

SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS

- 2c. Information Only-Ethics Law (Agenda Item #2c) System Administration staff and Board of Regents staff provided a brief overview of Regent ethics

4. Information Only-2015-17 Biennial Budget and

The Board recessed at 9:49 a.m. and reconvened at 10:04 a.m. with all members present.

5. No Action Taken-Board Governance (Agenda Item #5) The Board reviewed articles and studies responding to escalating costs, funding challenges, scandals and general societal questions regarding the value of higher education.

In an effort to examine the proper role of Board governance, the Board discussed the

5a. Questions a Higher Education Governing Board Should Ask (Agenda Item #5a) *continued*

Dr. Mark A. Curtis, President, Great Basin Community College (GBC), provided information on building utilization, Monday through Saturday, and during the summer.

Chairman Page noted the importance of class schedules being determined several years in advance in order for students to plan appropriately.

Regent Melcher stated twenty facilities were built when (g) 1974 -0.15 Td 1[(y)16 (e) (g21.0u (s)-5a
1.9 (e)6 (ad)-4 /P <</MCID 5 >>BDC 3i0.47 -1.7.9 (()Tj EMC /P <</MCID 5

5a. Questions a Higher Education Governing Board Should Ask (Agenda Item #5a) *continued*

President Johnson, UNR, presented information regarding the number of courses and credit hours faculty teach per year and addressed the requirements and challenges in achieving the Carnegie Foundation classification of RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity) as well as the challenges to teacher recruitment.

Regent Crear asked how faculty member research efforts are measured. President Johnson stated the expectations are different between disciplines. A professor's research performance is assessed during promotion and tenure reviews.

Chairman Page asked about post tenure review. President Johnson explained UNR does not conduct post tenure reviews; however, every tenured instructor gets reviewed annually and must meet specific performance requirements. Post tenure review is not common.

President Wells and President Jessup suggested the Board may want to look 20 ((ns)lc@k2s31-6

5b. No Action Taken-Board Efficiency (Agenda Item #5b) *continued*

Regent Wixom stated a healthy board culture is affected by renegade trustees not aligning with Board or System interests; interests must be focused through the framework of the Board and the System to be effective; personal issues and agendas need to be appropriately managed through the process; Regents should not go directly to the L

5c(1). No Action Taken-President Search Policy (Agenda Item #5c(1)) *continued*

Mr. Wasserman reviewed the Presidential Search process and explained the two tracks the Board can take (*see handout Ref. BOR-5c1 on file in the Board office*). At the request of the Board he further discussed the composition

- 5c(2). No Action Taken-Periodic Presidential Evaluation Process (Agenda Item #5c(2))
This item was held for a future meeting.

7. Information Only-New Business (Agenda Item #7) Regent Melcher suggested the Board form a group to interview the Regents individually and compile the information to help the Board examine its strengths and weaknesses. Benchmarks could be developed for the Board to use in examining itself.

Regent Doubrava suggested the Board approach the Legislature to seek an exemption from the Open Meeting Law for presidential searches. Staff should explore what other states are doing in this area and bring that information back to the Board. He requested the Board explore the discussions being had in regards to new names for the Cheyenne Campus.

8. Information Only-Public Comment (Agenda Item #8) There was no public comment.

Prepared by: Patricia Rogers
Special Assistant and Coordinator to the Board of Regents

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

Approved by the Board of Regents at the June 11-12, 2015, meeting

APPENDIX 1

Public Comment
Board of Regents
Nevada System of Higher Education
Special Meeting
January 23, 2015

Dear Chairman Page and Regents:

In reviewing your Agenda, item 5a has a list of questions that trustees should ask. As you look at what needs to be addressed in 2015 I suggest that your endorsement of the Common Core State Standards (Nevada Academic Content Standards) needs to be revisited.

It is not apparent that any analysis of how well the standards prepare students for success in Nevada's universities was performed, nor does it appear that the standards were reviewed or evaluated by college professors in our universities. What was the basis for your endorsement? Does achievement of algebra 2 really make students "college ready" when students with that level only have a 1 in 3 chance of graduating (nationwide)? Are you prepared to drop the standards of our Universities to match the lower K-12 standards? At Stanford University calculus is considered remedial with most freshmen starting in advanced calculus. There seems to be a big disconnect, and I suggest the Regents do their homework and get ahead of the wave of problems that I expect is coming. The math standards are very similar to math standards adopted in California in 1992, with a common author. By 1996 California had dropped from middle-of-the-pack to 49th out of 50 in math, and had to drop the standards. A similar result in Nevada may be coming and would be a disaster.

Thank you for your consideration.
Robert Clifford
Fallon, Nevada