

SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

University of Nevada, Reno
Cooperative Extension 4-H Camp
1 4-H Road
Stateline, NV 89449

Friday, October 21, 2011, 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Dr. Jason Geddes, Chair
Mr. Kevin J. Page, Vice Chair
Mr. Mark Alden
Dr. Andrea Anderson
Mr. Cedric Crear
Mr. Ron Knecht
Mr. James Dean Leavitt
Mr. Kevin C. Melcher
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Members Absent: Mr. Robert Blakely
Dr. Mark W. Doubrava
Mr. Rick Trachok

Others Present: Chancellor Daniel J. Klaich
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, Jane Nichols
Vice Chancellor, Finance, Mark Stevens
Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, Steven Zink

Interim President Bart Patterson, NSC
President Maria C. Sheehan, TMCC
President Neal J. Smatresk, UNLV
President Marc Johnson, UNR
President Carol A. Lucey, WNC

Faculty senate chairs Dr. Robin Herlands, NSC; Dr. Gregory S. Brown,
Summerhill, TMCC.

Chair Geddes called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, October 21, 2011, with all members present except for Regents Anderson, Blakely, Doubrava and Trachok.

1. Public Comment *Agenda Item #1* – Vice Chancellor Bart Patterson presented to the Board a Proclamation from Clark County Commission to the Board of Regents for a program being developed to enhance the NSHE's work with small and disadvantaged businesses
(Proclamation B-2 (a)(m)-2 (a)lagB-2 (a)(m)-2 (a)I (a)4 (g)10u -0.004 (ve)4 2,he)10u -On alagB-2he)4 2,heB4 (l)-oa2 (a4)

1. Public Comment*Agenda Item #1) – (Cont'd.)*

Moreover, the state of Nevada must make a commitment to higher education. As senate chairs, we understand that the economic future of Nevada depends on the state's dedication to and development of its higher education sye5sCovo and develurii

10/21/2011

5. Approved -Search Consultant of President Search Committee (Agenda Item #5) - The

5. Approved -Search Consultant for President Search Committees (Agenda Item #5)
(Cont'd.)

Regent Wixom expressed his support of the Chair's commendation but cautioned the Board to be particularly aware of potential conflict of using the same search firm for GBC and NSC noting that there could be potential overlap in candidate pools.

Regent Leavitt felt that any concern related to the how the delegation of authority away responsibility could be ameliorated by clearly stating to potential search firms what the Board and advisory committee members are looking for. He stated that the presidential prospectus will be a key factor in that. Secondly, he stated that although the cost of a search is borne by the respective institution, the UNR Institutional Advisory Committee clearly indicated that the cost would not outweigh the magnitude of the decision. Finally, he felt that the presidential search process is an opportunity for each institution to market itself throughout the country.

Chair Geddes clarified that a motion was only necessary if the Board wanted to have one search firm for all three institutions. Action would not be necessary if the Board decided to leave the selection of a search firm to the individual search committees.

Regent Crear questioned the efficiency of having one consultant simultaneously conducting two searches and what the savings would really be at the end of the process.

Regent Anderson felt it was important to engage with a consultant. She also felt that it was important to allow each search committee to select its consultant. She also felt that when considering what the state has done to higher education over the last few years, it was important to have all the help it could get in selecting the best candidate.

6. Approved -Acceptance of Gift and Naming Opportunity, UNLV

7. Action Taken - Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) -
The Board continued its discussion from the September 2011 meeting on the Board's Master Plan with the goal of producing a new blueprint for the future of Nevada's colleges and universities. The discussion is intended to outline a process for defining the Board's vision of where higher education in Nevada should be in the future and its relationship to the goals and strategic vision for the State of Nevada and the role of the institutions (Ref. BOR-7a and Ref. BOR-7b on file in the Board office).

Chancellor Klaich emphasized that the blueprint is a work in progress with much more input from various constituencies yet to be solicited. He thanked the Board Chair and the Board for focusing the System back on a strategic planning process after four years of budget cutting. He expressed the importance of this process as it will be the foundation from which the System goes forward to rebuild higher education. He stated that the process is not going to replace the current 2005 Master Plan or the road map that the presidents brought to the Board last September which express the fundamental core values of the System.

Chancellor Klaich and System staff provided a presentation and history that summarized the System's previously established goals (2005 Master Plan), strategic objectives from the 2011 legislative session, and evaluated what goals have been accomplished since 2005 and what objectives need to be established in the 2011 road map including support for the Student Success goal (BOR-7a on file in the Board office).

