

Minutes were approved at the August 27, 2026 Special meeting.

SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

System Administration, Las Vegas
4300 South Maryland Parkway, Board Room

Friday, May 1, 2026

Video Conference Connection from the Meeting Site to:
System Administration, Reno
2601 Enterprise Road, Conference Room
and
Great Basin College, Elko
1500 College Parkway, Berg Hall Conference Room

Members Present:

Mr. Byron Brooks, Chair
Ms. Stephanie Goodman, Vice Chair
Mr. Joseph C. Arrascada
Mr. Aaron Bautista
Mr. Patrick J. Boylan
Mrs. Susan Brager
Ms. Heather Brown
Mrs. Amy J. Carvalho
Mrs. Carol Del Carlo
Dr. Jeffrey S. Downs
Mr. Carlos D. Fernandez
Mr. Pete Goicoechea
Ms. Jennifer J. McGrath

Others Present:

- Mr. Matt McNair, Chancellor
- Ms. Renee Davis, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
- Mr. Brody Leiser, Vice Chancellor of Budget and Finance/Chief Financial Officer
- Mr. James Martinez, Vice Chancellor and Chief General Counsel
- Ms. Keri D. Nikolajewski, Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents
- Mr. Chris Nielsen, Special Counsel to the Board of Regents
- Dr. Stacy S. Klippenstein, President, CSN
- Dr. Amber Donnelly, President, GBC
- Dr. Amber Lopez Lasater, Acting President, NSU
- Dr. Jeffrey W. Alexander, President, TMCC
- Dr. Chris Heavey, Interim President, UNLV
- Mr. Brian Sandoval, President, UNR

Chair Byron Brooks called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. with all members present except Regent Bautista. Regent McGrath led the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Information Only-Public Comment – Dr. Bill Robinson voiced appreciation that the current Regents are the most listening Board there has been in a long time. He expressed serious concern that the Board will be spending hours discussing policy change (Agenda Item 4) while not devoting the same amount of time to issues such as budget and enrollment, funding shifts, and presidential turnover.

The following speakers made comments regarding Agenda Item 2:

- Dr. David Cooper expressed support for the appointment of Dr. Sandra Richtermeyer as NSU President noting that for the first time in a long time, he was excited for the future of Nevada State University.
- Dr. Pete Martini praised Dr. Richtermeyer's humility, personable nature, and unimpeachable qualifications. Additionally, he acknowledged Dr. Amber Lopez Lasater's steadfast leadership during the transition.
- Dr. Kinsey Wright shared data from the search process, noting that Dr. Richtermeyer was the top choice for 11 of 13 ad hoc committee members and received an 89% enthusiastic rating from campus forums. She highlighted Dr. Richtermeyer's assets including her background as a first-generation college graduate and a CPA with deep budget management experience.
- Stephanie Flores, NSU Student Body President, described Dr. Richtermeyer as a leader who leads with both strength and heart, sharing the qualities of previous leaders like Dr. Pollard and Dr. Lopez Lasater.
- Dr. El Hachemi Bouali emphasized that Dr. Richtermeyer's experience as a Provost and her background in accounting align perfectly with NSU's current history, particularly as they search for a new Provost and CFO.
- Dr. Christine Beaudry reiterated the campus-wide consensus for Dr. Richtermeyer, calling her a leader in whom students can most see themselves.
- Max Quinit highlighted Dr. Richtermeyer's track record of securing federal grants for first-year retention and building transfer pathways.

Lauren Beals expressed appreciation for Regents' attendance at student events, and asked that they match their efforts with students' engagement.

Interim UNLV President Chris Heavey addressed the Board on his one-year anniversary in the role. He thanked the Regents for the opportunity to lead the campus where he spent his entire career, stating that stepping into the President's role is always a learning experience. Dr. Heavey expressed his desire to continue serving for as long as the Board would have him.

Jorge Fonseca raised concerns regarding shared governance and transparency at UNLV. He urged the Board to be clear about their standards for leadership decisions. Mr. Fonesca added that a delayed decision is still a decision, and the campus deserves to know who benefits from delaying stability.

1. Information Only-Public Comment – *(Continued)*

Written public comment expressing support to appoint Dr. Chris Heavey as permanent UNLV President (Agenda Item 3) was submitted by: Carly Regan, Edward (Ted) Quirk, David A. Cárdenas, Ph.D., Justice Weyand, Alyssa Crittenden, Rhonda McElroy, Heather Torgersen, Ruth Kantrowitz, Lindsay Couzens, Stefanie Tuzman, Michelle G. Paul, Abbie Friedman, Roberta Sabbath, Rochelle Hamatian, Tom Burns, Shacaf Zamir, Barbara Silverberg, Carolyn Estevez, Jenna Heath, Liat Bodaker, Jennifer Keene, Sam Leif, Robert Bazak, Sara Silverberg, Kyle Ethelbah, Ross D. Bryant, Christine Draper, Gregory Brown, Jolie Brislin, Emily King, Kristopher Kendrick, Lori Church, and Miriam Borvick.

Billy Bobson and Dr. Esther Langston submitted written public comment opposed to appointing Dr. Chris Heavey as permanent UNLV President (Agenda Item 3). Dr. Langston called for a national search.

Regent Bautista entered the meeting.

Chair Brooks noted that Agenda Item 3 would not be heard at the request of Interim President Heavey. The item will return to the Board in September.

2. Approved-Appointment, President of Nevada State University – ad hoc Nevada State University Presidential Search Committee Chair Amy J. Carvalho highlighted the success of the search, which yielded 108 applicants, a testament to the institution's growing reputation. She acknowledged the help of Academic Search and a unanimous committee vote to advance two finalists: Dr. Sandra B. Richtermeyer and Dr. Suzanne R. Smith. Following Dr. Smith's withdrawal from the process, Dr. Richtermeyer was brought forward as the sole candidate for Board consideration (*Ref. BOR-2c on file in the Board office*).

Chair Brooks thanked Regent Carvalho and the committee for the heavy lift of the search process and for bringing community members and stakeholders together for such a significant decision. He expressed gratitude to Dr. Amber Lopez Lasater for her tremendous work at NSU. He stated she did a fantastic job navigating the transition from Chief of Staff to Acting President. Chair Brooks concluded by thanking the participants again for the work and time they put in.

Vice Chair Goodman inquired and Regent Carvalho clarified that the policy states that if one candidate comes forward there is only an approval process, and if two candidates had come forward then there would have been opportunity for questions. Vice Chair Goodman strongly advocated for the retention of Dr. Lopez Lasater in university leadership. She emphasized that Acting President Lopez Lasater's institutional knowledge and established legislative relationships are critical as the university approaches the upcoming legislative session. Regent Del Carlo, Regent Brager, and Regent Goicoechea echoed those sentiments.

