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The meeting was called to order at 9:09 a.m. on Friday, December 16, 2011, with all members of the Regents’ ad hoc UNR President Search Committee present except for Regent Crear.

1. **Information - Public Comment (Agenda item #1)** – None.

   Regent Crear entered the meeting.

2. **Information - President Search Process (Agenda item #3)** – Mr. William Funk, of R. William Funk & Associates, the Search Consultant selected at the December 9, 2011, committee meeting led a discussion on the president search process.

   Mr. Kirk Clausen confirmed his attendance via teleconference.

   Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, related that Mr. Funk would explain the search process that will result in semifinalists being brought to the committees shortly after the beginning of the 2012 year. Mr. Wasserman stated that the committees will provide Mr. Funk with direction such as how many semifinalists to bring back. At that meeting, the semifinalists’ applications will be reviewed and narrowed down to a smaller number that will then be invited to interview with the committees. Also, it was anticipated that the presidential leadership statement and advertisement would be finalized that day.

   Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich related that Mr. Funk had been provided with UNR’s most recent self-study, its course catalog and budget information including the state and self-supporting budgets. He and Mr. Funk had also discussed this meeting, the open meeting law and other aspects of the process. Chancellor Klaich stated that the contract would also be executed that day.

   Chairman Leavitt asked that the list of the documents provided to Mr. Funk be forwarded to the committees and that any recommendations for further materials be provided to Mr. Wasserman.

   Mr. Funk expressed his excitement in having been selected for the UNR President search. He related that he had already received a nomination from one of the University’s constituents.
2. **Information - President Search Process (Agenda item #3) – (Cont’d.)**

Mr. Funk related that this first phase of the process includes approval of the president leadership statement and advertisement. The next phase will be candidate selection. Mr. Funk explained that his firm will conduct original research to locate and identify those candidates that would be an excellent benefit for the institution. That research will target no fewer than 50 individuals from around the country. A letter will be sent to his firm’s propriety list of leaders in higher education to tell them about UNR’s search and ask them for their best nominations. That effort will result in between 5-25 suggestions or nominations.

Mr. Harvey Whittemore asked if committee members were precluded from making nominations in light of their participation in the selection process. He did not want any one candidate to be excluded or included as a result of any action taken by the committees’ members. Mr. Wasserman replied that all persons, including committee members should present nominations to the search consultant for due diligence.

Chairman Leavitt emphasized that when a nomination is forwarded it is not necessarily with the endorsement of the committee member. He asked if a form would be available for committee members to submit nominations. Mr. Wasserman stated that it would be appropriate for any nominations to be made directly to either himself or to Mr. Funk.

Chairman Leavitt asked if it was appropriate for non-committee members to also contact Mr. Funk. Mr. Wasserman stated any person can contact Mr. Funk directly with nominations. He also related that nominations received by the Board office prior to selection of the search firm have also now been provided to Mr. Funk.

Regent Geddes indicated that it would be appropriate to disclose any relationships once the list of semifinalists is released to the committees.

Mr. Joe Bradley felt that in symposiums held on campus in the days following President Glick’s death, there had been a solicitation for nominations. He asked if that list had been retained and if it could be provided to Mr. Funk. Chairman Leavitt clarified that the solicitation was for the position of interim president.

Mr. Wasserman also confirmed that the nominations made at that time were for the position of interim president. However, some of the remarks that went toward what qualifications were being sought in a permanent leader have been incorporated in the presidential leadership statement before the committees that day.

Chancellor Klaich indicated that he would share with Mr. Funk the memo that he prepared and submitted to the Board of Regents regarding those meetings.

Mr. Funk shared an example of a letter that would be sent to the friends of the university (*handout on file in the Board office*). He stated that it would be up to the institution if it wants to further develop and/or decide to send that letter out.
2. **Information - President Search Process** *(Agenda item #3) – (Cont’d.)*

Mr. Whittemore felt that the letter was entirely appropriate but recommended two changes. The first was in regard to nomenclature and asked that University of Nevada, Reno be used instead of just the University of Nevada. Secondly, the website address for the UNR President Search needed to be corrected to include a hyphen between president and search *(http://www.unr.edu/president-search)*.

