

**NEVADA STUDENT ALLIANCE (NSA)**  
**MINUTES**

**March 2, 2012**

**Attending:**           **Ms. Aimee Riley, ASCSN, Chair**  
                          **Mr. Casey Stiteler, ASUN, Vice Chair**  
                          **Mr. Alex Porter, GBC**  
                          **Mr. Scott Gaddis, TMCC**  
                          **Mr. Michael J. Gordon, GPSA**  
                          **Ms. Stephanie Vega, GSA**  
                          **Mr. Steve Gronstal, GRAD**  
                          **Bentley McDonald for Ms. Mikayla Morgan, NSSA**  
                          **Richard Cornejo for Ms. Sarah Saenz, CSUN**  
                          **Ms. Heather Dodson, ASWN**

**Meeting began at 7:45 a.m.**

**1. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public comment.

**2. DISCUSSION WITH BOARD CHAIR JASON GEDDES**

Riley asked for NSA Vision Statement Input from the Chancellor Klaich, Chair Geddes and Regent Page

- consistency from year to year with same goal focus
- purpose for mission statement is not reactionary
- where do you want to be in 10 or 20 years
- strip it down to what is common not targeted to a specific topic
  - advocacy at the Board of Regents level
  - voter registration
  - why do you get together?
  - perhaps with past presidents input to help focus on critical issues

Riley asked for suggestions for continuity for NSA due to turn over

- Page suggests a past president advisory board
- Stiteler suggests a 2-3 page legacy document with instructions and relevant documents
- Archiving docs in special collections
- list of people you know/have met with photos for next student government to utilize

Riley suggested that NSA consider putting in place a designated secretary or note taker for next year

Stiteler asked Regents' thoughts on Stanford Research Institute

- Klaich: bring great value to the project, great international consulting group
- Page: couldn't have went wrong either way

- Geddes: independent look at the new model, RFP asks SRI to gather data on formula funding models across the country to inform this proposed funding model.
- Klaich: SRI will probably find that we put a fair proposal on the table. Committee has asked a series of questions and will get good information on those topics.

Gordon asked do you think that students' reactions to the formula through the committee are useful at this point?

- Klaich: Students should recognize how powerful our voices are – our input has a tremendous impact.
- Geddes: Students should know that the details of the model isn't out yet. It's changing and things are in there and they disappear. We talk about things that aren't in there yet.

Cornejo explained the UNLV students have invited a record number of legislators on campus to hear from students. He asked what do the regents and chancellor think are the next steps after the study .

- Klaich: hopes that NSHE puts something on the table that can galvanize the system and provide a format to show the legislature how important the role of higher ed is. We can be a positive force.
- Page: For the committee, the board is providing just a recommendation
- Klaich: Invite those legislators...meet with them in small groups. We don't want glazed over looks after February 1. They need to know what the funding formula is and have familiarity with why it is important.

Stiteler asked about the process of phasing in the new formula.

- Klaich: Recommendation from the presidents is a two biennium phasing in for the new formula

Gronstal asked how do you see DRI in the funding?

- DRI is a line item budget that includes O & M support and some administrative support. Regents had a meeting with NCHEMS to sort out how a formula and performance metrics can be worked—keeping in mind the role of DRI and how it has changed since the 1950s. DRI has made proposal to us. The essence of funding is budget at risk. We have to understand how DRI proposes to do that. Right now, it continues as a line item.

Cornejo asked where do you see higher education fitting in with local government funding down the road?

- Geddes: We do not want to turn the colleges over to the local governments. I do not want to the budgets from the Legislature, Regents, and County Commissioners hands to the colleges alone. It would be hard to manage that budget.
- Klaich: We can start vetting proposal from this. I feel strongly that the counties that benefit from the community colleges need to start paying. It's good old Nevada's little red hen syndrome. Some of these counties can step up and pay. Ask this question from a position of strain.
- Stiteler said that in meeting with legislators invite the community college presidents as well.

Riley asked how likely do you think that the committee will approve this proposal.

- Klaich: 100 percent. They will kick it around and change it but it will definitely be approved.

Riley asked what direction should we go in as we have concerns about access.

- Klaich: UNR and UNLV should be honest in that they are non-access institution. We need to have strong community college entry points. If it is access without success, then we are stealing their money.
- Geddes: I want to clarify that we need to look at both academic access and financial access.
- Cornejo: As we shift the mission of the institutions, I hope that to we still keep in mind other types of access. We need to attend to minority status, first generation and so forth.
- Geddes: I think it will actually go the other direction from financial access. We want to look at access to graduate and succeed, not access to enroll and get on campus. We are saying whoever is on your campus, you need to get them to succeed.
- Stiteler: On SRI's proposal, will they look at mission differentiations?
- Klaich: Board has solid policies on mission differentiations if enforced. We think that new plan will drive this.

### **3. NEW BUSINESS**

No new business.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 a.m.