Regent Del Carlo, Regent Brager, and Regent Carvalho each expressed gratitude for Acting President Dr. Amber Lopez Lasater. They commended her steadfast leadership during the interim period, specifically noting her professional handling of difficult decisions and her success with the groundbreaking of the new North Las Vegas campus.

2. Approved-Appointment, President of Nevada State University – (Continued)

Regent Downs raised questions regarding the tenure upon hire clause in the proposed contract for Dr. Richtermeyer (*Supplemental Material on file in the Board Office*). James Martines, Chief General Counsel, clarified that, while not automatic, it is a standard negotiating point for candidates who already hold tenure (referring to Dr. Richtermeyer's current tenure at Rutgers University). Regent Downs advised that the Board should be more restrictive in the future to maintain rigorous standards.

Regent Carvalho moved to appoint Dr. Sandra B. Richtermeyer as the next President of Nevada State University, including approval of the proposed Employment Agreement and authorization for the Chancellor to execute the Agreement. Regent Del Carlo seconded. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Richtermeyer expressed her gratitude to the Board for her appointment. She emphasized that she does not believe in starting over with a new team, but rather building upon the existing talent. She specifically praised Dr. Lopez Lasater's leadership. Additionally, Dr. Richtermeyer reassured the Board that she successfully earned her tenure through academic rigor at four different institutions (University of Wyoming, Xavier University, University of Massachusetts, and Rutgers University). Dr. Richtermeyer expressed excitement about returning to the West region to focus on student access and building community partnerships.

The meeting recessed at 9:45 a.m. and reconvened at 10:06 a.m. with all members present except Vice Chair Goodman, Regent Fernandez, and Regent Brown.

3. Withdrawn-Office of the President, University of Nevada, Las Vegas – This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

Vice Chair Goodman returned to the meeting.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – Chair Brooks introduced the workshop facilitator, Mr. Tom Skancke, a resident and business owner in Southern Nevada for over 35 years. He shared that Mr. Skancke has served as the CEO of The Skancke Company, the Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA), and MetroMotion. Chair Brooks further noted that Mr. Skancke has been entrusted to work on complex policy initiatives by influential leaders like former U.S. Senator Harry Reid and former Governor Brian Sandoval. He added that Mr. Skancke's extensive background in strategic policy and public-private partnerships focuses on transforming regional economies and improving long-term outcomes.

Mr. Skancke opened the workshop by sharing his background in Nevada which began in 1982 with a voice scholarship at the University of Nevada, Reno. He shared that he wanted to be an opera singer but transitioned from vocal performance and music therapy into business. Mr. Skancke noted that he attended university with Brian Sandoval and Catherine

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

Cortez Masto. In 1988 he moved to Las Vegas to work on a political campaign intending to stay for three months which turned into 35 years.

Mr. Skancke noted that when he served as the President and CEO of the LVGEA, he took the job primarily because Brian Sandoval was governor. He added that he enjoyed the vision of what the governor had for economic development. Mr. Skancke acknowledged that he learned how important the system of higher education was to the work that the LVGEA was doing. Specifically, he learned that K-12 education and higher education were the primary reasons why businesses were not moving to Las Vegas. The LVGEA did extensive research and learned that businesses were not moving here because they did not think there was an educated workforce.

Mr. Skancke noted his three years at the LVGEA and current position as an adjunct professor in the School of Public Policy and Leadership at UNLV. From those experiences he stated his belief that Nevada has some of the most qualified faculty and students of any university in the country. He also acknowledged the System has some amazing university presidents.

Mr. Skancke then introduced “One NSHE” as the core concept of the workshop. He stated that he thinks the theme is important as the System and its responsibilities continue to grow. He also noted One NSHE’s significance approaching the biennium budget requests. Mr. Skancke acknowledged that in the past, institutions had to compete against each other at the legislature, which he believes is unfortunate. Mr. Skancke emphasized that working together as one entire System is vital in these fractured times. He stated his belief that this should be the least political board in the state. Mr. Skancke encouraged one common vision and one common goal for the System to be more successful.

Regent Brager expressed reservations about the session's length and depth. She stated her hope that the discussion would not venture too deep, strategically, since the Chancellor was already working on a strategic plan. Mr. Skancke insisted his goal was to lead a dialogue around big ideas. He additionally self-identified as a disruptor and quoted Eleanor Roosevelt saying, “Big minds talk about ideas. Average minds talk about events. Small minds talk about people.”

Regent Brown returned to the meeting.

Mr. Skancke posed a central question to participants around the dais: Who is your competition? Vice Chair Goodman asserted that the System does not compete internally. She noted the System’s competition would be outside individuals that come into the state, specifically healthcare programs like those at Roseman and Touro universities. Chair Brooks acknowledged that competition exists within the state due to service areas and dual enrollment. He also noted that the funding formula sets up competition between institutions to recruit students. He acknowledged other entities within and outside of the state, as well as on-campus and remote learning.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

WNC President J. Kyle Dalpe acknowledged that friendly-fire competition occurs within the System due to overlapping programs. He emphasized that student movement between institutions (e.g. WNC to UNR) should be seamless and viewed as a steppingstone rather than competition. President Dalpe noted that current antiquated systems hinder good customer experiences. He further explained that it poses a significant problem when faced with external competition from entities like Western Governors University (WGU) and other out-of-state online providers. President Dalpe warned that if the System does not adapt to the new higher ed marketplace, competition will take students out of public higher education. He noted that while internal groups work well together, it is ultimately the outside competition that will eat them up if they are not careful.

Mr. Skancke addressed the misconception of local rivalry, stating that Reno has never been Las Vegas's competition. He explained that when he worked on economic development under the governor, the strategy was one state of economic development and everyone worked together, which was the key to their success. Mr. Skancke emphasized that the true competition was not regional neighbors like Phoenix or California, but rather global hubs such as Singapore, Incheon, Korea, Beijing, and Mexico City. He specifically highlighted the University of Madrid as an example. The Madrid program is taught by English speaking professors for English students which attracts over 75,000 American students to their campus every year. Mr. Skancke asserted that example represents the real competition for NSHE and other universities across the country. He suggested that to be competitive, Americans should consider being fluent in Spanish and look toward opportunities in places like Mexico City.