Mr. Funk shared a draft of a potential advertisement *(handout on file in the Board office)* of the size and length that he would recommend. He indicated that the language had been taken from the draft president leadership statement. Mr. Funk recommended two changes. The first would be in eliminating the hard deadline date of March 15th and to replace it with a statement to the effect of “That while applications and nominations will be accepted until a new president is selected, interested parties are encouraged to send their materials by a certain date *(April 1st or later)* to receive optimal consideration.” That would allow the committee to consider late arrivals and not exclude a potentially perfect candidate from applying.

In regard to the leadership statement, Mr. Funk encouraged the committee to delete the request for five letters of reference, adding that has a tendency to chill the pool if candidates are concerned about confidentiality at the front end of the search process.

Mr. Funk also suggested the elimination of specific lengths of time. For instance, if ten years of experience is required and a potential candidate has nine and a half, it may prevent a potential perfect candidate from applying.

Regent Geddes suggested that Mr. Funk work with the institution for the sake of consistency. Also, as Ms. Cordova has indicated, state law has changed in regard to affirmative action and the language on the draft advertisement needs to be updated.

Chancellor Klaich deferred to Mr. Funk but he felt that it was important to be comfortable with the leadership statement as the advertisement would be a distillation of that statement.

Mr. Wasserman indicated that Mr. Funk should finish his presentation of the search process and then the leadership statement, proposed letter and advertisement can be fully vetted during agenda item #4.

Mr. Funk related that the steps to build the candidate pool will begin immediately. The Chronicle of Higher Education is on hiatus for the holidays and will not publish again until January 6, 2012. He recommended that an advertisement be placed in the January 6 and January 13 editions of that publication to reach the maximum viewship.

Mr. Funk cautioned that advertising is an expensive proposition and that it was important to identify other publications. For example, in the previous year, the University of Southern California saw the search for a president as an opportunity to promote what the institution has accomplished in the last 25 years. Although normally his firm would handle the advertising, USC handled it in that instance and spent approximately $653,000 on advertising.
2. Information - President Search Process (*Agenda item #3*) – (Cont’d.)

Mr. Funk continued that to run an advertisement of the size in the example currently before the committees two times would cost approximately $10,000. If the committees want to advertise in other minority publications, the cost will generally double. Mr. Funk reminded the committee that the best candidates will not respond to advertisements, adding that it is used more as a communication tool.

Mr. Funk related that between April 1 and 15, 2012, the pool of candidates should be generally finalized. Between that day and the pre-determined deadline date, he will have conducted stakeholder meetings, interviewed and conducted research and preliminary background checks on the better candidates. In addition, before the short list of semifinalists is presented to the committees, criminal litigation and credit background checks will have been conducted. He anticipated the presentation of the semifinalists would occur in mid- to late April.

Chairman Leavitt asked Mr. Wasserman if the committees would determine the number of candidates that Mr. Funk should submit as semifinalists. Mr. Wasserman replied that typically Mr. Funk would bring back a certain number of semifinalists such as ten, with all the applicable materials and references. The committees would then review that material and narrow that list down to five finalists to interview. From those five finalist interviews, perhaps three would be brought back for campus visits with the new president being selected from one of those three.

Regent Page asked Mr. Funk if he has seen a magic number of semifinalists that works well. Mr. Funk related that each search is different. Typically, except in all open records states, the candidates are confidential until they visit the campus. In five to seven states that have open meetings including Nevada, the process is open from some earlier point. Some candidates may feel that being one of ten candidates is still not sufficient odds to reveal themselves as a possible short-list candidate. He felt that would be the challenge. He felt that eight would be a good number for the list of semifinalists, that ten may be too many but that six would be too few. He agreed that it would be appropriate to then narrow that list to five or six interviews and then down to three for campus visits.

Dr. Donica Mensing expressed concern for the timing of campus visits as May 8, 2012, is the last day of classes.

