From: NSHE
To: Keri Nikolajewski; Winter Lipson
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Monday, August 31, 2026 1:55:37 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: marianne.sebok@csn.edu

Name: Marianne Sebok, PhD, PMP

Representing someone other than yourself?: Maria Schellhase, DBA, PMP, SHRM-SCP

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: NWCCU Board Governance and Three-Year Degrees

In Favor / Opposed / Other: In Opposition

Comment:

The CSN Bachelor of Applied Science Project Management program has been active since 2019. From the planning stages to the launch of the degree took two and a half years of methodical and deliberate steps, because that is what NSHE policy requires. Please defer action on Great Basin College's proposed 90-credit baccalaureate in project management and 90-credit baccalaureate degrees in general; refer to the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee to develop a complete record.

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, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Monday, August 31, 2026 9:16:28 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: Jackie.Mambelli@gmail.com

Name: Jackie Mambelli

Representing someone other than yourself?: myself

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

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

Comment:

I am a faculty member at the College of Southern Nevada and wish to raise a serious concern regarding institutional accountability, faculty compensation, and whether faculty have a meaningful mechanism for obtaining independent review when an institution allegedly fails to follow its collective bargaining agreement and established procedures.

One concrete example involves faculty compensation. The applicable collective bargaining agreement establishes a three-hour obligation associated with commencement. CSN has nevertheless assessed four hours of Leave Without Pay against faculty arising from that obligation. Despite repeated requests, CSN has not identified the contractual provision, payroll rule, calculation, or other authority explaining how a three-hour contractual obligation can result in four hours of withheld compensation.

There is an additional concern regarding deductions being carried across faculty contract periods. An obligation allegedly arising during one contract period may result in compensation being withheld during a subsequent contract period. This raises an important question regarding what contractual, NSHE, payroll, or legal authority permits an institution to carry an alleged Leave Without Pay obligation from one faculty contract year into another and deduct it from compensation earned under the later contract.

These are not merely individual employment disputes if the same interpretation or practice is being applied to multiple faculty members. They raise broader questions concerning CSN's administration of the collective bargaining agreement and the protection of faculty

compensation.

Faculty are repeatedly instructed to use established grievance procedures when institutional actions are disputed. Those protections have little practical meaning, however, if individual faculty members must separately pursue multiple levels of grievance simply to obtain an explanation of the contractual or legal authority under which their compensation is

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, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Monday, August 31, 2026 9:29:19 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: er.delara@gmail.com

Name: Rodney Delara

Representing someone other than yourself?: myself

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

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

Comment:

I am speaking today in my individual capacity as a Nevada resident and public employee regarding matters of institutional accountability, integrity, and stewardship of public resources at the College of Southern Nevada.

I have raised documented concerns that faculty employment, leave, payroll, or contractual records have been altered, manipulated, or inaccurately characterized in ways that resulted in the loss of compensation. If employment records affecting public employees' compensation are knowingly falsified or manipulated, this is not simply an individual employment dispute. It raises serious questions about institutional integrity, abuse of administrative authority, and stewardship of public funds.

These concerns are readily verifiable. I respectfully encourage the Board to ask CSN's Chief Human Resources Officer, Office of General Counsel, and President's Office whether they have received reports or are otherwise aware of allegations involving manipulated or inaccurate faculty employment records resulting in loss of compensation. More importantly, ask what was done after those concerns were reported.

Were the underlying records independently examined? Who created or modified them? Were inaccurate records corrected? Were affected faculty made whole? And were the individuals responsible for those records held accountable?

Faculty are repeatedly instructed to use internal grievance procedures. But there is a

fundamental accountability problem when employees must rely upon the same institutional structure whose conduct and records they are challenging to investigate itself.

I am not asking the Board to adjudicate my individual employment dispute. I am asking the Board to exercise its oversight responsibility and determine whether independent review is warranted regarding the integrity of CSN's employment records, losses of faculty compensation, grievance administration, and the institutional response after senior leadership was placed on notice.