Mr. Skancke asked where the future business sectors of this world are going. He questioned why UNLV hadn't pursued autonomous vehicle engineering programs sooner, while Michael Crow at Arizona State University was successfully attracting all the autonomous vehicle engineering companies. Mr. Skancke noted that while UNLV recently began a Ph.D. program in hydraulics engineering, institutions must constantly ask what the next big industry is to invite that population of student.

Mr. Skancke also observed a lack of engagement from the business community, noting that they were not represented in the meeting. He additionally asserted that while business leaders complain about NSHE and school board trustees, they often only attend meetings when they perceive something is important for them (e.g. legislative or county commission meetings). Mr. Skancke challenged participants around the dais to create something important for the business community to participate and engage.

GBC President Amber Donnelly emphasized the urgency of the situation. She stated that she couldn't agree more with the fact that the System is competing with innovation and technology. However, she further acknowledged that the System moves very slowly while neighbors like Utah and Idaho move very quickly. President Donnelly highlighted the 90 credit bachelor's degree as a necessary response to get students into the workforce at a faster pace. She pointed out that the competition is going to get steeper and expressed a critical need for reform. She noted that if socializing any degree takes an entire year the System fails to keep pace with the immediate needs of the workforce.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

DRI President Kumud Acharya stated that DRI's competition is out of state. DRI competes with other schools for research funding nationally. He also acknowledged that DRI works well with other institutions within the System.

NSU Acting President Amber Lopez Lasater addressed the need for taking a broader look at strategic enrollment. She noted that while there are great plans for growth, the state is facing an economic slope rather than a cliff. Acting President Lopez Lasater highlighted the issue of student swirling where headcount of the same student may be seen at multiple institutions. She further emphasized the importance of concurrent enrollment and K-12 pipelines to ensure students are matched with the proper institution. Acting President Lopez Laster asserted that competition is partially among institutions themselves. She called for a System-level approach to getting students across the finish line and into the workforce to provide long term economic mobility. Mr. Skancke asked whether that was a policy recommendation at the System level or a legislative fix. Acting President Lopez Lasater clarified that it is a necessary discussion to determine the goals. Additionally, she noted that discussion must include who is working to secure enrollment in the right places with an emphasis on ensuring that institutional fit is complementary on the front end. Further, she acknowledged that there will always be some inherent competition, but Nevada State University's priority is to see students graduate and go on to graduate school at sister institutions like UNLV or UNR.

Mr. Skancke contrasted the Arizona model of higher education with Nevada's approach. He explained that in Arizona, campuses like the University of Arizona and Arizona State University are complementary, not competition. That model allows students to graduate from the system by taking classes at either location. Mr. Skancke illustrated how internal competition exists in Nevada higher education. He used the example that when UNLV got the Thomas and Mack Center, immediately UNR had to get the Lawlor Events Center. Additionally, he recalled that when UNR established a medical school, UNLV consequently wanted a medical school. Mr. Skancke urged the Board to transition to a System where it shouldn't be competitive between the universities but rather competitive outside the universities and outside of the state. He further challenged the group to think differently about big ideas.

TMCC President Jeffrey W. Alexander shared that his institution engages with the business community heavily, daily, and has significantly scaled up in recent months. He noted the recent addition of five new members to the Institutional Advisory Council representing critically important sectors of the economy (Tesla, Lithium Americas, the Peppermill, Renown, and Turner Construction). President Alexander acknowledged that those partners have served as terrific supporters of TMCC's grant initiatives, confirming that such engagement is urgent and necessary.

President Alexander asserted that the biggest competitor NSHE faces in this environment is low-wage jobs and the welfare state. He described the institutional challenge of recruiting away from the spin cycle where many potential students might stay for the rest of their working lives. President Alexander clarified that he does not view other educational institutions as rivals, but rather identifies poverty as the biggest threat.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

Additionally, President Alexander identified time and money as students' two biggest obstacles to completing a college degree. He noted that students do not complete programs due to family, work, and the need to survive. President Alexander emphasized that TMCC's mission is to provide scholarships to students so that they can enroll and retain and persist all the way to completion. He concluded that true success is defined by getting students to believe in themselves until they complete their program and move on to better circumstances.

UNLV Interim President Chris Heavey identified the legislature's funding formula as a fundamental structural factor. He noted that money is allocated based on the proportion of weighted student credit hours rather than per pupil funding. He explained that the funding formula ultimately sets the institutions up to be competitors because an institution can grow and lose money if other institutions grow faster. Interim President Heavey noted that while presidents aim to be cooperative, the current funding structure drives competition across the state for limited funding.

Interim President Heavey noted that Nevada institutions compete for students with every institution out of state. He specifically highlighted Southern New Hampshire University and its \$150 million advertising budget. Interim President Heavey also drew comparisons to WGU, which he explained essentially has no faculty and instead hires tutors and coaches to offer degrees at a fraction of what it costs to employ human beings. He observed that Nevada operates with very low per-pupil funding while facing such aggressive, low-cost national models.

Interim President Heavey described the current environment as highly dynamic and challenging. He attributed its rapid movement to forces like AI and the Khan Academy getting into the business of higher education. Interim President Heavey also addressed shifts to the Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) environment and its impact on college athletics. He suggested that the changes currently happening in higher education are even more multifaceted and challenging to navigate. Interim President Heavey emphasized that the System is entering a time of great change that will require careful navigation.

UNR President Brian Sandoval addressed the reality of external competition. He cited that third-party entities like Columbia Southern University and the University of Hawaii are offering programs in Nevada without Board of Regents oversight. He raised a critical legal question regarding whether these entities fall within the Board's jurisdiction. President Sandoval further suggested such entities should be required to show basic standards. He emphasized that the world is changing around us and we must change with it.

President Sandoval also noted the rise of competency-based models like WGU where students finish degrees in weeks for a fixed price and perform well on professional exams. He urged the Board to take the lead on AI and conduct a deep dive into its impact across campuses. President Sandoval noted the visibility of out-of-state competition and cited billboard advertisements and storefronts for institutions like the University of New Hampshire. He further stressed the need for public institutions to adapt to these shifting market dynamics.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

President Sandoval noted that Nevada remains one of the lowest in the nation for college attainment, currently ranked 49th. He advocated for a unified strategy that includes dual credit and online education to go to where the students are. He emphasized that such a strategy is essential for workforce development and meeting economic needs of the state. He further stated his belief that the legislature and the governor would strongly support such a strategy.

President Sandoval stated that all institutions' goals remain theoretical unless the legislature and the governor increase funding. He noted that the current funding model was what previous NSHE leadership requested. Additionally, he suggested it may be time for a change if the Board can present a cogent plan showing clear outcomes. President Sandoval also anticipated a flat budget for the upcoming cycle. He advised that strategic changes may need to be made between 2027 and 2029 to provide the legislature with the specific results for which they provide funding.

