these students have been made by the University. It is now requested that UNR be authorized to waive the tuition and fees for these exchange program participants.

Dr. Eardley moved approval of the reciprocal exchange program waivers at UNR for the Samantha Smith Undergraduate Exchange Program participants. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

Mrs. Gallagher and Mr. Klaich returned to the meeting.

28. Approved Handbook Changes, Student Health, Fee, UNLV

Approved Handbook changes, Title 4, Chapter 17, Section 10, Student Fees at UNLV, as outlined below. The students have approved this increase by vote of the student body.

Section 10. Student Fees

Student Health and Accident Insurance

	UNR	UNLV
Optional		
Annual Premium		
Student Only	228	384
Spouse Only	NA	622
Spouse, Pregnancy Added	NA	1,244

Children Only	NA	592
Student and Spouse	1,429	1,878
Student and Child	576	936
Student, Spouse and Child	1,777	NA
Each Additional Child	348	NA
Student and Children	NA	1,248
Student and Family	NA	2,790

Summer Session

Student Only	62	32
Spouse Only	NA	NA
Children Only	NA	NA
Student and Spouse	388	158
Student and Child	156	78
Student, Spouse and Child	482	NA
Each Additional Child	94	NA
Student and Children	NA	104
Student and Family	NA	232

Health Service Fee 50 20*

*\$20 per semester to be assessed to all undergraduate and graduate, full- and part-time students. Exceptions include special, continuing education and Senior Citizens

Program students. Undergraduate special students may receive services by paying a \$20 voluntary fee on the first visit to the Center. In the event a student drops all courses, refunds will be given in accordance with established policy.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the Handbook change regarding Student Health Fees at UNLV. Mrs. Berkley seconded.

President Maxson stated that the proposed change has caused much debate on the UNLV Campus. He explained that the UNLV Student Health Service traditionally holds the student fees at the lowest level possible, but health costs are rising and it is necessary to raise the fees, but only those that are absolutely necessary. President Maxson noted that this issue has come before him during the last 8 years, but he had always felt inclined to keep student fees at its minimum; however, the current student body has approved the fee increase. This issue was brought before the students twice; once to assess a \$20 per semester fee, but the ballot was in error, so it went before the student body again with the correction and was approved by the student body. President Maxson stated that upon approval by the student body, he recommends the fee increase.

Throughout this process, an issue has arisen in regard to using non-State funds to publicize the election. President Maxson explained that funds were used to prepare a brochure throughout the Campus. The student body government considers this as a campaign for student health fee increase and, in addition, felt that the Student Health Center acted on behalf of the institution's Administration, which should not have been involved with the election process.

CSUN President Joel Kostman stated that the student government remained neutral in the election process and relayed that there was a 2:1 margin in support of this increase. However, it is his understanding that the Student Health Center obtained funds from the Vice President of Student Services for distribution of the information brochure. Students have expressed their displeasure in this action, therefore he felt it was necessary to bring this issue before the Board of Regents.

Mr. Ken Tomory of the UNLV Student Health Advisory Committee stated that a survey was distributed to 1362 students with the following results:

837 students would pay the increase

520 students would not pay the increase

Chairman Sparks relinquished the gavel to Vice Chairman Eardley.

Mr. Tomory stated that the intent of the Student Health Center was not to lobby the students, but to relay information to them so they could vote responsibly.

Mrs. Berkley stated that student health services are very important, especially with the new Residence Halls coming on line. She has received the brochure and felt it was very informative. She stated that she did not enjoy raising student fees, but felt that the health services are warranted on the UNLV Campus.

Motion carried.

29. Approved Handbook Change, Salary Schedules, UNLV

Approved a Handbook change, Title 4, Chapter 3, Salary Schedules, UNLV, as contained in Ref. D, filed in the Regents' Office.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the Handbook change regarding Salary Schedules at UNLV. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

30. Approved Handbook Change, Bylaws and Faculty Manual, DRI

Approved the Bylaws and Personnel Manual for the Faculty of the Desert Research Institute, as contained in Ref. L and Ref. M, respectively, filed in the Regents' Office.

These documents have been brought forward by the DRI Faculty Senate and have its approval.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the Bylaws and Personnel Manual for the Faculty at DRI. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

31. Approved Handbook Changes, Early Retirement, DRI

Approved changes to the Handbook, Title 4, Chapter 3, Section 24, University and Community College System of Nevada Early Retirement Incentive Program, as contained in Ref. N, filed in the Regents' Office.

Mr. Klaich moved approval of the Handbook changes regarding UCCSN Early Retirement Incentive Program at DRI. Mrs. Gallagher seconded. Motion carried.

32. Emergency Item: Building Plans, TMCC

Chancellor Dawson requested approval of building drawing plans for TMCC. He explained that the Board had approved the project, but the plans had not been submitted for approval and the State Public Works Board could not allow the project to continue.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval to accept the emergency item regarding building drawing plans for TMCC. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

33. Approved Building Plans, TMCC

Approved building drawing plans for TMCC as presented.

Mrs. Gallagher moved approval of the building drawing plans for TMCC. Mrs. Berkley seconded. Motion carried.

34. Information Only: Recommendation for Promotion or Assignment to Rank, UNR

The following recommendation for promotion or assignment to rank has been forwarded for Board consideration. This is an information item only, with Board action scheduled for the June 25-26, 1992 meeting.

A. University of Nevada, Reno - President Crowley recommends the following promotion, effective July 1, 1992:

Robert T. King to Professor, Oral History Program,
College of Arts and Science

35. Information Only: Recommendations for Award to Tenure, UNR and UNLV

The following recommendations for award to tenure has been forwarded for Board consideration. This is an information item only, with Board action scheduled for the June 25-26, 1992 meeting.

A. University of Nevada, Reno - President Crowley recommends the following award to tenure, effective July 1,

1992, to the following:

Fritz Grupe, Accounting/Computer Information Systems,

Business Administration

James H. Trexler, Geology, School of Mines

B. University of Nevada, Las Vegas - President Maxson

recommends the following award to tenure, effective

July 1, 1992, to the following:

Maria G. Ramirez, ICS, College of Education

Chancellor Dawson introduced Mrs. Virginia Pickering who will be graduating from the University of Nevada, Reno with a Bachelor of Arts and Science. She is the mother of staff member, Leslie Jacques, who is also receiving her Bachelor of Arts degree.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

Mary Lou Moser

Secretary of the Board

05-14-1992