Public empl

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, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2026 8:22:16 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: r3basss@gmail.com

Name: Ronald Ramirez-Rivera, EdD

Representing someone other than yourself?:

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: General Public Comment

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

Comment:

Esteemed members of the Board,

My name is Ronald Ramírez-Rivera, a K-5 world language scholar-practitioner in Las Vegas, and currently pursuing a Master of Legal Studies at Vanderbilt University. I am writing to urge you to retain the IDEA Committee.

Our nation has a well-documented foreign language deficit. While funding exists for world language education, we overlook a resource Nevada already has: multilingual speakers. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2023 American Community Survey, 31% of Nevadans speak a language other than English at home — the national average is 23%, placing Nevada among the top five states for this resource. That resource requires nurturing, not neglect. Eliminating the IDEA Committee would remove a safeguard for developing it fully.

A related concern is our deaf and hard of hearing (DHH) community, which continues to be underserved. Part of the problem is a persistent misunderstanding that American Sign Language (ASL) is simply English with your hands. It is not. ASL is a language with its own grammar and culture — one of hundreds of signed languages worldwide. Much DHH language access is addressed under the ADA, but ASL is not an accommodation; the accommodation is providing an interpreter. Languages are typically protected under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, but only by country of origin — and a community, unlike a country, does not qualify. Ironically, Indigenous languages and other signed languages abroad receive that protection.

We create taxonomies to understand the world, but the world does not fit neatly into them. Bodies like the IDEA Committee exist to catch what law and society miss. As a scholar-practitioner in world language education and neurodiversity, I urge the Board to vote against eliminating the IDEA Committee, and to consider strengthening rather than dissolving this safeguard.

Respectfully,

Ronald Ramírez-Rivera, EdD

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, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2026 9:42:10 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: azaidi_cmp@live.com

Name: Ali Zaidi

Representing someone other than yourself?: Syeda Zaidi

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: My daughter is a student in pre- nursing. Despite triple checking with advisor and admin team, she is being refused to register for nursing and has changed policy today without informing students. We have paid out of pocket costs for her to take required classes at other schools so she doesn't have to miss a semester. Please address this policy. A lot of kids are going to lose a semester.

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

Comment:

UNLV can't change admin policy on the fly in the middle of the year when kids have planned and paid months years in advance. Please hold school of nursing admission team accountable.

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)

ESTABLISHED 1983

To: NSHE Board of Regents
From: Amy Pason, Chapter President of the UNR Nevada Faculty Alliance

RE: UNR Administration's Response to the Hawk Fire

The UNR Nevada Faculty Alliance, a chapter of the American Association of University Professors, **advocated to University leadership that campus should have been closed on August 24, 2026** due to the Hawk Fire. Although the University Administration repeatedly communicated that the campus was not in an evacuation zone (and thereby "safe") the conditions in which faculty, staff, and students were meant to work under were not ideal given the impacts of the fire on our greater Reno community. We believe the Washoe County School District and TMCC made the correct decision to remain closed at the start of the semester. The decision for K-12 to close created additional stress and burdens for those with children, who had to navigate the fire, start of semester, and childcare. Stress, disruptions, and that not all in our campus community could start the semester on campus were not ideal to have a successful Fall semester.

UNR-NFA chapter officers had been receiving emails from faculty throughout the weekend prior, with faculty reporting needing to evacuate, being without power, and without a clear indication of when they might be able to return to their homes. Whether they were evacuated or hosting another faculty member who had to evacuate, all were delayed or unable to prepare adequately for the semester start. We heard from members who were not in evacuation zones and in "yellow" get ready zones (or near those) who left the area out of abundance of caution or because they couldn't sleep believing they would need to evacuate at a moment's notice. We know of some faculty sleeping in their offices to ensure that they would be able to be at work on time. Those of us teaching classes had to address a number of emails from students who would not be able to attend for a number of reasons related to the fire (being evacuated, living in an area where roads were closed, assisting others who were in evacuation zones), where those students had the stress of missing class on top of addressing fire disruptions at home. Even faculty not impacted noted that traffic on Virginia Street gets congested and backed up on regular days in between class sessions or the end of the workday—we could only imagine how hard it would be for campus community members, especially those living on campus, to evacuate in a timely manner, especially when MORE would be on campus for the start of semester classes. For stress, for safety, and for not compounding challenges for those fighting and living in fire zones, UNR should not have operated under a "business as usual" mantra for the first week of the semester.