Regent Del Carlo noted that none of the Regents were on the Board at the time of President Sandoval's governorship. She inquired about his reference to the current model as something that NSHE wanted. President Sandoval clarified that the then-Chancellor and Board leadership at that time expressed their vision for System funding. As a result, a special committee was formed that studied everything regarding tuition retention. President Sandoval noted the process involved a bit of give and take, particularly with the weighted student credit hours, and that there were representatives from every institution involved in the discussion. President Sandoval highlighted that the biggest thing for the institutions was the desire to keep their tuition. He explained that under the previous model, if an institution had more tuition, the state would take it back in June.

Brody Leiser, Chief Financial Officer, provided background on the 2011 interim study which led to the most recently adopted version of the formula, implemented during the 2013 legislative session. He explained that the revised funding formula marked a shift from being enrollment-driven to distribution by weighted student credit hours. Those policy changes were the priority of the Board and the System office at that time, recommended by the governor, and adopted by the legislature to modernize the System's financial structure.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser noted that the distribution component of the formula was suspended for the last two biennia, primarily because it created a perception of winners and losers. He confirmed that because there is a pool of money distributed based on an institution's proportion of weighted student credit hours, some institutions may get more or less than they would have if that distribution had not occurred. Chief Financial Officer Leiser highlighted that the legislature has indicated that it does not want to move forward with this policy, and the Board must consider this factor for future budget requests.

Chief Financial Officer Leiser highlighted the separation of the student driven revenues from the state General Fund. This policy ensures that those revenues are looked at separately so that if an institution brings in additional student registration fee due to enrollment, it won't reduce the amount of general fund that would have otherwise been

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

appropriated. He concluded that while funding can be part of the conversation regarding competition, these policies were designed to protect institutional growth.

President Sandoval asserted that this is a good time for a reset because the System cannot keep doing things the same way and expect to get different results. He urged a focus on best practices and a collaborative effort where all leaders charge the hill together, arm in arm, to prevent the System from losing ground and slipping. President Sandoval called for more focus on the big picture rather than continuing to find little things to really grind while missing the overarching strategic goals.

Chief General Counsel Martines noted that the Board's duties are set by the legislature and emphasized that it is a legislative responsibility that falls upon them. He explained that while the Board is created by the Constitution, the legislature has the authority to set the duties of the Board and that this could change. Chief General Counsel Martines also addressed potential dormant commerce clause challenges. He noted that there is a very high standard to be met involving strict scrutiny and the requirement that regulations cannot be protectionist.

Chief General Counsel Martines also introduced the idea of inner engineering, suggesting that as an individual organization, there is certain inner engineering to be done before running out into public and affecting everything externally. He asserted that if an organization doesn't have control of itself before trying to compete in the world, it might not do its best. Chief General Counsel Martines emphasized that this should not be seen as a small idea, as it is an important foundational idea to best effectuate and best compete. He clarified that was not legal advice.

Regent Brown highlighted a lack of cohesion and messaging about entry from an economic development standpoint. She noted that a recent regional workforce document was signed by the Chambers of Commerce and the LVGEA, but excluded higher education leadership. She asked where any of the presidents or the Chancellor were, to emphasize that while the Board discusses being the workforce pipeline of the state, higher education is frequently not invited to the table. Regent Brown acknowledged that everything in the state is siloed, and that infighting leaves little time to engage effectively with the legislature or regional development authorities. She pointed out that even the Governor's Workforce Committee didn't have any representation from higher education until she brought it to their attention. Regent Brown asserted that if the rest of the state doesn't realize the importance of higher education, the economic development future of the state is hurt.

Regent Brown noted that the System has been proactive by working on transfer alignment and credit for prior learning to meet people where they are. She expressed pride in the fact that presidents can work with the business community to set up training pipelines in five to seven weeks. However, she lamented that neither the regional authorities nor the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED) shares that information, leading to a persistent disconnect. Regent Brown acknowledged that critics want to blame the Board for all the bad things, but then don't invite them to the table for the good things. She

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

addressed the higher education versus the rest of Nevada competition and the preconceived notions that prevent the state from moving forward. Regent Brown emphasized that real progress cannot be made until these groups have real conversation and stop stepping on each other's toes.

Regent Brown called for the Board to speak the truth and say the quiet things out loud regarding enrollment decline, budgets, buildings, and staffing. She observed that it is easier to fund a new building than it is to fix a building. She urged for capital improvement to be built into finances from day one. Regent Brown concluded that the ultimate goal must be to break down all the barriers and silos so that the System can truly fix what is broken and help students.

Mr. Skancke stated that the first step toward recovery is acknowledging the System's existing problems. He noted that the business community has historically lacked a compelling reason to engage with the Board, only becoming involved when crises arise. He pointed out that the NSHE represents the state's second-largest educated workforce. He added that educational entities often generate more revenue than major gaming corporations like Boyd Gaming. Mr. Skancke urged all stakeholders to check their agendas at the door and focus on collective action to effectively compete against the rest of the world. To ensure future engagement from the broader business sector and the Chambers of Commerce, he advised the Board to focus on legislative changes and wedge issues that directly impact business interests, thereby forcing a seat at the table for higher education.

Vice Chair Goodman addressed the Board's historically poor reputation and emphasized the necessity of reviewing policy to establish a functional foundation that remains effective regardless of changes in elected leadership. She suggested that the negative reputation has hindered the recruitment of business professionals, even though current Board members and presidents are recognized as incredible individuals working to move the needle. Moving forward, the Board aims to ensure that its policies fully support a functional, working governing body.

Mr. Skancke reiterated the lack of business community engagement and noted that business leaders typically only attend meetings when they are angry. He emphasized the need for a strategic message that gives the community a reason to participate. Mr. Skancke additionally urged the presidents to proactively reach out to business leaders to create pipelines. He called on the Board to provide the Chancellor with the tools and policies necessary to increase visibility. He asserted that the more NSHE communicates its activities to the public, the more the business community will be motivated to get involved.

Regent Brown stated that while the Chancellor is working to amplify the System's efforts, the Board can do better. She defined her role as supporting the eight presidents in their roles, ensuring they have the tools and resources needed to establish new training or degree programs. She expressed her belief that it is incumbent upon the Board to evaluate such initiatives to ensure they are future-proofed for the long-term trajectory of the students who will go through the System.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

Regent Brown emphasized that she does not want the business community to spend their time at the Board level. She would rather they be embedded at the eight campuses working with staff and students. Regent Brown noted a dichotomy in her approach, wanting the community to tell the story of the presidents so effectively that business leaders become curious about what is happening on campus and start showing up to open forums and meetings.