Dr. Jane Nichols, Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs, related that the development of the 2005 Master Plan had been launched by the Board in 2001 in response to the anticipated increase in capacity caused by the then recently implemented Millennium Scholarship. Vice Chancellor Nichols elaborated on the history, premises of the plan, and its seven interrelated goals, principles and targets (Targets 3-9 of Ref. BOR-7a).

Chancellor Klaich related that approximately one year ago, he worked with the presidents to focus on how the times have changed and to sharpen the focus on some of the goals, principles and targets of the Master Plan. That work created the 2011 Road Map. It was discovered during that process that the 2005 Master Plan and the 2011 Road Map shared the same underlying intent at Tw 9.96 -0 9832au3 (oc Tc 0.0(m S)-2 (c)6 (h)2 (o)2 (la)6 (r)5 (h

7. Action Taken -Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) –
(Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht asked Mr. Redding to elaborate on a statement made that Nevada has very little needbased aid particularly in light of Nevada's Millennium Scholarship program. Ms. Abba related that the Millennium Scholarship is a merit program, not need-based.

Regent Knecht asked for a side by side comparison of both need-based and merit based financial aid in Nevada compared to other states. Ms. Abba indicated that...

7. Action Taken - Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Melchealsofelt that President Richards's comments were important with respect to quality and rigor. He cautioned against focusing on the data and if ~~regent~~ quality aspect.

Regent Crear felt that it was important to be cognizant that there are members of the business community, legislature and ~~governor's office~~ included in the discussion of determining graduation success. He emphasized that the System's goal was more student success and graduation, not to make the data look like the System is doing better.

Regent Knecht hoped that in the spirit of accountability and transparency, ~~that the results~~ of the evaluation of low yield programs and course redesign are published ~~to slide 16, Ref. BOR-7a).~~

In regard to quality assurance for the use of ~~part-time~~ faculty ~~(slide 16, Ref. BOR-7a)~~, Regent Knecht asked if it was true that each institution ~~has to assure~~ that the faculty for lower division course work, particularly at the community colleges, has a degree in that specific area. Chancellor Klaich did not think ~~that~~ was a ~~System level~~ policy.

President Smatresk explained that national accreditation guidelines require that any four year accredited university demonstrate that faculty members have terminal certification in the proper area. An exception can be made but it has to be logged and registered for exceptional practice or equivalent ~~experience in the field~~ as appropriate

Regent Knecht asked if the faculty member has an MBA with substantial classes in economics, will that qualify them to teach economics at the community college level. President Richards replied that it would, ~~and~~ the faculty person's experience would also be considered.

Regent Anderson felt that the issue of ~~part-time~~ faculty was significant. President Smatresk related that every ~~part-time~~ faculty member at UNLV is evaluated ~~(under review)~~ every year on their ~~teaching~~ performance.

President Lucey felt that the weakness on heavy dependence ~~on part-time~~ faculty needs to be paid attention to as the System begins to focus on degree completion. ~~She~~ explained that degree completion does not occur without a lot of TLC and ~~part-time~~ faculty generally does not have the time or knowledge of the institution to be academic advisors. Due to the large numbers of ~~part-time~~ faculty, WNC has not developed a system that is heavily faculty dependent for advisement.

The meeting recessed at 12:42 p.m. and reconvened at 1:19 p.m. on Friday, October 21, 2011, with all members present except for Regents Blakely, Doubrava and Trachok.

7. Action Taken -Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) –
(Cont'd.)

Ms. Abba continued the presentation with a report on progress made over the last decade in several areas including, but not limited to, public/private partnerships, routine review of academic programs, distance education courses, class sizes, measurable goals (Complete College America), diversity initiatives, “Go to College” campaign, college readiness standards, common course numbering, and dual education. (slides 20-24 of Ref. BOR-7a).

Regent Knecht referred to slide 20 and asked a detailed report on the four measures listed (private/public partnerships; review of academic programs; distance education courses; and class size) and included it for tent. 2(c)(4) of the I

7. Action Taken -Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Mr. Summerhill reinforced what President Sheehan had previously said that course assessment becomes very difficult with online education. He related that theoretically, the learning outcomes for History 101 taught online or in a traditional setting should be the same. However, in practice it is proven to be more difficult. Whenever speaking of

7. Action Taken -Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Regent Knecht asked what method was used for ascertaining the lack of sections and options and how those numbers could be disaggregated between people who decided not to apply and those that wanted to but could not get the opportunity. President Smatresk felt that explanation would vary among the institutions although there is fairly straightforward evidence that increased cost is driving down enrollment. He related that UNLV experienced its largest number of financial withdrawals in its history by a large factor. It is also known that in certain areas there is a lack of critical class sections (*time instructors*). There is also reputation loss which is harder to grasp. He was not defending bad productivity, but it is an uphill fight.