In that regard, Regent Trachock asked to hear from the committees to determine a sense of when the deadline should be and how many semifinalists should be presented. He wanted as many qualified applicants as possible but felt that if left open too long, the process could become too burdensome.

Mr. Whittemore related that because of the open meeting law and having been involved in these discussions on a statewide basis, he felt that the number of semifinalists should be narrowed to six. Of those six, three should be brought back for campus visits. From his perspective, there needs to be three top candidates. He felt
2. **Information - President Search Process (Agenda item #3) – (Cont’d.)**

that having eight or ten candidates with a longer application period would cause potentially good candidates not to apply. He felt that April 1st may be too late. He realized that made it difficult on the search consultant but the institution wanted the process to be done as quickly as possible and pushing it further out means that the faculty, staff and students may not have the opportunity to provide the level of input they deserve.

Ms. Mary Simmons asked Mr. Funk what the usual time schedule is. Mr. Funk related the next three weeks occur over the holidays, making it difficult to contact potential candidates. That time can be spent focusing on research and infrastructure. He stated that it takes ten to twelve weeks to develop a candidate pool. In addition, other timeline issues need to be considered such as the placement of advertisements in the Chronicle of Higher Education which will not run until January 6, 2012.

Regent Geddes felt that mid-March needed to be targeted in order to conduct interviews by April 1. He also felt that the number of candidates should be six to eight at the most.

Mr. Chuck Price agreed with Regent Geddes. He recommended that on-campus interviews be conducted prior to May 1 at the latest.

Dr. Bill Follette agreed with the smaller number of semifinalists and endorsed Mr. Funk’s suggestion to narrow the list to six semifinalists but was open to bringing more if those candidates where worth considering. He felt that the campus needs closure but it also needs to participate. Dr. Follette stated that he also assumed that Mr. Funk probably has contacts that have expressed interest in finding other positions. Mr. Funk expressed his comfort with the timeframe and the number of six semifinalists, adding that those potential candidates may be far more willing to go public with the smaller pool.

Regent Page asked if a date was required or if the position could be advertised as open until filled. Mr. Funk recommended that type of format and that it does not preclude the process from moving earlier.

Ms. Simmons asked if the semifinalists would be narrowed to six by March 15. That would provide two weeks to narrow that list to three that will be invited for campus visits.

Mr. Wasserman summarized that if the number of semifinalists is six, then the committees will immediately narrow those six to the finalist group of three. Those three would be invited back for an interview and campus visits. He has always been advised that once names become public, the candidates want the process to move quickly. If six candidates were brought to the committee on March 15, one week later the next committee meeting could be held to interview the three finalists, with the campus visits and the committees’ final selection being held the week after that.
2. **Information - President Search Process (Agenda item #3) — (Cont’d.)**

Dr. Angie Taylor noted that spring break is from March 15 to 22, 2012. She felt that there was a natural cut to narrow the semifinalists from six to three. She also cautioned that transparency was critical and that it would be a mistake to drag the process into May.

Dr. Follette agreed that campus participation was critical.

Chairman Leavitt asked if Mr. Funk should be provided the discretion to bring a minimum of six but up to eight if the candidates are appropriate.

Mr. Alfredo Alonso felt that there should be a firm number of six semifinalists.

Chairman Leavitt reminded the committees that when the first list of six semifinalists is presented, it is on paper only. The candidates will not be present to interview.

Dr. Follette wanted Mr. Funk to submit the smallest group of good, qualified candidates at Mr. Funk’s recommendation. He was hoping that Mr. Funk will assert some judgment.

Chancellor Klaich felt that the committees had been clear in asking Mr. Funk to return in mid-March with semifinalists. However, he felt that it would be wise not to put hard dates on that but to let Mr. Wasserman figure that into the overall meeting schedule. He also felt that the committee has expressed a desire to see the smaller number of six semifinalists. He agreed with Dr. Follette that Mr. Funk was being paid for his professional judgment.

Mr. Bob Davidson felt that it would be appropriate to target six, plus or minus with Mr. Funk’s judgment.

Regent Trachok expressed concern that March 15 would be too late. However, he felt that narrowing the semifinalists to six, plus or minus, and leaving it up to Mr. Funk’s judgment was appropriate.