She noted the ultimate goal of this strategy is to have business leaders investing in students directly on the campuses and within the institutions. Regent Brown noted that the Board's job is to tell the story of the eight institutions and amplify the good things happening to ensure the System stays out of negative news cycles. She stressed that her time on the dais is not about a personal agenda or making friends in the community.

Regent Brown shared an example of connecting Athletics with DRI after highlighting their green box program and its impact on K-12 education. She maintained that her job is to facilitate such connections, leaving the institutions responsible to manage relationships. She concluded that until people in the state actually spend time on college campuses, they will not be invested in education in a meaningful way.

Regent Goicoechea emphasized the need for a structural reevaluation and proposed that the Board of Regents should function strictly as a board of directors to the Chancellor. Under this model, the eight institutional presidents would maintain full responsibility for the day-to-day operations, recruitment, and graduation at their respective campuses. Regent Goicoechea called for a back-to-basics approach involving a deep review of policy and Regents' core duties to redefine their role before seeking broader external engagement. He then concluded that once the Board clarifies its function as an oversight body, rather than an operational one, it will be better positioned to coordinate institutional efforts and attract significant investment from external stakeholders. Mr. Skancke agreed.

Regent Brager emphasized the need to elaborate on collaborations and relationships, noting that they are currently fractured. While Regents sit on various boards, they often serve as businesspeople. She noted that while some shared information is beneficial, the System must encourage others to invite people in and speak up more effectively to ensure the region's educational needs are prioritized in these external spaces.

Regent Brager raised concern over the significant lack of public awareness concerning the role of a Regent and the System itself. She observed that members of the public often do not understand what a Regent is or what the Board does. Regent Brager stressed that the Board cannot simply sit in a room and expect the public to know its mission; instead, Regents must take a more active role in defining their purpose to the community.

Regent Brager described the current format of meetings as people talking at the Board. She expressed frustration with the practice of speakers reading agenda items and screen content that Regents have already reviewed during briefings. Regent Brager suggested reforms to meetings such as selecting one specific item per meeting, whether it be DRI or another

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

institution, to discuss how to reach the next step with the goal of shifting from passive listening to active, focused discussion on campus initiatives.

Regent Brager highlighted the importance of CSN as the most critical part of the System for developing relationships with the Clark County School District. She pointed out that many students are unaware that they can stay within the state System to get everything they need. She called for a coordinated effort among all Regents to speak in their communities to ensure students understand the value and opportunities provided by the System.

Mr. Skancke emphasized that the primary objective of the Chancellor's leadership should be the realization of a "One NSHE" System. He advocated for the adoption of a strategic framework rather than a traditional plan to ensure the initiative remains active and impactful. Mr. Skancke echoed the institutional presidents and stressed the urgent need for more honest conversations. He encouraged the Board to adopt an outside perspective to objectively evaluate the System while acknowledging the validity of internal viewpoints. Mr. Skancke continued to challenge the group to identify the single biggest challenge that NSHE faces today.

Vice Chair Goodman addressed Mr. Skancke's perceived tension among the Regents. She explained that the meeting came at the end of a long week of System events. She further clarified that the workshop was providing a productive, open dialogue thanks to Chair Brooks. Vice Chair Goodman emphasized the importance of meeting clients where they are. She presented her business-centric approach as a fundamental model for the System to achieve success by prioritizing student accessibility and engagement.

Vice Chair Goodman recommended establishing a System ombudsman to facilitate problem-solving. She identified the need for a dedicated role to resolve specific barriers, such as transferring nursing credits from CSN to UNLV. Vice Chair Goodman believed the primary objective of this position would be to ensure the various institutions function more effectively as a unified System by solving these recurring constituent issues.

Vice Chair Goodman further proposed the creation of a concierge department to serve as a community outreach entity. She believed such a department would work directly with students to make System access easier and more intuitive by meeting them where they are in the community. By providing a dedicated point of contact to guide students through the process, a concierge service would aim to successfully integrate more individuals into the System.

Vice Chair Goodman urged the System to invest in these two recommendations as a strategic means to bring in more students and improve retention. She presented the initiatives as a necessary defense to counteract the efforts of external institutions like WGU. Vice Chair Goodman emphasized that proactive System improvements are essential to prevent such competitors from poaching students from the state's institutions.

Regent Brager emphasized the strategic importance of expanding NSU's reach, specifically through the North Las Vegas relationship, and advocated for similar community

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

engagement across all regions to provide necessary guidance to all students, regardless of socioeconomic background. She highlighted that establishing a visible collegiate presence helps shift student perceptions to prove that higher education is attainable and potentially paving the way for further campus developments similar to CSN's Foothill High School model. Regent Brager expressed a newfound sense of encouragement through the workshop discussion, but noted a specific desire to see the Chancellor's strategic plan.

Mr. Skancke emphasized the transformative effect of institutional unity and noted that when the group works together as one, the tenor and tone changes significantly. Mr. Skancke reflected on his five years as an adjunct professor at UNLV to remark that higher education politics is more difficult than Capitol Hill. Mr. Skancke asserted that the Board and institution presidents must adapt their thinking to enable the state to compete globally. He acknowledged that while Nevada is a little bit behind, the state is uniquely willing to step out and get ahead.

Mr. Skancke steered discussion toward critical challenges including AI, competing campuses, and entities that open up shop without any type of accreditation, which require legislative action. Mr. Skancke advocated for engaging the business community in such policy matters. He further noted that such dialogue is essential to attract more people to the state's mission.

Regent McGrath expressed concern that while discussions regarding artificial intelligence are becoming commonplace, the System must implement significant fundamental changes to effectively prepare students for the evolving workforce. She emphasized the urgency of adapting as quickly as the technological landscape shifts and questioned whether current efforts are sufficient. Regent McGrath advocated for increased collaboration among institutional presidents to share resources and information cost-effectively across campuses. Finally, she urged the Board to focus on overarching strategies to address incredible changes.

Mr. Skancke shifted the discussion to the importance of demonstrating a competitive advantage to both the business community and state legislators. While the legislature frequently emphasizes accountability and return on investment, he suggested reframing the dialogue by asking what happens if they don't make the investment.

