



NEVADA STUDENT ALLIANCE (NSA)

MINUTES

March 5, 2020

5:00 p.m.

Time Approximate: this meeting may begin earlier than 5:00 p.m. upon recess of the Board of Regents meeting.

College of Southern Nevada

Student Union, Room 123

700 College Drive, Henderson, NV

MEETING IS CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:13 PM BY NICOLA OPFER, NSA CHAIR

- 1. ROLL CALL:** Nicola Opfer, Nevada State College, NSSA (NSA Chair) **PRESENT**
Anthony Martinez, University of Nevada, Reno, ASUN (NSA Vice Chair) **PRESENT**
Tamara Guinn, University of Nevada, Reno, GSA (NSA Secretary) **PRESENT**
Melanie Dodson, Great Basin College, SGA **PRESENT**
Daniel Gutierrez, College of Southern Nevada, ASCSN **PRESENT**
Gabrielle Clark, Western Nevada College, ASWN (new representative) **PRESENT**
Hannah Patenaude, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, CSUN **PRESENT**
Alexandra Patri, Truckee Meadows Community College, SGA **PRESENT**
Stephanie Molina, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, GPSA **PRESENT**

Office Vacant, Desert Research Institute, GRAD

Guests:

Terina Caserto, NSHE
Renee Davis, NSHE
Mark Doubrava – BOR Vice Chair
Jason Geddes – BOR Chair
Dean Gould – BOR Chief of Staff
Thom Reilly – Chancellor
Valeria Saborio, SGA, TMCC

A QUORUM OF MEMBERS IS PRESENT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MEETING

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

INFORMATION

No public comment.

3. DISCUSSION WITH BOARD OFFICERS AND CHANCELLOR

INFORMATION

Guinn expressed concern regarding differential fees that are being brought back before the Board of Regents. She expressed that while she could not speak directly to the College of Business fee for undergraduate students, but the disappointment of graduate students at UNR that the Community

Health Sciences differential fee was being reconsidered by the Board. Discussed concerns regarding how the vote was conducted with the Graduate Student Body and received concerns regarding the survey that was administered by the college. Further expressed the financial hardship the proposed differential fee would have on graduate students in the CHS program. That the grant in aid does not cover these fees and the students are financially burdened and indebted.

Patenaude asked how items such as these can be brought back before the Board for reconsideration?

Geddes responded there are multiple ways this could happen. In this particular case with the differential fees, Regents requested reconsideration. This will call for a rescission of the previous vote and a new vote in the case the vote is to reconsider.

Reilly reminded students to speak during comment and to utilize public comment.

Guinn expressed concern that many students expressed feeling uncomfortable participating in public comment because speaking against the proposed fee could lead to retaliation.

A discussion was held regarding the procedures behind rescinding a vote in a previous meeting. Gould gave an overview of the number of votes required to rescind and reconsider.

Martinez mentioned that in the coming weeks we will be drafting a legislative priorities list for the incoming 2020/2021 NSA. He requested input from the Board members. Items on this document include faculty compensation, separation of governing bodies and how student government is considered, housing and food insecurity, affordable higher education with a discussion on differential fees, sustainability in the environment, sexual assault & harassment initiatives, and diversity & inclusion efforts, lastly regents' vote and perspective regarding legislation AJR5.

Geddes discussed that regents are on the sidelines when it comes to advocating for AJR5. Regents cannot do it. If you have questions please contact General Counsel Reynolds.

Reilly discussed faculty compensation, for NSA consideration looking at student success initiatives, advising ration and co-requisite education. The recommendations we will hear tomorrow are a fundamental change to how we have previously done things regarding faculty compensation. We believe we have developed a model to refrain from approaching legislature for funding. In regards to legislative matters we want to prioritize student success, capital improvement (deferred maintenance), workforce issues, and research. We are happy to come meet with student government to discuss priorities going forward. Reilly continued the discussion about AJR5, the Board has taken a position and has opposed AJR5 twice. The primary issue is whether we elect or appoint regents in the State. There are far reaching repercussions that could impact shared governance and free speech. It could change the structure and make NSHE a department similar to the DMV. We are asking legislature to thoroughly examine the possible repercussions and outcomes of this decision. Asking them to make an informed decision hearing the voices of students and faculty as well. Regents cannot campaign against this legislation. Reilly encouraged student leaders to meet with NSHE general counsel for ideas and further guidance regarding student government issues and directions.

