

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Friday, February 27, 2026 4:06:11 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: sfederofficial@gmail.com

Name: Samantha Feder

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: Agenda Item #18 – 2027-29 Biennial Operating Budget/2027 Capital Improvement Projects (For Possible Action)

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Favor

Comment:

As a disabled student who has been unable to build community because of the lack of accessible guidelines followed by UNLV. I am currently a senior graduating this semester, and for the last 3-4 years I have had a hand in supporting accessible events for students, faculty and staff. While bigger events have minimal accommodations, the need for a guideline for accessible measures at UNLV is needed. The need to support disabled students, not just in building ramps, but in actual accessible measures including accessible measures when emergency happens (re: December 6th), guidelines for accessible events including how one enters and leaves events, more care for automatic doors which includes having the free space around the buttons to open said doors, and so much more. Currently, UNLV is breaking multiple ADA guidelines including ones for Emergency Services (Emergency Management under Title II of ADA, Chapter 7), Automatic Doors (Automatic doors and gates comply with 404.3: Full-powered automatic doors shall comply with ANSI/BHMA A156.10 + Clear Floor Space: Section 308.2 for Operable Parts), Temporary Event Planning (Title III: Sec. 12182. Prohibition of discrimination by public accommodations + [§206.2.2]: Within a Site [<https://www.access-board.gov/ada/guides/chapter-4-accessible-routes/#accessible-routes-exterior-within-a-site>]), Accessible Tables, and Elevators (Platform lifts shall comply with ASME A18.1 [1999 edition or 2003 edition]). I hope the Board sees the need for more money to be put into accessible care on campus, including for residents who live on campus. These measures not only benefit disabled students, but through the curb cut effect, these accessible

measures make it easier for everyone at the end of the day. However, there needs to be focus and care in providing accessible space and community for disabled students. I hope that disabled students that come after me, do not have to feel as isolated as I have felt during the bulk of my time at UNLV.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Monday, March 2, 2026 7:24:21 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: jodi.gonz@csn.edu

Name: Jodi Gonz

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: Cut in Summer pay and increase in office hours

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Good morning my name is Jodi Gonz and I am a faculty member with fifteen years at CSN. I teach in Health Sciences in the Diagnostic Medical Sonography Program. I have enjoyed my years here at CSN tremendously and love my input in future sonographers lives. I feel that because of our expertise in the program we have staffed our communities with very capable and intelligent sonographers that can be trusted with our health and the health of our loved ones in their hands.

This confidence would not be possible if it were not for the long hours that we put in, the education in the field that we have and the hours upon hours of studying and professional development that we invest in ourselves so that we can invest in future sonographers.

With all of that being said it would absolutely not be fair to us or our students If we had to increase our office hours with no financial incentive as we put in long tedious hours working at home every day already. Not only that, but our students also know that they can reach us at any time and we will make ourselves available. Adding more office hours will not improve our workload.

As health care workers we have already cut our pay to teach in Health Sciences and in my fifteen years I have only seen two healthy cost of living raises which were both implemented by Governor Lombardo in recent years. Cutting summer pay would also absolutely not be fair considering the long tedious hours we put in in our after-hours preparing material which we do not get paid for.

Respectfully I encourage Dr. Klippenstein to please leave our summer pay and office hours alone. Thank you for your time and consideration on this important matter.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 8:31:54 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: gracie.mcdonough@csn.edu

Name: Gracie McDonough

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Public Comment on Faculty Contract Changes I want to express my concern regarding the recent decision by the administration to try and change faculty contracts from 35 hours per week to 40 hours per week without any additional compensation. This change is not only unfair but also undermines the hard work and dedication of faculty members. Increased Workload: Faculty members already put in significant effort to support their students and contribute to the institution. Adding five extra hours without compensation is unreasonable and places an undue burden on us, diminishing the quality of education we can provide. Unreasonable Expectations: It is simply unreasonable for the administration to expect faculty to take on additional responsibilities without any increase in pay. This expectation not only devalues our contributions but also risks burnout among faculty, which ultimately affects our students.