Mr. Skancke emphasized the principle of getting one's own house in order before attempting to influence external bodies. He cited that internal policy alignment is a prerequisite for a successful legislative agenda. Mr. Skancke recommended that institutional presidents, in their roles as educators, should educate the Regents on the weeds of the System's operations to empower them as more effective advocates. He noted that Nevada is small enough and agile enough to implement rapid change and urged the group to turn their collective intelligence into a resource that drives the System toward a positive turning point. Mr. Skancke acknowledged that while there is always a fight about money, the state consistently finds resources for its true priorities; therefore, the System must force the legislature to recognize higher education as a top priority for Nevada's endless potential.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

Mr. Skancke discussed the strategic necessity of adopting one voice. He noted that influential organizations like the Clark County School District Teachers Union succeed because they prioritize a single, cohesive message. He proposed that NSHE should utilize a “One NSHE” concept to present a unified front to the legislature rather than advocating for individual campuses. Mr. Skancke suggested that by leveraging the unique talent in the room, including a former governor and legislative experts, the System can effectively shepherd its agenda through the legislative process as the recognized experts in the field.

Regent Brown noted that while the Board agrees on collective priorities, individual institutions continue to pursue independent agendas. She characterized it as a cannibalism of priorities that fosters bad behavior, where one institution’s progress often comes at the expense of another. Regent Brown highlighted that smaller institutions frequently become casualties of such actions. She cited a recent instance where a small institution’s request was cut at the last minute because the System was not advocating specifically for their needs.

Regent Brown also expressed frustration that the ideal of one-band, one-sound, remains unattainable as long as individuals use personal influence and relationships to bypass System goals. She asserted that without a strong mandate from the Chancellor to align all campuses, NSHE would likely face the same shock of lost priorities in future legislative sessions. Regent Brown suggested that the Board must either strictly mandate that all campuses follow suit or reconsider the autonomy of institutional lobbyists to ensure the System can truly rule the day.

Mr. Skancke posed a hypothetical idea for the System to establish a unified legislative platform by identifying four primary policy changes agreed upon by all institutional presidents. He recommended that the Chancellor collaborate with the presidents to define the priorities based on their specific needs, subsequently tasking institutional lobbyists, who are already under significant contracts, to advocate for this collective agenda.

Regent Brown stated that the Board consistently fails to hold individuals accountable when they act contrary to Board decisions. She expressed concern that this lack of enforcement removes any incentive for compliance. She noted that previous warnings never materialized. Regent Brown asserted that the Board must choose to either enforce strict accountability or continue a free-for-all environment resulting in competing institutional priorities. She cautioned that the latter would lead the legislature to question the Board’s fundamental purpose and effectiveness. Mr. Skancke acknowledged that reality, and it should be addressed in the strategic plan.

The meeting recessed at 11:41 a.m. and reconvened at 12:08 p.m. with all members present except Vice Chair Goodman and Regent Fernandez.

Mr. Skancke resumed the workshop soliciting input from the institutional presidents.

CSN President Stacy S. Klippenstein noted his ten-month tenure. He emphasized the value of “Systemness,” specifically the ability to work directly with colleagues at UNLV and

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

other community colleges to continue to strengthen one another. President Klippenstein voiced support for the Chancellor's proposal to develop a strategic framework. He asserted that such a plan would be critical for establishing a unified legislative position that brings all institutions together.

President Klippenstein distinguished between the global competitiveness of R1 institutions and the internal competitiveness driven by current funding formulas. He characterized the lack of full funding for the small institution factor as a travesty. He further highlighted the paradox where five percent enrollment growth does not necessarily translate into increased financial support. President Klippenstein affirmed his intent to remain competitive in that space for CSN. He maintained that such pursuits should not negatively impact the broader System-wide dialogue necessary for collective success.

President Klippenstein asserted that students at open-enrollment institutions are primarily concerned with on-site, on-ground deliverables, rather than global market alignment. He recommended continued dialogue regarding mission differentiation and a broader understanding of the distinct role each institution plays within the System. President Klippenstein cautioned the Board against becoming four-year centric. He reminded members that over half of Nevada's enrollments are within the state's four community colleges. Mr. Skancke offered an apology, and acknowledged his failure to practice his own advice. He disclosed being a product of a community college and representing CSN for five years. He emphasized that CSN's involvement at the LVGEA was critical to workforce development because not every student should, can, or will go to a four-year institution. Mr. Skancke recounted his own educational path from a community college in Tucson to a four-year program in Reno.

UNLV Interim President Heavey addressed the strategic plan and alignment of institutions by clarifying the distinct roles of the Board, the System, and the campuses. He noted that businesses are on campuses constantly, with major engagements in every industry and deans maintaining business advisory boards filled with leaders. Interim President Heavey suggested that business engagement appropriately happens at the campus level where degrees are offered, while the System delivers oversight to implement Board policy.

Interim President Heavey emphasized that the campuses are actively working to graduate AI-ready students and are making AI available throughout the educational process. Faculty are currently incorporating AI into the curriculum to ensure students possess workforce-aligned credentials.

Interim President Heavey expressed pride in the achievements of Nevada's institutions. He noted that they run proud R1 institutions on R2 level budgets, despite being nearly last in the country for funding. Interim President Heavey highlighted that the institutions continue to produce thousands of successful graduates every year with valuable credentials on shoestring level budgets.

WNC President Dalpe noted that while Board members and presidents come and go, the System requires a long-term plan to guide its maturation. He characterized Nevada as a

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

higher education system that is growing up. President Dalpe observed that the nature of Nevada's economy has not historically driven a strong value proposition for higher education. He noted however that recent changes through economic development initiatives have allowed trained individuals to work within the state. President Dalpe emphasized the need for a formal plan, citing California's 1964 plan as an example, to define how institutions like WNC link to the broader System.

President Dalpe called for mission differentiation, and warned that without a unified strategic plan, the rest of the country will eat Nevada for lunch. He highlighted a specific threat regarding dual enrollment students and noted that universities in states with diminishing high school populations are likely to recruit Nevada's talent. He asserted that all stakeholders must be on the same page and work together to protect the state's student base, ensuring that Nevada does not lose its talent to out-of-state recruiters.

President Dalpe called for a strategic framework where everyone would have some sort of credential. He emphasized that skill certificates should count alongside traditional degrees. President Dalpe cited data indicating that higher education attainment beyond high school leads to higher earning potential and makes individuals less likely to be pushed aside during a recession. He believes the plan would ensure every student gains a credential that provides them with economic security and a clear path forward in the changing economy.

Regent Boylan expressed gratitude to the Chair for organizing the workshop. However, he voiced skepticism that the outcome would be the same old, same old. Regent Boylan noted that despite trying to push for progress, nothing has changed in his five years on the Board. He expressed concern that once the meeting adjourns, the Board will forget about Mr. Skancke and the dialogue he facilitated. Regent Boylan further highlighted that he has requested a Regents retreat for five years to no avail. He additionally stated his belief that the Board will ultimately stick to its old ways. Regent Boylan emphasized that while a few things have been accomplished, the fundamental *modus operandi* remains as it was in the beginning. He expressed appreciation for this discussion and encouraged Mr. Skancke to return in two months to ensure accountability for the initiatives discussed.