Geddes added that regarding the faculty compensation, past governors have not considered faculty merit pay and no legislators are pushing the matter either.

Could came back to the discussion regarding AJR5 and discussed that previously proposed SB354 would have restructured board composition and operations if AJR5 passed. He expressed the importance of understanding the history of the proposed legislation.

Reilly expressed the importance of understanding the possible implications of the proposed legislation AJR5.

Patenaude mentioned her concern that students do not understand or have a grasp of what NSHE is or who the Board of Regents are. She asked how we get students in the loop and how their vote at the polls matter? We have a responsibility to educate and pass awareness on about these issues on our campuses.

Opfer expressed the importance of NSHE onboarding for student leaders.

Molina mentioned her public comment during the Board of Regents meeting and asked for their consideration of revising the policy and conflict of interest procedures within student government to protect student votes. She mentioned that UNLV GPSA does not currently have access to many important documents or budgets, they are held at the Graduate College. She expressed the importance of examining separation of student governing bodies.

Reilly recommended looking at how other institutions are functioning.

Doubraava mentioned the importance of student government being allowed to function with appropriate oversight.

Patenaude discussed how CSUN is set up completely different than GPSA, we do not have administrators at the governing table.

Guinn echoed that at UNR administration is not present unless invited. GSA is a separate entity and the Graduate Dean is an invited guest, does not sit at the table as they do at UNLV.

Reilly will look into how student governments function across the state.

Opfer brought up the email Chancellor Reilly sent regarding the use of the ITIN number to compensate undocumented student workers. Perhaps a procedure could be developed for paying a stipend rather than hourly employment.

Discussion opened how different institutions are paid hourly and some are paid by stipend. Patenaude mentioned she is paid by stipend, while Gutierrez and Opfer discussed their student government members being paid hourly.

Further discussion was had regarding the use of the ITIN number and how undocumented students are paid in various institutions; examples being provided. Opfer mentioned a better solution is necessary. Gutierrez mentioned this should be an issue that remains on the table and for discussion.

Patri directed the discussion back to differential fees, particularly the proposed differential fee in the UNR College of Business. She expressed that when students were interviewed and had conversations about differential fees, students are genuinely unaware of these fees and the

implications they have. She expressed concern that many students believe the added cost is a financial burden.

Martinez mentioned that as a representative of the ASUN at UNR he has had many conversations with the undergraduate business student council and business students have campaigned to inform students and outline the positive impact these fees could have. There have been educational dialogues about the matter and from his perspective, the members of the business student council are in support of the fee.

Guinn mentioned the two fees, College of Business and Community Health Sciences, are structured very differently. She expressed that many students are unaware of the fees and how they will be used, and what benefits the fees will have for students. These are huge fees and they seem excessive.

Patenaude expressed that more education and awareness need to be built around fees of this nature.

Patri emphasized the differential fees add a significant cost to the program and many students will not see the benefit.

A discussion was held about the potential benefits and downside of implementing differential fees for various programs. Opfer mentioned that it would be important to have clear guidelines and information when it comes to differential fees being implemented.

4. NEW BUSINESS

INFORMATION

Gutierrez mentioned that a resolution should be examined regarding differential fees.

Opfer and Martinez discussed that this could be addressed in the recommendations for the 2020/2021 NSA.

Clark and Patenaude expressed interest in NSA examining fee transparency and fee breakdowns at various institutions.

Martinez mentioned that recommendations in a memo could be made for outlining NSA Officer positions and possibly reorganizing the responsibilities of NSA members.

Patenaude echoed adding more leadership positions within NSA to promote involvement.

Molina discussed drafting a memo at UNLV for GPSA to pass on to the 2020/2021 NSA.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

INFORMATION

No public comment.

OPFER ADJOURNED MEETING AT 6:06 PM