UNR-NFA sent a questionnaire to our members to better understand the impacts the fire had on their ability to work, and for members to give feedback on the Administration's response. Although the responses we received represent a small subset of faculty at the institution, we hope the Administration seriously considers this feedback both for future responses to crises as well as generally to better support workers. Notably, **25% of those that responded reported they were very impacted** by the fire, with 75% of total respondents noting they were impacted to some degree. Therefore, this feedback is coming directly from those that were navigating the fire and the Administration's push to continue business as usual.

The results are clear. The Administration's response to the Hawk Fire was UNSATISFACTORY.

80% of respondents reported being unsatisfied with the response by administration. Within that number, 68% indicated VERY unsatisfied with the response.
86% indicated they believe the University should have been closed the first day of the semester.

In the written comments, notable themes were clear. A majority believed campus should have been closed on August 24th and even noted that we have closed campus for less severe issues (snow days when there was barely any snow). There were a number of responses that said closing campus for a day or two was a "no-brainer." Additionally, the following themes emerged:

The first week of the semester was very stressful and very disruptive.

- A number of respondents noted the additional challenges caused by the fire: road closures that kept people away from Reno, half of departments evacuated and staying with faculty who were in safe zones, many preparing "go-bags" or assisting others that needed help with childcare or evacuations.
- Many noted the additional work of answering questions from panicked students, communicating with family and friends across the country who saw news of the fire on in national news outlets, and just the additional work for those that did hold class to "teach twice"—for the students in attendance and catching up those that could not attend.
- Many noted the equity issues and the added mental load to students (or faculty) that had to email professors or supervisors about missing on top of the "bigger (traumatic) problems" they had to worry about with the fire.
- Others noted their departments were hugely impacted (in one department, 60% of faculty and classified staff required to evacuate, 80% impacted by school and daycare closures) with most spending the weekend before the first day of the semester assisting evacuees.
- Many noted that it was hard to focus on classes (for faculty and students) with many students checking phones or taking calls during class to see the latest perimeter map updates.

There was a lack of communication from University Administration.

- Some described the administration's response as "negligent" and especially noted that there was no communication from the Provost, from Deans, or from other administrative supervisors in units. Some noted it wasn't surprising to not hear anything from administrators (as that fits previous patterns) but was still "incredibly upsetting" to not hear from administrators during challenging times.
- Some noted that the messages sent to campus were entirely student centered (about where to find resources) and that faculty should contact supervisors. It was also noted that contacting supervisors was not helpful as supervisors didn't have any more information than what was in the President's emails.
- Many noted that communication did not address the concerns or needs of faculty. "It would have been nice to receive some guidance or even words of condolence from our provost, a vice provost, or any of the Deans. We didn't hear anything from anyone in upper administration other than the president addressing the entire university in generic ways."
- Many noted that the Administration should have acknowledged we were in a state of emergency and not expect "business as usual" with many displaced/evacuated and national news attention on the fire.

The communication that was sent to faculty was "tone deaf" and did not fully understand the impacts of the fire on faculty and community members.