Impact on Morale: This decision can severely impact faculty morale. It sends a message that our hard work and commitment are not valued, which may lead to decreased job satisfaction and retention issues.

Quality of Education: With the increased workload and no additional pay, the quality of our educational programs may suffer. Faculty need the time and resources to prepare effectively for classes and support student needs.

I urge the administration to reconsider this decision and engage in a transparent dialogue with faculty about fair compensation and workload expectations, and for the Board of Regents to not allow the administration to put forward unreasonable proposals. We deserve an

environment that recognizes and values our contributions. Thank you for your attention.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 9:43:34 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: lvsawyer@hotmail.com

Name: Jack Sawyer

Representing someone other than yourself?: Self

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment on CSN Admin Proposed Faculty Contract Changes:
OPPOSED to +5 hours faculty work/no pay; appointing dept chairs

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Re: CSN admin's two proposals: 1) Add 5 hours to the faculty's work week without additional compensation, and 2) appointing dept. chairs (instead of honoring faculty's power to elect chairs)—these ideas will: crash faculty morale; crash CSN's ability to attract high quality job candidates; crash the faculty's trust in the College administration; crash faculty's willingness to work any minute beyond absolute contractual requirements; crash our spirit of collaboration on fulfilling the College mission to guide and inspire students to their very best efforts to achieve, succeed and prosper.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 9:55:19 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: stephanie.espinoza@csn.edu

Name: Stephanie Villamor

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment on CSN Admin Proposed Faculty Contract Changes

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Public Comment on Faculty Contract Changes – I want to express my concern regarding the recent decision by the administration to try and change faculty contracts from 35 hours per week to 40 hours per week without any additional compensation. My department is unique in that we are faculty librarians, charged with multiple duties including running both physical and online campus library spaces, teaching information literacy and critical thinking skills, managing entire library collections in both print and online such as our ebook collections and over 130 databases, serving on internal committees as well as external committees for service to the college, and much more. Adding five more hours to our work load is an unfair ask without offering additional compensation, but I would also like to point out that we were hired under a 35-hour work week as one of the benefits of working at CSN. In the past two years we have already lost two qualified librarians to other institutions. If we want to keep our current talent and attract new talent we can't be taking away one of the benefits of being a faculty member at CSN. I stand with my colleagues who have urged the administration to reconsider this decision and engage in a transparent dialogue with faculty about fair compensation and workload expectations, and for the Board of Regents to not allow the administration to put forward unreasonable proposals. We deserve an environment that recognizes and values our contributions. Thank you for your attention.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 11:18:38 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: irene.coons@csn.edu

Name: Irene Coons

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Comment (Proposed Administrative CBA Changes at CSN)

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

I do not support the proposed administrative changes to our CBA. As a nursing professor who teaches mostly in clinical facilities, I should be able to meet my students for office hours where it is best for them/myself. This may include after clinical ends, but while still at the facility. Making it a mandate to have “on campus” office hours only shows a lack of understanding regarding the uniqueness of the various faculty teaching at CSN. Furthermore, Dr Avalos recently held “remote” office hours on each campus (in the student unions). I assume that this was to better reach students where they were learning/located. However, we as faculty must be strictly in our offices during these hours? This is seen as a punitive measure. I have also written to Dr Klippenstein of my concerns regarding the multiple changes to the CBA.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2026 12:03:24 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: jason.green@csn.edu

Name: Jason Green

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: 35-Hour Work Week Change

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Being a Librarian and Faculty Member of the College of Southern Nevada is part of being something greater than a “work week hour change.” We are Academics that have cognitively demanding work that includes teaching, research, contract negotiation (for Acquisitions Librarians), instruction session planning, creating deliverables for classes and the college in general, as well as our internal committees and our Faculty commitments to Faculty Senate Work.

The 35-hour work week reduces burnout (which our CAPE Team just did a CAPE session on this past Convocation), it improves the overall mental health of constantly being on demand and using a higher level mental capacity and function than a typical job – our jobs are unique daily and we face challenges of overcoming those challenges creatively taxes the mental health and increases burnout.

The 35-hour work week as a benefit also reduces turn over. In my 9 years as a Librarian and 12 years at the College of Southern Nevada, we have had a turnover rate higher than I’ve seen at other schools – we lose talent when work-life balance falls short. In the time I’ve been hired, of the 12 Librarians I started working at the College of Southern Nevada with, including myself, 3 (THREE) are still working here. Others left for better opportunities at other colleges, this change in the 35-hour work week makes those other opportunities more appealing to all involved. I have also been through a change of 5 Library Directors in that time due to burnout

as well.

Academic quality is not measured by time, but by quality of output. It's measured by quality of instruction, research endeavors, institutional service and committees, work that goes far beyond our already established 35-hour work week that we are already not compensated for in any way – monetarily or time off.

The Board of Regents should consider reasonable workload boundaries already put on us through various activities rather than assuming we are a replaceable and unlink

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 6:04:32 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: bob.manis@csn.edu

Name: Robert Manis

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

The Nevada faculty alliance has been bargaining in good faith with the college of southern Nevada for well over a year. Despite its best intentions, it has been met with strange and punitive demands including more work for less pay. Additionally, The college negotiating team has insisted that simple things like academic freedom aren't mandatory topics to be bargained over. The new college President while well intentioned has thus far been unwilling to put a stop to these unreasonable demands. The Regents have recently passed a student fee increase. Insisting on pay cuts is unnecessary and unreasonable. Refusal to acknowledge academic freedom is unconscionable. The Regents need to understand that such tactics are counterproductive and result only in lower morale. I hope they will let the President know that it's up to him to stop such maneuvering by the team that is operating in his name.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 6:32:48 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: tara.busch@csn.edu

Name: Tara Busch

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

I am firmly opposed to the proposed summer pay cut, increased faculty in person office hours, and the increased PEPB health insurance costs.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 9:43:16 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: ff2emtvol@yahoo.com

Name: Scott S Beckstrand

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Favor

Comment:

I regret not being able to attend , but had shoulder replacement surgery on March 3rd. For over 30 years I did not affiliate myself with the NFA for a number of reasons. To be honest, I disagreed with some stances of NFA in the past and am not a fan of union-like organizations because they often become just like the organization they are working against; more concerned with self-preservation than representing. However, times have changed, and the new negotiating team and current administration of CSN have been moving too far away from any type of shared governance or even including faculty in decisions. I feel their actions are more about a new campus that, in my opinion, is not needed, and the administration as a whole, which keeps growing with Deans, VPs, etc. and now a desire to name Department chairs and make them administrative positions. Dictates now seem to be the norm from the Administration. I do question if their current actions are really for the students. The administration wants to cut Summer pay even though it is a money maker for the College, do not seem to follow the State in the use of funds. as well as wanting additional work but without any pay increases. I have watched the erosion of the faculty voices which needs to be reversed,

Dr. Scott Beckstrand

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 8:03:51 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: staci.walters@nevadafacultyalliance.org

Name: Staci Walters

Representing someone other than yourself?: Nevada Faculty Alliance

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Comments

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

Title: Grievance arbitration is mandatory, affordable by design, and needed. I'm Staci Walters, President of the Nevada Faculty Alliance. Today I'm addressing one thing only: grievance arbitration—not interest arbitration. Grievance arbitration is the final step to enforce a contract when internal steps fail. It prevents disputes from dragging on indefinitely. [Under the Board's bargaining framework, grievance and arbitration procedures are a mandatory subject of bargaining. In plain terms, "mandatory" means it must be seriously negotiated—it's not something the employer can simply take off the table. Yet across negotiations, chapters are being told—directly or indirectly—that grievance arbitration is not available because "the system doesn't want it" and because it is "too expensive." So my questions are: • Do Regents actually oppose grievance arbitration? • Or are Regents hearing "too expensive" without being shown cost-controlled models? • And who is deciding what can be negotiated—campus leadership, the system, or legal strategy? Because "too expensive" compared to what—months of unresolved disputes, turnover, and management time? Grievance arbitration can be designed to be affordable: mediation first, expedited timelines, a single arbitrator, caps on hearing days, and limits on briefs. My ask: request a short options memo with two or three cost-controlled arbitration models, and direct negotiators to meaningfully bargain this mandatory topic. Thank you.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 8:07:47 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: staci.walters@nevadafacultyalliance.com

Name: Staci Walters

Representing someone other than yourself?: Nevada Faculty Alliance

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Comments, CB Negotiations

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

Title: Bargaining stability, CSN stalled negotiations, and fact-finding. I'm Staci Walters, President of the Nevada Faculty Alliance, and I'm on the bargaining team at the College of Southern Nevada. [pause] CSN is in month 16 of negotiations. And over the last month, CSN has stopped bargaining in any meaningful way—pushing us toward fact-finding, which delays resolution and creates instability for students and employees. Here's the plain-language problem: bargaining is being narrowed to "only the minimum required topics," while other long-standing, working contract provisions are treated as disposable. That doesn't streamline the process—it strips the contract and fuels conflict. On the ground, that looks like: faculty input being dismissed, not weighed—because "it's not mandatory." It looks like delay, stalling, and elimination of language that previously helped the campus operate predictably. I've helped negotiate prior agreements that both CSN and faculty described as sustainable and workable. So when the approach shifts from problem-solving to delay-and-strip, it fractures trust and makes settlement harder. My ask is simple Board oversight: 1) Require regular, standardized bargaining updates—what's settled, what's stuck, and why. 2) Ask directly: are campuses bargaining a complete successor agreement or a minimum-only shell? 3) With CSN moving into fact-finding, ask: who decided to stop bargaining, and what is the plan to restart real negotiations now? Thank you.

CSN only decided to return to the negotiating table once they heard that CSN faculty were going to show up and speak to the Regents at the CSN-hosted meeting. They offered to return

to negotiations on Monday of the same week, in order to have a response to the Regents when asked about negotiations at CSN. This is not a good faith effort to end bargaining. It is merely performative politicking.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 8:54:24 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: latasuvvari@gmail.com

Name: Lata Koneru

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

Good morning, NSHE Board of Regents. My name is Lata Koneru, and I am a Professor in the CIT department at CSN. I appreciate the opportunity to address you today on matters that directly affect the quality of education and the integrity of our institution. I am here to voice serious concerns shared by many of my colleagues regarding proposed changes that would cut summer compensation, increase workload without additional pay, and diminish faculty participation in shared governance.

On summer pay cuts: Summer instruction is not supplemental work, it is essential to student progress and degree completion. Cutting summer compensation will make it harder to attract and retain the qualified instructors our students depend on. Faculty who can seek opportunities elsewhere will do so, and the students who remain will bear the cost.

On unpaid workload increases: Our faculty are already operating at capacity. Asking us to absorb more responsibility without compensation is not a budget solution. It is an unfunded mandate that degrades working conditions and, ultimately, the student experience. Sustainable institutions do not balance budgets on the backs of their educators.

On faculty voice: Shared governance is not a courtesy; it is a cornerstone of academic excellence. Decisions about curriculum, workload, and academic policy must include the faculty who carry them out. Eroding that voice doesn't streamline decision-making; it disconnects leadership from the realities of the classroom.

I urge this Board to reject these proposals and to work collaboratively with faculty to find solutions that protect both the institution's financial health and its academic mission.

Thank you,
Dr. Lata Koneru

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 10:31:58 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: luke.parker@csn.edu

Name: Luke Parker

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: I do not support summer pay cuts, I do not support unpaid workload increases, I do not support you eroding my voice as a faculty member of CSN.

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

If you want to manage a learning institute, you need to support the students, the faculty, staff, and the programs that support students, faculty, and staff. Those need to be the priorities.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 10:36:38 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: kali.rao@csn.edu

Name: Kali Rao

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment on CSN CBA changes.

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

The CSN administration is increasingly antagonistic towards faculty. The faculty at CSN is the main reason that our college has a good reputation across the country. We are the first and main contact with the students. One cannot claim to be student first while disrespecting everything the faculty does.

The administration is trying to remove articles of CBA that are dear to faculty members. I completely oppose the administration stance on the following:

1. Summer pay, it is very important part of faculty income at no cost to NSHE.
2. On campus office hours – a very outdated concept. I sincerely maintain office hours on campus and the last four years only one student showed up because he needed a signature. On the other hand, I have several online video conferences with students every semester. Students prefer it and are less intimidated to communicate online. A dean or chair of the department can drop in on online office hours to check if we are keeping office hours. It is actually much easier on those who monitor to check online office hours rather than going to three campuses to see if the person is there or not.
3. Please keep the current CBA

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 11:04:53 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: sraocitclass@yahoo.com

Name: Smita Rao

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment on CSN Admin Proposed CBA Changes

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Good morning. My name is Smita Rao, and I am a Professor at CSN. I have truly enjoyed my work over the past 25 years and am grateful for the opportunities and experiences this position has provided.

As we work through negotiations for the new CBA, I would like to take a moment to share a few concerns.

I do not support the following proposed administrative changes to our current CBA.

1. Cut summer pay: Reducing summer pay would also hurt faculty morale. Summer teaching is an important incentive, especially for new faculty who often begin at the lower end of the pay scale. For current faculty, it helps offset the reality that COLA adjustments are rare while the cost of everyday expenses continues to rise. Maintaining this support shows that the institution values the work and commitment of its faculty.
2. Restrict the location of office hours: Restricting office hours to a few set times on campus feels outdated. Today's students expect convenience and flexibility. They prefer being able to reach their instructors when questions come up rather than waiting for a narrow window during the week and driving to campus for a short meeting.
3. Remove meaningful faculty voice in department chair selection. Give deans greater authority to choose department chairs and direct departments day-to-day, shifting CSN away from faculty-elected chairs and weakening faculty voice in how programs are run
4. REFUSAL TO USE NEUTRAL ARBITRATION IN GRIEVANCES – Admin insists that

final decisions stay with administration, not an independent third-party arbitrator.
Thank you for your time.
Respectfully,
Smita Rao

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 12:14:32 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: joseph.hassert@csn.edu

Name: Joseph Hassert

Representing someone other than yourself?: Myself

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

I want to note I was present at the meeting at CSN with intent of publicly stating this comment, but I had to leave to teach.

I'm writing to express concern about the current state of collective bargaining negotiations between faculty and administration at the College of Southern Nevada.

While I am not personally at the bargaining table, the reports from our faculty negotiators suggest that faculty are largely on the defensive—working simply to preserve the provisions and protections of our current contract—while administration has advanced several proposals that would significantly reduce faculty power and compensation.

Two proposals in particular stand out. One would increase contracted hours without increasing pay, and another would reduce compensation for summer teaching. At a time of rising costs—when many of us are struggling with the housing market—and after eleven years of my career here in which I have experienced more years of furlough pay than merit pay, these proposals would move faculty backward.

Our first contract negotiations a few years ago were not without disagreements, but both sides ultimately approached the process in good faith. The agreement we reached improved faculty morale and made many of us feel that faculty were being treated as important stakeholders in

the institution.

This time feels different.

I've heard that negotiations at Nevada State University are proceeding with far more cooperation, which suggests that the posture we're seeing at CSN may not reflect the intent of this Board or the Chancellor.

My hope is that the Regents will encourage CSN administration to reconsider its approach—either by adjusting its posture or its representation at the table—so that negotiations can move toward a fair agreement that strengthens, rather than weakens, faculty pay and protections.

Right now, these proposals are damaging morale and straining constructive working relationship faculty have had with CSN administration in recent years.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education (<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 1:39:13 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: adrienne.finlay@students.nevadastate.edu

Name: Adrienne Finlay

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

I appreciate the opportunity to have my comment considered today as the Board reviews items related to the development of the 2027–2029 biennial budget and upcoming tuition and fee considerations.

I understand that maintaining strong institutions requires careful financial planning. At the same time, the way those decisions translate into the daily lives of students deserves equal attention. Even incremental tuition increases, especially when discussed as small percentage adjustments, can have cumulative impacts on students who are already balancing tuition, housing, transportation, and work.

For many students across Nevada, affordability is not a theoretical discussion. It directly shapes whether we remain enrolled, how many credits we take each semester, and how long it takes to complete a degree.

As the Board continues developing budget priorities and tuition plans, I encourage you to ensure that student voice and student affordability remain central to those conversations. Students are not just stakeholders in this system, we are the reason the system exists.

So my question for the Board is this: as these financial decisions move forward, how will you ensure that student affordability remains a measurable priority, not just a value that is acknowledged in discussion?

Thank you for your time and for your service to Nevada's students.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 1:59:57 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: erikagabad@gmail.com

Name: Erika Abad

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: general public comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

Words matter. Four years into teaching public speaking at Nevada State University, the generosity and support Scorpions give each other reminds me of why my spiritual ethic is still fed by serving southern Nevada students.

While many of them celebrate and look forward to financial security, working and going to school full-time, they also find growth in the moments they support themselves. Whether giving someone a tissue, texting each other to tell me they're going to be missing class or bringing home baked cookies, students' sense of compassion and care is something from which I, like many of us, can learn from.

In reflecting on the discussion of examining NS like a business, I asked students what it meant they were—clients, consumers, or products. As consumers, what more are they paying for as leaders are combing through the in-person services that AI cannot begin to replace? As clients, how will the long-term services they're provided be improved among hiring freezes and or shrinking personnel? As products—my least favorite framing—under what conditions are each of these organizations expected to produce quality employees if/when the employees are sacrificing sleep and, by extension physical and emotional health, to be more employable?

I think about this especially as Wellness and I discuss the mixed feelings that come with the thousands of visits the campus pantry gets. I think about this when students run to grab the

freshly harvested produce in student lounges. We are a community of mutual support here at Nevada State—a culture in which many of us have thrived, even as the necessity for innovation is prompted by limited resources. That being said, the innovation born of limitation, as any good businessman knows, can effect the long-term quality of what we provide.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Thursday, March 5, 2026 6:41:25 PM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: irunfast1217@gmail.com

Name: Mike Lewis

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: Public Comment on Agenda Item #14 – Athletic Reports

In Favor / Opposed / Other: No Position stated – Concerned or Neutral

Comment:

The presentations provided by the athletic departments highlight achievements, conference participation, and general program operations. However, they do not provide the Board of Regents or the public with an important analytical context: the NCAA regulatory framework that defines the minimum requirements for maintaining NCAA Division I membership. Without this context, it is difficult for policymakers to determine which athletic expenditures are required by NCAA rules and which represent discretionary institutional choices that could potentially be adjusted to manage costs. NCAA Division I Bylaw 20.10 requires member institutions to sponsor at least 14 varsity sports. Beyond these structural requirements, most NCAA sport regulations establish maximum limits rather than mandatory levels. These include: Maximum number of regular-season contests, Maximum number of countable coaches, Maximum roster or scholarship limits, and Scheduling and participation parameters. In other words, Institutions may choose to schedule fewer contests in a season, hire fewer coaches than the maximum, or reduce roster sizes without jeopardizing Division I membership status. They do not require schools to operate at the maximum level of competitive or financial intensity. The athletic reports presented to the Board do not disclose where UNLV and UNR operate relative to these limits. Without this information, the Board cannot determine whether athletic spending reflects compliance requirements or strategic institutional choices. Transparent reporting would allow the Board of Regents and the public to better understand where meaningful cost-management opportunities might exist. Future athletic reports could therefore include a standardized table showing, for each sport: 1. NCAA

maximum contests allowed vs. actual contests scheduled, 2. NCAA coaching limits vs. number of coaches employed, 2. NCAA roster limits vs. actual roster size, and 3. Scholarship capacity vs. scholarships awarded.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Friday, March 6, 2026 1:27:16 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: bmwflora@yahoo.com

Name: Flora Rudacille

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: Public Comment

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Greetings NSHE Board of Regents,

My name is Flora Rudacille and I'm a faculty member at CSN. CSN educates more Nevada students than any other higher education institution in the state. Indeed, my daughter and my grandchildren are all CSN Alumni.

I'm writing because several proposed changes affecting CSN faculty raise concerns about both the working conditions of educators and the learning conditions of students. One proposal would reduce summer teaching pay from about \$2,100 per instructional unit to \$1,400. That's a reduction of roughly \$2,100 for a typical three-credit course.

At that level, summer pay would match part-time faculty compensation. Our part-time colleagues are essential to CSN, and many of us are actively advocating for increased compensation for them as well. However, this change may discourage many full-time faculty from teaching summer courses, which could reduce course availability for students.

At the same time, faculty are facing increased health insurance costs and proposals that would expand workload expectations without additional compensation.

Equally concerning are proposals that would reduce faculty voice in shared governance — including removing meaningful faculty participation in the selection of department chairs and weakening protections for academic freedom. Shared governance is a foundational principle of higher education and one that our accreditor, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, has emphasized.

NSHE depends on attracting and retaining talented faculty. Policies that reduce compensation

while expanding obligations make that goal harder to achieve.
Right now, these proposals feel like “all stick and no carrot”. If we want to retain the faculty who educate so many of Nevada’s students for the next step in their educations (often at another NSHE institution) and for their future careers, and roles in Nevada’s workforce, we must protect fair compensation, shared governance and academic freedom. Thank you!

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)

From: [NSHE](#)
To: [Keri Nikolajewski](#); [Winter Lipson](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026
Date: Friday, March 6, 2026 6:29:58 AM

External Email:

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Email: joshua.cook@csn.edu

Name: Josh Cook

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, March 5-6, 2026

Agenda Item: Summer pay, contract workweeks, contact hours, chair selection

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on these agenda items. I would like to speak out against them.

The summer pay decrease, if approved, would provide the same amount of compensation for summer courses as I earned as an adjunct teaching regular semester courses in 2009 and 2010. These wages were unlivable then, and they are more so in 2026.

Regarding faculty workweeks/contact hours: So much of the work I do is not completed in my office: grading, prepping, corresponding with students via email and Canvas. I help advise the Creative Writing Club, and meet with students on evenings and the occasional weekend. I do, however, hold all my office hours, currently, in-person, in my office on the Charleston campus. Since I started at CSN in August 2025, no student has made use of those in-person hours. I have, however, met with various students virtually.

No two students are the same. They cannot both be helped in the same way. A top-down approach in which administrative decisions dictate pedagogical methods is not, in my view, conducive to learning.

I'm to CSN and Las Vegas, and I am happy to be here. CSN's students are active, engaged, and curious; their work makes my work fulfilling. I have good relationships with my colleagues in

the English department, as well as with my department chair. CSN is a place I could see myself staying long-term. Having just left Texas, where I taught for two years, the difference is palpable: here, I feel trusted and supported. However, the rationale behind proposals such as increasing faculty workweeks and removing shared governance (dept chair selection, for instance) seems to me a step in the opposite direction.

I have seen what it looks like when trust is absent between faculty and administration. Fear steps in and dominates the culture. In these situations, faculty can't do their jobs, and students don't receive the education they deserve. I respectfully ask the Board of Regents to vote no on these proposals.

Agreed that all the information above is true and accurate: Yes

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Nevada System of Higher Education
(<https://nshe.nevada.edu>)