President Richards added that underrepresented minorities also took a significant hit in enrollment this year. He related that CSN had been close to achieving the requirement for designation as a Hispanic institution. However, Hispanic enrollment dropped by 5 percentage points this year.

Regent Alden noted the tracking method that is done in European countries prior to graduation from high school (*household, technical or college track*). If a student is not ready for college, they do not go to college. He asked if perhaps that was something missing in the American education system. Ms. Abba did not know the answer to that. However, America is not doing well and data reflecting that is readily available. She added that the mechanisms for early alerts are in place but we do not use them. In the next year, the P 16 Council will look at the development of a statewide data system that will link the state's educational systems together beginning with early childhood.

Regent Crear felt that one of the problems with tracking is that once placed in a track, it is difficult to get out of it.

President Johnson felt that in regard to the concept of tracking, students need to be directed to the right institution for the greatest amount of success. He also felt that efficiency goals were met through the need to conduct business differently and not necessarily through outside forces.

Regent Anderson related that one of the challenges of career and technical education is the idea or stereotype of tracking. Parents do not want to be told where their child needs to be, adding that she was not sure that was a battle that could be overcome.

President Luce related that much had been in the media recently about how young people deal with the economic crisis using education to make a living. Instead of using the term tracking, she preferred to think of it as career and technical education. She felt that type of education and training has a place in America as long as American culture suffers from the idea that every child has to go to college, it is doing a terrible disservice to its children. She felt that culture has not successfully changed because the funding is not put into vocational training or tech degrees, nor have the parents been given comfort that their student is not going to be dead-ended with a certificate or a two year degree. She felt that was the only way in which the problem will be solved.

7. Action Taken - Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) – (Cont'd.)

Chair Geddes asked President Sheehan to provide more clarity on how accreditation relates to strategic planning

President Sheehan indicated that there was a close relationship between the discussion that day and what the accreditation commissions are requiring. She related that the Northwest Commission on Community Colleges and Universities (NCCCU) is requiring a continuous review and oversight of accredited institutions which creates a road map for governing boards to address institutional excellence and effectiveness in years 1, 3, 5 and 7 of accreditation. *(Handout on file in the Board office).*

President Lucey added that accreditation in the United States has adopted a peer review methodology which on one hand is good in that it fosters continuous development and improvement. However, that same peer review methodology makes it difficult to test.

President Sheehan related that it was important to look at metrics to ensure that the institutions are meeting the goals and demonstrating that they are achieving the mission. Chair Geddes observed that, in turn, it was important for the Board to make sure that the metrics and data that it is requesting is in alignment with what the campuses need to accomplish to meet accreditation requirements.

President Lucey clarified that one of the standards for accreditation is a governance board that regularly evaluates the objectives that the institutions have set for themselves and the success of the institutions in meeting those objectives. The Board of Regents met that standard and provided that alignment with the discussions held that day.

Chair Geddes stated that the Board's discussion will continue at its December 2011 meeting. He asked each of the Regents to provide further input on any issues or topics that were not discussed that day.

Regent Wixom asked 1) the focus be placed on the integrate project and how it

h

t >>BDCEaal f Tw [u1 (r)-1 (at [(t)-2i)-6 (en)-2 (h-1 (.e))]T4)-1 (a)4 (t)-1 jor >>BDCEaal inw [(o >>B

7.

7. Action Taken -Strategic Planning of the Future of Higher Education (Agenda Item #7) –
(Cont'd.)

On behalf of Regent Trachok, Chair Geddes asked that the presidents come up with two to five issues that need to be focused on and that those issues be provided to staff prior to the December Board meeting.

Regent Schofield also felt that a healthcare system or program for the state of Nevada needed to be discussed.

Regent Knecht strongly endorsed pre and post testing as being a part of instructional excellence. He asked that discussions pertain more to educational aspects and less on administrative and organizational aspects

Chancellor Klaich felt that a critical aspect of this type of discussion focuses on what is doable. He hoped that part of the process will be to narrow down what is accomplishable with the staff available

Regent Wixom agreed with Chancellor Klaich, adding that the Regents needed to be extraordinarily careful of demands placed on staff. He felt that a conversation may be necessary to determine how to convey Regent requests to take advantage of the data and information but without monopolizing staff.

8. Information Only -New Business (Agenda Item #8) tdtnett rayraot