Mr. Skancke referenced a principle by Albert Einstein, stating that "you have to change your current pattern of thought in order to solve the problems you've created with your current pattern of thought." He noted that it is a philosophy he has practiced for 35 years since attending the University of Nevada, Reno. He emphasized that the only way to effectuate change is to start with oneself rather than solely persuading others. Mr. Skancke offered to return on his own dime once a month, once a quarter, whatever it would take to assist the ongoing conversation. He expressed a deep belief in the System and the state's need to provide quality education to remain competitive. Additionally, Mr. Skancke shared that he had received nineteen appreciative text messages from former students thanking him for leading this discussion.

Regent Downs expressed gratitude for the entrepreneurial and business perspectives shared by Regent Brown. He emphasized that great ideas require a functional infrastructure to succeed. Regent Downs observed that roadblocks often hinder new strategies or

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

innovation. He noted that the current System office often focuses on finding reasons why initiatives cannot proceed rather than facilitating their implementation.

Regent Downs suggested that the Chancellor's primary focus should be connecting NSHE with businesses and integrating those relationships. He stressed the urgent need for the entire System to become more responsive to industry demands. Regent Downs echoed the call to align the System's goals to better serve students.

Regent Brown left the meeting.

Regent Arrascada expressed a strong sense of optimism regarding the progress of Nevada's higher education System. He noted that during his nearly six-year term, the System has made great strides and significant accomplishments. Regent Arrascada stated the infrastructure is supported by numerous scaffoldings, including presidents, executive leadership, and student governments, all of whom are succeeding in creating a workforce that is beneficial to the state and performing well.

Regent Arrascada advocated for a balanced approach that offers both criticism and praise to every campus location, regardless of its geographical distance. He cautioned against turning a blind eye to local issues, suggesting that each location needs a mix of accountability and recognition. Regent Arrascada shared his optimism and thanked Mr. Skancke for facilitating a necessary conversation.

Regent Boylan added that the System needs to be rowing as a team, but that the Board currently seems to be rowing in different directions. He asserted that there are issues and they need to be addressed.

Regent Goicochea stated that the recent dialogue clearly indicates a need for the Board to adapt and implement changes moving forward. He expressed support for the presidents, and noted that they are doing a great job and should be given the space to perform their duties effectively. Regent Goicochea emphasized that the primary role of the Regent and the Board is to provide oversight of the Chancellor and ensure that all parties are aligned on the same page. He affirmed his willingness to adapt and move forward.

Regent Carvalho emphasized that Nevada should remain one system, but that it must move away from a one-size-fits-all approach. She noted that current tuition structures often cause community colleges to suffer more than the four-year institutions. Regent Carvalho called for a deeper conversation regarding mission differentiation to ensure that the state serves students in the specific ways each institution is charged to do.

Regent Carvalho raised discussion concerning the understanding of where Board oversight is, where System oversight is, and where campus oversight lies. She suggested that the areas of responsibility sometimes blend in ways that aren't beneficial to students. Regent Carvalho recommended that the System better distinguish those areas of responsibility instead of dictating what others should do.

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

Regent Carvalho expressed struggle with the big and complex nature of AI. She questioned how it interferes with how we teach and what it looks like for faculty and students. Regent Carvalho encouraged the Board to talk about it to understand it from different constituent lenses, acknowledging that each campus is already dealing with it as a tool in various ways.

Regent Carvalho referenced Arizona State University's scrappy ethos as a model for finding alternative funding. She asserted that the conversation about the legislature not adequately funding NSHE becomes a barrier for progress. Regent Carvalho suggested that since Nevada is an extremely wealthy state, the System should partner with the private sector to find innovative ways to get where they need to go.

Regent Carvalho differentiated between being career ready and industry resilient. She noted that graduates often change paths, or their original jobs may no longer exist in the world they currently live in. Consequently, a good liberal arts education is essential for providing graduates with the resilience and endurance to pivot and take on whatever the future holds.

Regent Brown returned to the meeting.

Mr. Skancke highlighted the success of President Crow at ASU who developed a formula for institutional growth by creating programs that the business community actively supports and getting ahead of the curve. He noted that while Nevada possesses significant assets, such as the largest data center in the universe in both the northern and southern regions, the state has not fully capitalized on these resources. Specifically, the absence of specialized educational programs was identified as the primary reason why emerging industries like autonomous vehicle transportation and electric vehicle engineering, including companies like Lucid Technologies, chose to settle in Phoenix rather than Nevada.

Mr. Skancke suggested that Nevada's higher education system must solve a chicken and egg problem by putting relevant programs in place first to give the business community a reason to invest. Nevada faces specific barriers that Arizona does not, such as the lack of a land bank. He additionally noted that while tax incentives are available, businesses do not make decisions based upon corporate income tax. Ultimately, the community, including business leaders and institution presidents, must determine what the state is offering to attract new industries and students in order to define what that future looks like.

Regent Brown challenged the Field of Dreams model, stating that it takes excessive money, time, and resources. She noted a communication gap where the five industry pillars and recruitment efforts from GOED are not trickling down to higher education institutions. Regent Brown asserted that without better alignment the state risks providing taxpayer subsidized education to students who will ultimately leave Nevada because the industries they were trained for are not being brought in.

Regent Brown addressed Nevada's competitive advantages, noting that while proximity to California and Nevada's 54 million visitors is compelling, those should not be the only

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

selling points. She emphasized that Nevada's true strength should be that higher education is so nimble and that staff will work with businesses to create specific training programs. Regent Brown acknowledged that Nevada has limited resources compared to competitors like Texas, which can offer tax free for 10 years or land incentives that Nevada cannot currently match.

Regent Brown concluded that higher education cannot dictate to the market, as this results in students who wouldn't have jobs and they leave the state. She advocated for a collaborative approach where stakeholders are sitting at the table to understand what businesses are hearing. Regent Brown shared that since many business interests are inbound curiosity about Nevada, the System must be ready to introduce them to presidents to navigate the community effectively.