Chairman Leavitt asked Mr. Wasserman to share the tentative schedule. Mr. Wasserman related that the following schedule was subject to consultation with the Board Chair, the Committee Chair and the Board of Regents schedule:

- Friday, March 16 – Committee reviews the number of semifinalists brought forward and narrows that list to three.
- Friday, March 23 – Committee interview the three finalists.
- Monday, March 26 and Thursday, March 29 – campus visits could occur for the three finalists.
- Friday, March 30 – Mr. Funk would report back to the committee on those visits and the committee would make its final decision.
2. Information - President Search Process *(Agenda item #3) – (Cont’d.)*

Mr. Wasserman stated that the committees’ recommendation could potentially be made to the Board on April 20, 2012, *(tentatively scheduled special meeting date)*, or sooner at the Board Chair’s discretion.

Chairman Leavitt asked for concerns regarding the March 23 date since it was the last day of spring break. Ms. Simmons indicated that she would be out of the country but would read the materials if they were sent to her.

Chairman Leavitt emphasized that the proposed dates were tentative.

The meeting recessed at 10:22 a.m. and reconvened at 10:28 a.m. on Friday, December 16, 2011, with all members present.

3. Action Taken - President Leadership Statement and Related Materials *(Agenda item #4) -

The committees and the consultant reviewed and approved with changes the proposed leadership profile, advertisement and other related materials for the UNR Presidential Search *(handout on file in the Board office)*.

Chancellor Klaich encouraged the committee members to look hard at the statement but stated that the process needed to be reach completion that day. He asked that substantial errors or problems be brought forward.

Regent Crear indicated that his request to include a bullet point under Challenges and Opportunities to address the health sciences program and the statewide mission of the medical school appears to have been incorporated under “Address the Quality of Health Care through University Programs” *(page 4)*. Mr. Wasserman confirmed that the comments heard at the previous committee meeting were incorporated into the new draft presented that day.

Dr. Mensing asked if there should be mention of the economic issues occurring in the state and on the campus.

Chairman Leavitt felt that the current economic situation could be included under Challenges and Opportunities and asked Mr. Funk for his thoughts. Mr. Funk stated that he had been impressed with the document so far. He did not feel that a bullet point to address the economic situation would do any harm. However, he felt that economic difficulty was considered the new normal around the country.

Dr. Mensing asked if other campuses have laid-off 30 tenured faculty members and cut salaries as UNR has. Mr. Funk stated yes, that there were many that have had to do that. Chancellor Klaich and Regent Geddes also stated that there were many campuses where that has occurred.
3. **Action Taken - President Leadership Statement and Related Materials** *(Agenda item #4) – (Cont’d.)*

Mr. Bruce Shively questioned a reference in the first paragraph in the Challenges and Opportunities section that indicates the university is experiencing tremendous growth and development. He suggested that at a minimum that phrase should be revised to state “As is typical in any academic environment, challenges and opportunities exist.” He indicated an additional reference along those lines in the fourth bullet point on page 3 that “capacity and activity continue to grow at a rapid pace.” He did not feel those were accurate characterizations of the institution at this point in time.

Regent Geddes stated that although he agreed with Mr. Shively and somewhat with Dr. Mensing, he did not want to place negatives in the leadership statement when potential candidates will receive that information via other avenues and materials. He clarified that the leadership statement should not over-sell the situation but should also paint an accurate picture.

Mr. Davidson agreed that there should be nothing misleading or misrepresented of the situation but he did not feel that the institution needed to go out of its way to imagine that UNR is the only institution with financial problems.

Mr. Rick Hsu expressed concern that the leadership statement convey the importance that fundraising will be for the next president. In addition, Mr. Hsu felt that bullet points “Enhance the Positive Relationships among the University and its Communities” *(page 3)* and “Enhance Research and Economic Development Activity” *(page 3)* should be moved higher on the list of challenges. He felt that moving those two bullets up would reflect that fundraising was a priority without making it a message about dollars.

Mr. Wasserman referred to the third bullet point of the working draft dated December 9, 2011, titled “Lead Major Institutional Development Efforts,” and felt that spoke to the importance of fundraising.

Mr. Price recommended that a statement be included under an existing bullet point, or a separate one, that identifies the economic challenges that the institution has had and that it will continue to have in as positive a light as possible.

Chairman Leavitt asked if the committees agreed with the inclusion of a bullet point that positively indicates that Nevada is experiencing resource-constrained times similar to other states and that those resources need to be managed well.

Regent Page felt that if a candidate could not figure out that resources are constrained during this time that the institution did not want them.

Mr. Davidson felt that was a good point, adding that even in good times, the institution wants a president that can manage resources. Although it was important to achieve those goals, he felt that it would not be appropriate to paint the situation into such a picture that the institution has lost its confidence and optimism about the future.
3. **Action Taken - President Leadership Statement and Related Materials (Agenda item #4)**

(Cont’d.)

Mr. Wasserman suggested a revision to the first sentence of the first bullet point on page 2 to state “Student enrollment is projected to continue growing over the next several years at an average annual rate of about 3% while facing declining state support and resource constrained times in higher education nationally.”

Mr. Whittemore asked if a centralized on-line location could be created to include resource and background materials that will allow potential candidates to make their own judgment on whether this is a state and institution that they want to come to. He felt that would also add transparency to the process.

Chancellor Klaich indicated that many of those materials had been requested by and provided to Mr. Funk. He will ask that those materials be linked to UNR’s presidential search website.

Dr. Follette applauded close consideration of the presidential leadership statement. However, from his experience during the last search in 2004, it became apparent that there is variability among good candidates on how much they will look at the materials ranging between scouring the website and not looking at it much at all. He felt that providing access to the materials was a great idea. However, he felt that the committees may have invested as much into the leadership statement as it will receive a return on.

Mr. Erik Williams indicated that there was already a budget update page on UNR’s general website. Ms. Patricia Richard confirmed that there was.

Mr. Shively noted that page 1 of the statement refers to the University as having a Tier 1 ranking in the top 150 public universities. He felt that the correct reference was actually in the top 100.

Mr. Wasserman thanked Ms. Richards for working on the leadership statement and for coordinating much of the updated information. He asked Ms. Richards to verify if that revision would be appropriate. Ms. Richards stated that Mr. Shively was correct.

Regent Crear related that his philosophy was not to dwell on the past but to state that the institution is moving forward, to present who it is and where it is going. He stated that it was a new day, a new time and it was the new president’s time to establish what he or she wanted to do moving forward. That should be the culture of the institution and potential candidates should already know there are financial issues.

Dr. Rita Laden noted that the fourth bullet point on page 4 (Engage in Innovative Partnerships), references Washoe County’s Education Collaborative but indicated that needed to be updated to its new name, Washoe County’s Education Alliance.

Dr. Stephen Lafer referred to the first bullet point on page 3 (Prioritize and Implement University Goals), that states “With an established foundation for strategic planning now in place, it is important for the University to continue allocating its resources in ways
3. **Action Taken - President Leadership Statement and Related Materials (Agenda item #4) – (Cont'd.)**

That best achieve its objective for the future.” He asked that statement be expanded to indicate that the candidate has an opportunity to define the institution’s objectives.

Chairman Leavitt felt that the last sentence of that bullet point “The president must be a consensus builder and work in consultation with all stakeholders, both internal and external, to articulate a vision for the University and develop a prioritized set of goals.” would help candidates further understand their role in that process. Mr. Wasserman agreed with Chairman Leavitt but noted the phrase in the first sentence could be changed to read “…in ways that best plan and achieve its objective for the future.”

Mr. Shively noted that the third bullet point on page 3 (Enhance Research and Economic Development), refers to an Institute for Innovation and Informatics. However, that Institute no longer exists on the UNR campus and asked that it be deleted from the statement.

Mr. Shively referred to the last bullet point on page 4 (Implement the Campus Master Plan and Manage University Properties), and noted that most of that reference relates to the strategic plan developed by former President John Lilley. He questioned if that plan was still appropriate or accurately reflected where the institution was currently headed. However, he did feel that property management would be critical for the next president in terms of addressing development of the Redfield campus, a medical school campus in southern Nevada and final steps in closure of the Fire Science Academy. Regent Geddes stated that he would rather there be a general statement on property management than to list the properties.

Mr. Wasserman recommended to keep that bullet point title the same (Implement the Campus Master Plan and Manage University Properties) but delete everything except the final sentence and then edit that sentence to read “The next president will have an opportunity to fully implement the campus master plan and shape the future physical environment of the campus for years to come throughout the entire state. ”

Dr. Laden referred to the last paragraph on page 7 and emphasized the need to update that affirmative action statement to include all the protected groups as statutorily identified during the last legislative session. Mr. Wasserman asked that Dr. Laden provide the accurate wording for that statement.

Mr. Dave Brackett referred to page 1 of the Overview, noting that it referred to the institution as a “Research I institution.” However, it was his understanding that nomenclature has been changed by the Carnegie Foundation to “Research University with High Activity” (RU/H). He felt that updating that designation would make the statement more correct and more contemporary.

Regent Crear felt that before making an official change, confirmation needed to be sought from an authority on campus to ensure that the designation is reflected accurately. Mr. Wasserman stated that he would work with the University on the correct terminology.
3. **Action Taken - President Leadership Statement and Related Materials (Agenda item #4)** (Cont’d.)

Mr. Wasserman sensed that the previously discussed statement “while facing declining state support and resource constrained times in higher education nationally” would not be included and that information will be available on the website and that the general feeling was that the economic situation is known nationally.

Regent Geddes move to approve the presidential prospectus (leadership statement) with the changes presented that day. Regent Page seconded. Motion carried.

4. **Approved - Advertising Options (Agenda item #5)** - The committees discussed and approved placement of advertisements for the UNR President search twice in the Chronicle of Higher Education, including once on January 6, 2012, and once each in the Hispanic Outlook, Women in Higher Education and Diverse Issues in Higher Education.

Mr. Funk related that there was a litany of individual minority group publications and that unfortunately, the smaller the readership, the higher the rate. He was not familiar with Asian Week and felt that Higheredjobs.com was not necessary.

Mr. Wasserman asked Mr. Funk if he was recommending advertisements in the remaining four publications: Chronicle of Higher Education, Hispanic Outlook, Women in Higher Education and Diverse Issues in Higher Education. Mr. Funk indicated that was correct, adding that depending on the allotted budget, advertising in the Chronicle of Higher Education was critical.

Mr. Whittemore asked Mr. Funk what he would recommend for an advertising budget. Mr. Funk felt that in order to cast a wide net, advertisement in a minimum of four publications would be necessary including the Chronicle of Higher Education as a priority. He related that the cost to run an advertisement twice in the Chronicle of Higher Education would cost approximately $10,000. The other three publications mentioned would together cost approximately $10,000. Mr. Funk added that the Chronicle is a weekly publication whereas the others are published twice monthly.

Regent Page questioned the need to advertise in the Chronicle twice.

Mr. Funk stated that for presidential searches, the final three to five candidates are 98.9 percent of the time individuals targeted by the search firm or nominated by a third party. Advertisements are used more as a communications tool rather than a recruiting tool.

Regent Crear felt that the discussion should not be about how to save money but rather for how to cast the widest net possible. He asked how the commitment to pursuing diversity could be followed through without advertising in multiple publications throughout the country. He felt that it was not appropriate to solely rely upon Mr.
4. **Approved - Advertising Options (Agenda item #5) – (Cont’d.)**

Funk and his contacts and that a broad based advertising and media strategy was needed to attract individuals. He stated that the Board has a fiduciary duty to this institution, the System and to all individuals that reside in this state to have as much of a broad based search as possible. He asked if the list of publications submitted was recommended by Mr. Funk or if it had been provided to him.

Mr. Funk stated that although the Chronicle of Higher Education, Hispanic Outlook, Women in Higher Education and Diverse Issues in Higher Education happen to be four publications that his firm typically uses, the list had been provided by the Board office.

Regent Crear felt that was a backwards process and that the committees had hired a search consultant for their expertise to create a strategy to find a broad based and diversified group of individuals and then return to the committees with a plan on what it will take to properly execute the will of the organization. For instance, Regent Crear stated that although the list of publications does not appear to specifically target African Americans, he would hope that Mr. Funk has a way of targeting and reaching that population. He felt that it was Mr. Funk’s role to return to the committees with a recommended media strategy.

Mr. Funk related that Diversity Issues in Higher Education was formerly titled Black Issues in Education. He added that although it was easy for him to spend the System’s money, he has to collaborate with the clients within their budget constraints.

Regent Crear related that in his business, he first meets with the clients to understand their strategy and objectives in order to establish a plan to meet the needs of the strategy. If the plan is too rich for the client, then the strategy needs to be addressed. He was looking to Mr. Funk to tell the committees what the plan will be to meet the objectives of the strategy.

Mr. Funk explained that his approach was from a different perspective. Regardless of the color of the candidate, the best candidates do not come from the advertisements. Secondly, he takes other significant actions to create a diverse pool of candidates such as having 125 out his 500 person mailing list being of color and proven to be good resources. He does not rely upon the advertisements because he felt they did not produce good candidates of any color.

Mr. Whittemore asked if an advertising budget of $20,000 was appropriate to cast a net that is somewhat useful as Mr. Funk has indicated.

Mr. Wasserman related that the budget is established by the Board Chair in consultation with the Chancellor and himself as CEO of the Board. Depending on the number of advertising options chosen by the committees, it has already been determined that $10,000 to $20,000 would be an acceptable range. The list of publications included on the agenda is derived from recommendations made by the search consultants in previous presidential searches.
4. **Approved - Advertising Options (Agenda item #5) – (Cont’d.)**

   Regent Page moved approval for an advertising budget of up to $20,000. Regent Crear seconded.

   Chairman Leavitt noted that the $20,000 budget would allow for advertisements to be placed twice in the Chronicle of Higher Education and once each in the Hispanic Outlook, Women in Higher Education and Diverse Issues in Higher Education.

   Regent Melcher asked that if the Board Chair and the Chancellor set the budget, was it then wise for the Board to take action on a specific number. He asked if a friendly amendment could be made to the motion to instead indicate the specific publications and the number of times.

   Regents Page and Crear accepted the friendly amendment to place advertisements twice in the Chronicle of Higher Education and once each in the Hispanic Outlook, Women in Higher Education and Diverse Issues in Higher Education.

   Regent Geddes asked Mr. Funk if there was any real value in advertising in the Chronicle twice. Secondly, he asked if any significant publications were missing from the list provided. Mr. Funk recommended advertisement in the Chronicle on January 6, as that is one of two “back to school” issues with one of the largest readership of the year. He recommended advertising in the Chronicle at least once for $5,000 and then once each in the other three publications listed for a total of approximately $15,000.

   Regent Page asked to amend the motion to indicate advertisement once in the Chronicle. Regent Crear declined the amendment.

   Mr. Wasserman clarified that the motion still on the table was to approve advertising twice in the Chronicle of Higher Education, including once on January 6, 2012, and once each in the Hispanic Outlook, Women in Higher Education and Diverse Issues in Higher Education.

   Upon a roll call vote, Regents Geddes, Leavitt, Melcher, Trachok and Crear voted yes. Regent Page voted no. Motion carried.

   Dr. Mensing suggested the need to advertise in locations other than solely in print, such as on-line to reach non-traditional candidates.

   Regent Page related that his vote against advertising twice in the Chronicle was a reflection of having hired Mr. Funk as the consultant with many resources to ensure a diversified pool of candidates.

5. **Information – New Business (Agenda item #6) – None.**
6. **Information – Public Comment (Agenda item #7) – None.**

The meeting adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

Prepared by: Jessica C. McMullen
Special Assistant and Coordinator to the Board of Regents

Submitted by: Scott G. Wasserman
Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board of Regents