- One respondent was clear that "Simply repeating that the university itself is not in an evacuation zone is both tone deaf and caused significant anxiety and hardship for students and faculty. UNR was the outlier; WCSD and TMCC behaved responsibly." A number of respondents used the words "tone deaf" about messaging to campus.
- One noted: "The governor of the state declared a state of emergency for Washoe County, and our former-governor President declared 'Welcome Back Pack'. Tone deaf."
- Some suggested the only reason UNR remained open was all about a "national image" and made it look like the University only cares about money and ensuring student enrollment. "It feels as though the university was more concerned with what freshmen parents would think if the first day was closed than the reality of what the campus community was experiencing. It is another example of the University putting its head in the sand."
- Several respondents noted that they believe the Administration does not care, and that the feeling they had was the Administration believes faculty are "expendable, unimportant, and replaceable." A few mentioned it seemed the Administration was more concerned about the Lithium Summit than they were on the stress caused by the fire.
- One respondent pointed out that one email from the President also included information about the football schedule—another place where this left faculty "feeling stressed and devalued."
- One respondent heard from colleagues at other institutions (some that have also addressed wildfire crises) and said that these colleagues found our administration's communication "disrespectful and an unnecessary blow to morale. Seems unfathomable, especially as there is no up-side [to holding class]. A complete absence of humanity."
- Another noted that the University forgot how closely tied it is to the broader Reno community: as one the largest employers in the area, everyone on campus is related in some way to someone immediately impacted by the fire.
- Some noted that this is consistent with how "University Leadership completely disregards the well being of their faculty as well as their students," and that it "felt completely disrespectful to expect students, faculty and staff who are directly and indirectly impacted by the fire to navigate showing up for and preparing classes as usual."

There was a lack of an emergency plan or the information conveyed did not seem sufficient to address needs.

- Although emails suggested "there was an evacuation plan if needed," many faculty that would have been responsible during an evacuation (especially of those living on campus) received no specific information about a plan. As many evacuation centers filled up, this elevated concern about what would be possible if the campus had to evacuate.
- Some respondents wanted to have more transparency and information about *who w*as part of the decision-making process. It appears that faculty were not involved, and when asked about who was part, that information was not provided.
- A number mentioned the concern for bringing more people to campus which could increase risk if there was an evacuation. One noted the *Reno Gazette Journal* reporting that part of the reason for WSCD and TMCC to close was to reduce traffic in areas to prioritize access for first responders. This does not seem to be a consideration that UNR had with choosing to hold classes.
- One noted that "It seems that UNR decided to do its own thing because they thought it was safe, but safety wasn't the only factor. Practically speaking, the community was not prepared to come back to work."

- A number of respondents were looking for information from administration that provided "clear instructions on what supervisors were allowed to allow their instructors, staff, and students to do" in relation to cancelling class or seeking accommodations. They noted that this information was conveyed in an HR newsletter that went out on Tuesday—not in a message from the President or Provost. [Notably, the Dean of the Graduate School did send out more instructive information in this regard on Sunday night—that went out to Graduate Program Directors, but not campus-wide.]
- Many noted that the burden of navigating the situation was put on faculty or that giving students one contact for assistance (Dean of Students) was insufficient for the need. All individuals had to determine for themselves whether to leave for safety, go to campus for materials or class, or risk missing out.

There were a few respondents who did think the response was appropriate. They thought the Administration put students first and that there was benefit of being able to meet with students in-person to check in with them and how they were doing. These were certainly in the minority of respondents.

Just as our academic faculty receive feedback from students every semester in their classes, we hope that this serves as feedback to the Administration. Just because no one lost a life in this recent wildfire does not mean the right decisions were made for UNR. We have experts at our institution specializing in crisis communication, addressing traumatic events, and planning around natural disasters. In that, we have a few suggestions:

- The university should not exacerbate states of emergency in the area by remaining open and bringing more people to impacted areas. We could establish a threshold for when operations could continue depending on the number of faculty, students, and community impacted by disaster events.
- We need to develop planning for providing access to food and shelter in case of emergency. Systems can be implemented to reach out to faculty, staff, and students to understand the impacts on our community in real time.
- More planning and training should be done specific for our on-campus residents in case of evacuations. The faculty and staff in charge of residents' safety and well-being should be the first to receive information and given the support they need to do their jobs.
- Decisions for opening/closing campus should be transparent with clear communication of the reasons behind those decisions. Crisis communication best practices indicate that information should be limited to the most essential information during a crisis, but post-crisis communication is equally important in addressing the full needs of a disrupted community.

We submit this feedback because we want to have a successful academic year and to be able to focus on educating our community. We need leadership to clear the path to this work, not create additional institutional fatigue and stress.

###

The Nevada Faculty Alliance is the independent statewide association of professional employees of the colleges and universities of the Nevada System of Higher Education. The NFA is affiliated with the American Association of University Professors, which advocates for academic freedom, shared governance, and faculty rights, and the American Federation of Teachers/AFL-CIO, representing over 300,000 higher education professionals nationwide. The NFA works to empower our members to be wholly engaged in our mission to help students succeed.

From: NSHE
To: Keri Nikolajewski; Winter Lipson
Subject: Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2026 5:08:54 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: president@nevadafacultyalliance.org

Name: Staci Walters

Representing someone other than yourself?: Nevada Faculty Alliance, State President

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: Items 31

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

Comment:

In January 2026, this Board approved tuition increases for AY 2026-27. The briefing paper presented at that meeting cited the July 2023 and October 2024 cost-of-living adjustments and the 1% faculty merit pool as priorities that revenue was intended to address. The 83rd Legislature covered approximately 65% of COLA costs through bridge funding. Students were asked to cover the rest.

Faculty received no COLA and no merit increase in 2026-27. Benefits costs rose. Professional employee paychecks went down. NSHE funded a 1% merit pool from institutional operating budgets in 2022 with no legislative appropriation and no tuition increase. That authority existed in 2026-27. It was not used.

The budget documents before this Board today — BFF-5 and BFF-6 — report aggregate expenditures by function. They do not show whether the additional student fee revenue was used for the compensation purposes cited when this Board approved the increase, or where it went instead.

This Board voted to cancel merit for two years. 2026-27 is year two. The 2027-29 biennial budget is being shaped at this meeting. NFA asks the Board to confirm that ongoing COLA and merit funding for professional employees is included in that legislative request. If it is not, this Board is extending the merit cancellation into a third and fourth year without a vote to do so — while students continue to be charged fees that were partly justified by compensation needs that remain unmet.

Students paid more. Professional employees were cited as the reason. Professional employees received nothing. Nevada already ranks last in the nation in per-student funding. Every year without a compensation adjustment, inflation erodes faculty purchasing power and NSHE's ability to recruit and retain against peer institutions weakens. The 2027-29 budget request is the mechanism to address this. NFA asks the Board to ensure it does.

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, September 3-4, 2026
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2026 5:11:17 PM

Public comment submitted through NSHE Online form

Public Comment for the Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Email: president@nevadafacultyalliance.org

Name: Staci Walters, State President

Representing someone other than yourself?: Nevada Faculty Alliance

Meeting: Board of Regents Quarterly Meeting, September 3-4, 2026

Agenda Item: Item 32 – PROCESS TO REVIEW AND RECOMMEND AMENDMENTS TO SELECT AREAS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS HANDBOOK

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

Comment:

This Board requires shared governance at NSHE institutions. CSN's Executive Budget Advisory Committee (EBAC) — including representatives from the Faculty Senate, Classified Council, and Administrative Faculty Assembly — exists within that required framework to advise on budget priorities and workforce planning affecting the entire institution.
Before EBAC members could participate in the current budget cycle, at least several were approached individually by CSN Administration and asked to sign non-disclosure agreements. Members were told explicitly: if you do not sign, information will be withheld from you. Nearly every member signed. This is the first time NFA is aware of CSN using an NDA to constrain a shared governance committee. Every prior NDA at CSN has been tied to an individual complaint or settlement. This NDA protects no individual — it protects institutional budget decisions from stakeholder scrutiny.
NFA has confirmed that EBAC discussions have included which positions would be funded from student fees in future budget cycles, a potential Employee Separation Incentive Program offering faculty buyouts, and whether to request new student fees in coming years. These decisions affect every employee and student at CSN and are being made behind an NDA.
The result: Faculty Senate, Classified Council, and the Administrative Faculty Assembly cannot receive accurate reports from their own EBAC representatives. This Board receives reports from all three bodies at every quarterly meeting. Those reports are now incomplete by institutional design.
NFA asks that the Handbook review under Item 32 include: first, shared governance participation cannot be conditioned on a non-disclosure agreement; second, institutions must

report all employment settlements by cost, nature, and funding source quarterly to this Board. Shared governance cannot function when representatives are prevented from reporting back. This Board should not accept that as compliance with its own policy.

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)