Mr. Skancke clarified that he wasn't suggesting it is the responsibility of the institutions or the Board to attract businesses. Regent Brown asked if the regional development authorities are not attracting those businesses, what happens to the student in four years. Mr. Skancke returned to the chicken and egg relationship between the System and industry attraction, emphasizing that educational programs, like those at Stanford in Silicon Valley, often serve as the primary catalyst for industrial growth. Mr. Skancke asserted that policy must shift to prioritize the proactive attraction of students to build a competitive, educated workforce that rivals markets like Phoenix and Austin, necessitating a streamlined process that eliminates current barriers to entry. He challenged the System to prove its nimbleness by questioning whether institutional presidents have the direct authority to initiate new programs or if they are hindered by bureaucratic barriers involving the Chancellor and the Board.

Regent Brown addressed misconceptions regarding the role of the Board in program development. She asserted that the Board rarely denies new programs and emphasized that the onus lies with institutions working alongside the business community. She characterized the success of Silicon Valley as a result of entrepreneurs approaching Stanford with specific needs, arguing that higher education should not dictate offerings to the business sector. Regent Brown emphasized that for workforce training to be effective, businesses must be in the room to tell institutions exactly what they are looking for, rather than developing degrees in a vacuum and hoping jobs appear later.

Regent Brown criticized the current lack of coordination between regional development authorities and higher education. She called for increased accountability from economic development heads to present their focus to the Board, ensuring that institutional training remains strictly aligned with the state's actual business attraction and retention efforts. Regent Brown noted that recent workforce collaborative agreements have excluded academic institutions entirely. Mr. Skancke asked what the Board can do to create the next opportunity to attract the next generation of student. He conceded he did not know what that is or whose responsibility it is. Regent Brown noted that, in a perfect world, she would love to get all the entrepreneurs in the state who are investing here, starting businesses here, and creating things from scratch, in a room to learn what their "next" is. Mr. Skancke encouraged her to call such a meeting. Regent Brown placed the onus of coordination on

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

regional development agencies and addressed a fundamental crux of the disconnect between startups and higher education. She further asserted that there must be a streamlined point of contact, exemplified by a single individual who has all the answers, to eliminate redundant meetings and bridge the gap for companies entering the region. Regent Brown emphasized that rather than begging for talent through traditional higher education channels, businesses would sooner hire out-of-state talent and provide relocation packages to maintain operational speed.

Mr. Skancke offered an offline conversation on how to best achieve that vision.

Regent Brager left the meeting.

NSU Acting President Lopez Lasater emphasized the critical need for the System to establish a clear strategic direction. She noted that the fragmentation currently observed across individual spaces in Las Vegas serves as a significant barrier to achieving collective goals. While external stakeholders acknowledge the region's positive momentum and collaborative spirit, she highlighted that the needle has not yet moved far enough. Acting President Lopez Lasater advocated for institutions to work hand-in-hand to identify specific areas for expansion, thereby establishing a unified North Star to guide the future.

Chancellor Matt McNair acknowledged the validity of the concerns raised throughout the discussion. He noted that strategic planning efforts rooted in mission differentiation are underway despite existing resource and time constraints. Chancellor McNair also noted addressing the System's current lag in Artificial Intelligence is a significant priority. He acknowledged that the administration is conducting a comprehensive inventory of campus-level AI initiatives to develop a unified System strategy aimed at achieving operational efficiencies, economies of scale, and enhanced purchasing power. Chancellor McNair also emphasized the strategic planning process as a vital mechanism for institutional advancement. He underscored the philosophy that a plan is nothing, but planning is everything. Chancellor McNair highlighted the process as an opportunity to build trust and change collaborative workflows. The goal is to transform the administration and campuses into a cohesive team moving in a shared direction, with the initial discussions serving as a foundational step toward that objective.

Mr. Skancke recommended that NSHE establish a clear framework to define the roles of its leadership, likening the structure to the three branches of government. Mr. Skancke suggested a proactive legislative strategy as a critical priority for the System's future. He advised the Board to define its own legislative agenda and communicate the System's needs to the state legislature before mandates are imposed upon them. Mr. Skancke highlighted that the approach requires consistent education, communication, and pure grit to be successful. He urged the group to change their current patterns of thought to solve systemic problems. He noted that as the state grows in a global economy, the existing framework must adapt rather than remain stagnant like century-old water laws. He shared his belief that having honest and difficult dialogue now provides an opportunity to make the substantive changes necessary to modernize how the System functions. Mr. Skancke challenged the Regents to identify what they specifically want to accomplish during their

4. Information Only-Leadership Workshop: One NSHE – (Continued)

tenure and suggested that they focus on a four-year goal for policy reform. He emphasized moving away from political documents and instead creating policy-driven frameworks that guide staff toward collective goals. Mr. Skancke concluded the workshop with a reminder of the shared responsibility to help the next generation of leaders, emphasizing that the work done today should leave the institutions better for those who follow.

Chair Brooks closed the discussion by thanking the participants for the open dialogue and acknowledging that while not every idea was popular, the conversation was necessary to move the System forward.

Chair Brooks paused to offer special recognition to Mr. Rick Romero, SCS Manager of Audiovisual Operations. He highlighted Mr. Romero's 24 years of service to NSHE. The Regents expressed their collective appreciation.

5. Information Only-New Business – None.

6. Information Only – Public Comment – Dr. Bill Robinson addressed the Board with three specific recommendations aimed at fixing the *Board of Regents Handbook* to improve institutional oversight. Dr. Robinson urged the Regents to reclaim its authority to approve institutional bylaws. He noted that in the past, campuses were required to bring their bylaws to the Board for approval to ensure policy alignment. Dr. Robinson recounted that a previous chancellor grabbed that away, leaving the Board unaware of how campuses were implementing Board policy. Additionally, Dr. Robinson suggested canceling the quarterly meetings and instead having the Board spend one full day every two years on each campus. The goal would be to learn about the campus and talk to everybody on the campus. Dr. Robinson's third recommendation focused on long-term student recruitment. He proposed sending giant posters to every 7th grader in the state featuring all System institutions and a QR code for social media engagement. The strategy would involve continuous engagement from 8th through 10th grade, pushing students toward dual and concurrent enrollment early. He asserted that by the time a student is a junior or senior, they should think of the System as an old friend, not some new person who just sent them a postcard. The end goal would be a one-click application process for all seven teaching institutions.

Luisa Bautista, NSU Chair of Public Relations and member of the Power-based Violence Task Force, expressed gratitude on behalf of the student body for the appointment of Dr. Richtermeyer as the next President of NSU. She offered special thanks to Acting President Lopez Lasater for her service, noting that she has done amazing things for the student body, faculty, and staff.

The meeting adjourned at 1:28 p.m.

Prepared by:

Klaas H. Van Der Wey
Special Assistant and Coordinator to the Board of Regents

Submitted for approval by:

Keri D. Nikolajewski
Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents