

SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

University of Nevada Cooperative Extension
Nevada State 4-H Camp
1 4-H Camp Road, Stateline, Nevada

Thursday, August 25, 2016
Friday, August 26, 2016

Members Present:

Mr. Rick Trachok, Chairman
Mr. Michael B. Wixom, Vice Chairman
Dr. Andrea Anderson
Mr. Cedric Crear
Mr. Robert Davidson
Dr. Mark W. Doubrava
Dr. Jason Geddes
Mr. Trevor Hayes
Mr. James Dean Leavitt
Mr. Sam Lieberman
Mr. Kevin C. Melcher
Mr. Kevin J. Page
Ms. Allison Stephens

Others Present:

Mr. John V. White, Chancellor
Ms. Crystal Abba, Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs
Dr. Constance Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs
Mr. Robert Moulton, Vice Chancellor, Information Technology
Ms. Brooke A. Nielsen, Vice Chancellor, Legal Affairs
Mr. Vic Redding, Vice Chancellor, Finance
Mr. Nick Vaskov, System Counsel
Mr. Frank R. Woodbeck, Executive Director, Nevada College Collaborative
Mr. Dean J. Gould, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel to the Board
Dr. Michael D. Richards, President, CSN
Dr. Robert Gagosian, President, DRI
Dr. Mark A. Curtis, President, GBC
Mr. Bart J. Patterson, President, NSC
Dr. Karin Hilgersom, President, TMCC
Dr. Len Jessup, President, UNLV
Dr. Marc A. Johnson, President, UNR
Mr. Chet O. Burton, President, WNC

Faculty senate chairs in attendance were Dr. Bryan Sigel, NSC; and Mr. Eric March, SA.

Chairman Rick Trachok called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m. on August 25, 2016, with all members present except Regents Anderson, Hayes, and Stephens. Regent Melcher led the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Information Only – Public Comment – Chairman Trachok announced a public comment submission from Florence M. E. Rogers has been placed on file in the Board Office.

Interim Dean and Director Mark Walker, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension (UNCE) and 4-H Camp Director Carrie Stark, UNCE, welcomed the Board to the camp. They provided an overview, history and future plans for the Nevada State 4-H Camp. Dean Walker introduced Camp Manager Kent Worker who keeps the camp looking beautiful and running smoothly.

Regent Anderson entered the meeting.

2. Approved – Consent Items – The Board approved the consent items as presented.

- 2a. Approved – Minutes – The Board approved the following minutes:

- May 12, 2016, Board of Regents' special meeting. (*Ref. BOR-2a1 on file in the Board Office.*)
- May 27, 2016, Board of Regents' special meeting. (*Ref. BOR-2a2 on file in the Board Office.*)

- 2b. Approved – Lease Renewal, Redfield Performing Arts Center, TMCC – The Board approved Truckee Meadows Community College's (TMCC) request to renew a Lease Agreement for the Redfield Performing Arts Center located in the Keystone Square shopping plaza in Reno, Nevada, for a term of 36 months, with an option to renew the Lease for an additional 24 months. The total cost of the lease over the three-year term is \$432,892. The common area maintenance, taxes and insurance portion of the total cost (\$122,974) are subject to change based on the owner's actual expenses. (*Ref. BOR-2b on file in the Board Office.*)

- 2c. Approved – Operating Pool Reserve Account Distribution – The Board approved a request from Chancellor John V. White and the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) presidents for a one-time distribution from the NSHE Operating Pool Reserve Account to address campus initiatives such as the medical education transition in Las Vegas, program start-up and other budgetary opportunities that would otherwise be foregone or delayed without this funding distribution. (*Ref. BOR-2c on file in the Board Office.*)

Regent Geddes moved approval of the consent items.
Regent Page seconded.

Regent Geddes asked for a report in October or December on the campuses' allocation of spending.

Motion carried. Regents Hayes and Stephens were absent.

3. Approved - 2017-19 Biennial Operating Budget and 2017 Capital Improvement Request – The Board approved a final report concerning the NSHE biennial operating budget request including additions to the base and maintenance items, an enhancement request for the Desert Research Institute (DRI) weather modification (*cloud seeding*) program, and the 5 percent budget reduction plans to be submitted to the Governor's Office. The operating budget request is due to the Governor's Office of Finance by September 1, 2016. (Ref. BOR-3 on file in the Board Office.)

Vice Chancellor Vic Redding, Finance, presented a report concerning the NSHE biennial operating budget request for the 2017 Legislative Session, including information on the base and maintenance items, enhancements and the requested five percent budget reduction as required in the instructions from the Governor's Office of Finance. Vice Chancellor Redding provided the following:

Base and Maintenance Items

- Professional merit and benefits and classified step and benefits are included.
- Funding formula calculations are included based on Fiscal Year (FY) 16 final weighted student credit hours (WSCH). Breakdowns by institution are included on page 13 in column c3.

Vice Chancellor Redding reported consistent with the funding formula, the base and maintenance adjustments are 100 percent general fund. If the caseload growth generates additional funds, the revenues are authorized and budgeted separately but will not offset the general fund increases.

Base and Maintenance Items (Continued)

- Formula adjustment for the DRI is included.
- The third and fourth year of general funds for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) School of Medicine build-out are included.

Regent Melcher moved to approve the base and maintenance items. Regent Geddes seconded.

In a response to Regent Melcher, Vice Chancellor Redding clarified the old formula offset increases in tuition and registration fees with a corresponding reduction in the general fund, but with the new formula, it is completely separate.

Motion carried. Regents Hayes and Stephens were absent.

Enhancement Request

- Governor's Office of Finance request for an enhancement request for the DRI Weather Modification (*cloud seeding*) program in the amount of \$682,000 per year.

Regent Page moved to approve the enhancement request for the DRI weather modification (*cloud seeding*) program. Regent Lieberman seconded.

3. Approved - 2017-19 Biennial Operating Budget and 2017 Capital Improvement Request – (Continued)

Vice Chairman Wixom asked what specific parts from the materials would be included in the motion. Vice Chancellor Redding clarified all prior enhancement requests have been approved and are included in the materials as information. Approval of the DRI cloud seeding program enhancement is being requested.

Regent Melcher asked if the enhancements were prioritized, with Vice Chancellor Redding responding they were.

Regent Anderson asked why the community college career and technical education (CTE) decreased. Vice Chancellor Redding reported there were less WSCHs. The original projections used FY14 and the totals were then updated with final FY16 which created a slight decrease.

Motion carried. Regents Hayes and Stephens were absent.

Budget Reductions/Caps

- Requested limiting of biennial budget request to not more than two times the FY17 general fund base budget.
- Plans for five percent budget reductions.

Regent Page wanted to make sure that student fee increases are making it back to the students on all campuses. Chairman Trachok stated it was his understanding all the Presidents are required to come back and report to the Board on how they have used the fee increases for the previous year. Regent Page agreed but he did not want to see it buried in a report.

Regent Hayes entered the meeting.

Vice Chairman Wixom appreciated the narrative but his prior experience of budget reductions has been painful. If budget reductions become reality, he wanted to maximize flexibility on the campus so it can respond in an appropriate manner. He added the Board needed to be careful about across the board mandates because it can be unintentionally destructive. The students' needs must come first. The Board must have the foresight and fortitude to change the way it does business.

Regent Geddes asked for clarification on the two times rule and why three programs are not subject to the cap. Vice Chancellor Redding reported the two times rule limits the request for the next biennium, excluding certain items such as enhancements and caseload growth. It does not exclude inflationary costs otherwise known as "roll-ups". Almost every biennium the System is over the cap. The reason it does not affect the Silver State Opportunity Grant and the state funded Perkins Loan is because there are no salaries associated. Vice Chancellor Redding was unsure why UNCE was not affected and would report back once he knew.

3. Approved - 2017-19 Biennial Operating Budget and 2017 Capital Improvement Request –
(Continued)

Regent Leavitt thought a positive message would be sent that the Board did not think the cuts were appropriate and that they are the advocates for students and faculty by not approving. Chairman Trachok did not think ignoring the request would be a good way to move forward for this biennium. The Governor has supported higher education.

Regent Melcher asked why Business Center North and Business Center South were allocated individually to the institutions. Vice Chancellor Redding responded the business centers were a part of the individual institutional budget accounts.

In response to a question from Regent Page, Vice Chancellor Redding stated Nevada has a central purchasing entity and is a fee based funded agency. Regent Page asked why there was not one entity in the System for purchasing. Vice Chancellor Redding stated the System has disparate business practices right now but all back office practices are being evaluated by the business officers for potential sharing.

Regent Page asked who controls the State Health Lab and why it was under the umbrella of the System. Vice Chancellor Redding stated it was transferred to the System to be included as a part of the Department of Pathology at the University of Nevada, Reno (*UNR*) School of Medicine (*SOM*). He also noted because of its discrete function it is a separate budget account that does not fall under the traditional educational mission of the *SOM*.

Regent Page asked for clarification on the Agricultural Experiment Station. President Marc A. Johnson, *UNR*, reported the Agricultural Experiment Station is managed by the Dean of Agriculture. The Board will hear a proposal in September to consolidate management with the *UNCE*. It is useful to have separate line items to show the utilization of funds directed to the entity.

Regent Crear stated as the five percent budget cuts are presented to the Governor as directed, the System needs to reiterate the amount that has already been cut prior to Governor Sandoval's administration and the impact it had. Regent Geddes pointed out that with the new funding formula two of the community colleges are still on a downward trajectory.

Chancellor White stated in September he will provide a report that will try to capture the state of higher education in Nevada. One of the recommendations in the report will be for the state to recognize the education gap and try to fill it over a long period of time.

Regent Geddes moved to approve the five percent budget reduction plans to be submitted to the Governor's Office. Regent Davidson seconded. Motion carried. Regent Stephens was absent.

Chairman Trachok commended the Board for its work putting together the budget.

3. Approved - 2017-19 Biennial Operating Budget and 2017 Capital Improvement Request – (Continued)

Vice Chancellor Redding updated the Board on the Capital Improvement Program proposals submitted to the State Public Works Board and the changes it recommended. The Public Works Board has recommended a change to the timeline of the Henderson Health Sciences building at the College of Southern Nevada (CSN) and Northern Nevada Advanced Manufacturing Center at TMCC.

Regent Geddes asked if the three biennium strategy was not statutory, could it be addressed at the Legislature. It takes away fundraising opportunities. Vice Chancellor Redding stated the thought process behind the strategy relates to the bonding capacity of the state. It is not a universally used strategy. Regent Geddes asked if there are any discussions on how to change the amount available for Capital Improvement Projects. Vice Chancellor Redding stated the estimates are based on current law and would require a change in the funding stream.

4. Action Taken – Board Governance – The Board directed the Chief of Staff, in consultation with the Chairman, to develop a committee schedule around four regular quarterly meetings, with four special meetings and to work the committee meetings around those meetings for presentation to the Board of Regents. (*Ref. BOR-4 and supplemental material on file in the Board Office.*)

With the help of Chancellor White, the Board discussed its role as the governing body of the NSHE. The discussion included the following topics: the Board's role within the higher education structure; the relationship between the Board and Chancellor; coordination versus governance boards; functions of coordination and governance boards; elected versus appointed boards; the Board's communication with the Legislature; changes and pressures in higher education nationally; the budget and funding process; and efficiency and effectiveness.

The meeting recessed at 12:59 p.m. and reconvened at 1:27 p.m. with all members present except Regent Stephens.

Chairman Trachok asked the Presidents to give their thoughts as to the governance versus management aspects of the Board.

President Chet O. Burton, Western Nevada College (WNC), did not feel there was a large degree of micromanagement in terms of how his campus is managed on a daily basis. He stated the Board does a good job of setting overall policy goals and objectives but felt some coordinating functions had been left on the table. He added the Board could do a better job of defining and facilitating best practices throughout the entire System.

President Johnson stated the Board should leave the management of the institutions to the Presidents with full accountability to the Board and Chancellor. The Board could create mechanisms to move proposals ahead without having to set an emergency or special meeting.

4. Action Taken – Board Governance – (Continued)

President Bart J. Patterson, Nevada State College (*NSC*), stated the Board does an excellent job at balancing resources fairly between the competing institutions and determining how to best utilize resources to the benefit of the students. As it relates to the coordinating role, the Board does a good job identifying core areas. He added he thought the least amount of coordination is in the academic space.

President Mark A. Curtis, Great Basin College (*GBC*), stated the Board of Regents' *Handbook* and *Procedures and Guidelines Manual* are a form of micromanagement and difficult to navigate. He pointed out he has served as a dean at two different institutions and a corporate vice president and he had more power, authority, and autonomy than he has had in the System as the GBC President.

President Michael D. Richards, College of Southern Nevada (*CSN*) did think the unified System in Nevada is very important to the taxpayers and students. Without a unified System, there are problems with transfer and articulation. He believed the Institutional Advisory Council (*IAC*) model implemented for the community colleges would also benefit the other institutions since their purpose is to tie the institution back to the community in which they serve. The Board should be involved in discussion of resources, public accountability, marketing and the participation crisis in higher education.

The Board continued its discussion with the following topics: affordable participation; how the Board can help the school districts with the pipeline; and formula funding.

President Len Jessup, UNLV, stated the funding formula as currently set-up does not provide adequate money to fuel the two research universities. President Jessup believed the Board should focus more on governance and less on management, allowing the Presidents to manage while holding them accountable.

President Robert Gagosian, DRI, clarified he is not familiar with undergraduate education, but he felt the Board may want to try streamlining policies because over time policies get longer. The Board can delegate responsibilities, authority, and accountability but the power will always lie with the Board. He added it is very difficult for shared governance to work as it was intended because there are so many more restrictions, regulations, needs, and laws.

Regent Stephens entered the meeting.

Past Interim President J. Kyle Dalpe, TMCC, believed strategic planning, mission differentiation and knowing where the System is going is yet to be defined. The institutions must be able to respond to the economy and do it in an efficient manner.

4. Action Taken – Board Governance – (Continued)

Vice Chairman Wixom stated that however the governance model is structured, all decisions must focus on the following four objectives:

- Responsibility for finance and facilities.
- Responsibility for student success.
- Responsibility for workforce development.
- Responsibility for research.

Regent Crear suggested a potential way to be more efficient and less involved in the management structure is for the Board to meet more often. If the Board met every month to address issues it would allow the institutions to be more reactive. The quarterly meetings would still be held and it may allow the committees to meet more in depth.

The meeting recessed at 2:50 p.m. and reconvened at 3:08 p.m. with all members present.

Chairman Trachok explained on the East coast a Board of Visitors meets at the institutions once a year and spends up to a week reviewing institution statistics. The Board of Regents would be responsible for appointing the Board of Visitors, comprised of five community members and two Regents. After its institution visit, the Board of Visitors would report back to the Board of Regents, Chancellor and the President as to whether the institution is fulfilling the policy directions of the Board, providing the education and support services to Nevadans, and meeting the objective of educating more Nevadans. The Board of Visitors would relate to the universities, while the IACs would continue its work at the community colleges.

Regent Lieberman agreed with the concept but asked that community leaders at all levels be chosen. Regent Melcher wanted to make sure it was a positive, helpful tool, rather than punitive. Regent Crear stated he would need more information on the Board of Visitors to make a more educated decision. Regent Stephens was concerned with creating another level of bureaucracy and asked what interaction Regents would have with the other institutions while performing their duties on the Board of Visitors. Regent Anderson was concerned with the implications if the Board of Regents did not approve the recommendations of the Board of Visitors after it had given of its time. Regent Doubrava was skeptical of the proposal and asked to explore it further. Regent Davidson did see benefits such as bringing expertise and the ability to give advice to the Presidents on this level but did think there was a potential for it to get out of control. Regent Hayes was concerned with the Regents not having the time or the resources to do this but agreed the Board must find a way to look deeper into the institutions. Regent Leavitt believed it was the Board's obligation to ask for the resources needed to implement what Nevada is asking it to do. Regent Page liked the idea, but also thought the IAC process should be revisited.

Regent Melcher suggested the Board of Regents may begin the process at the universities and state college, that Regents not be included on the Board of Visitors, and that the Board of Visitors meet at each institution at the call of the President.

4. Action Taken – Board Governance – (Continued)

Vice Chairman Wixom asked if the Foundation and its committees are subject to the Open Meeting Law (*OML*), with Vice Chancellor Nielsen responding yes, as well as the IACs for the community colleges. A Board of Visitors would be a public body subject to the *OML*.

Regent Stephens believed the Board of Regents should be looking at what is best for the State of Nevada. She had significant concerns related to not abdicating her duties as an elected official, concerns of regionalism and advocacy for a specific institution as it relates to governance.

Chairman Trachok suggested the Chancellor, Presidents, Vice Chairman and Chairman continue the proposal discussion and return with more specifics.

The meeting recessed at 4:20 p.m. and reconvened at 4:35 p.m. with all members present.

Chancellor White and the Board continued discussions as to its role as the governing body of the NSHE as it relates to committee structure, including standing and ad hoc committees.

Regent Lieberman believed the committee structure should change as the role of the Board changes.

Chairman Trachok asked Regent Crear to clarify his earlier suggestion related to the Board meeting monthly. Regent Crear stated the Board would meet on the same day per month in the System Office to address any agenda items that may need action, and then there would be more time for committee work at the quarterly meetings. The Board and Chief of Staff discussed variations to the proposal.

Chairman Trachok believed the System needed the following committees: Audit Committee; Investment Committee; and Cultural Diversity and Title IX Compliance Committee.

Regent Melcher suggested the two off-cycle committee meetings be moved to the same day as the Special Board of Regents' meetings.

Chairman Trachok asked Chief of Staff (*COS*) Gould to take the direction given and create variations of the proposal to include what staff resources will be needed and report back to the Board.

President Curtis suggested the Board could meet every six weeks, with half the committees meeting at every other meeting.

Regent Hayes left the meeting.

After further discussion, Chairman Trachok asked Vice Chancellor Nielsen if the Board was required to have standing committee meetings every quarter. Vice Chancellor Nielsen stated it is at the Board's discretion to set its own committee structure process. The Bylaws do reference regular meetings which may have to change to accommodate a new schedule.

4. Action Taken – Board Governance – (Continued)

Regent Melcher moved to direct the Chief of Staff, in consultation with the Chairman, to develop a committee schedule around four regular quarterly meetings, with four special meetings and to work the committee meetings around those meetings for presentation to the Board of Regents. Regent Anderson seconded.

Regent Crear asked if the motion limits the suggested scope of meetings. COS Gould suggested he would bring one or more proposals for review.

Regent Geddes suggested the scope of the Health Sciences System Committee could change to focus on the medical schools and the academic program components related to the medical schools that are currently going through the Academic, Research and Student Affairs Committee.

COS Gould clarified the proposal will be drafted with the current committee structure.

Motion carried. Regent Hayes was absent.

The meeting recessed at 5:35 p.m. and reconvened on Friday, August 26, 2016, at 9:00 a.m. with all members present except Vice Chairman Wixom.

5. Information Only – Overview of System Computing Services (Agenda Item 8) - Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Robert Moulton presented information on NSHE System Computing Services shared services. (Ref. BOR-8 on file in the Board Office.)

Vice Chancellor Moulton gave a PowerPoint presentation and it included information on shared services, customers, network services, technical services, needed changes, and required teamwork.

Regent Page asked for Vice Chancellor Moulton to look into why there are campuses that do not have internet access across the whole campus.

Regent Davidson asked to what extent K-12 is involved. Manager of Audio Visual Operations Dani Chandler, Network Services, reported K-12 has approximately 50 end points on the System network.

Chairman Trachok asked Chancellor White to report back to the Board which campuses are not taking advantage of System Computing Services.

Vice Chancellor Moulton stated along with the Chancellor and Presidents all of the security policies will be reviewed and brought to a centralized location within the Board of Regents' *Handbook* to create an environment that can be audited. Chairman Trachok asked that Vice Chancellor Moulton provide a progress update to the Chancellor and himself as soon as possible. Regent Stephens requested Chief Internal Auditor Joseph Sunbury, Internal Audit, and Vice Chancellor Redding be included in the policy review.

6. No Action Taken – Role of the Chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education (Agenda Item 7) – The Board discussed the role of the Chancellor of the NSHE and attributes correlated with the successful performance of the Chancellor's duties in preparation for the launch of a chancellor search later this year. (*Ref. BOR-7 on file in the Board Office.*)

Chancellor White noted there is no job description for the Chancellor position. The Board must decide how it wants the System to operate and what the Chancellor's role within the System will be. Chancellor White discussed how the Chancellor position works within coordinating and governance boards.

The Presidents offered the following attributes for the next Chancellor:

- There must be a national search for a strong leader who can manage inside and outside the organization.
- Leadership skills to bring cohesion among the institutions.
- Very good communication skills.
- Good idea for the Chancellor to have presidential experience.
- The ability to leverage the collective strengths of the System.
- Experience running a System.
- Understands university level research.
- Understands community college model.
- Able to balance high quality with efficiency.
- Able to supervise and evaluate Presidents in a positive, constructive manner.
- Someone of national prominence with credibility.
- An educational leader within the country.
- Ability to raise the visibility of the System nationally.
- Visionary.

The Regents offered the following attributes for the next Chancellor:

- Important for the Chancellor to have a good understanding of the role of the community colleges.
- Some background in the community colleges.
- Be a forward thinker.
- Strong academic credentials.
- Higher education background.
- Good administrator who knows how to build the culture.
- Innovative thinker.
- Relationship builder.
- Credible.
- Visionary.
- Has an interest in improving the System.
- Someone who will hold the Presidents accountable.

6. No Action Taken – Role of the Chancellor of the Nevada System of Higher Education
(Agenda Item 7) – (Continued)

- Been a Chancellor or President before.
- Understands research.
- Strong Chief Executive Officer.
- Understands System and institutional design.
- People skills in all settings.
- Has a strong character.
- Outstanding communication skills.
- Able to identify opportunities.
- Ability to sell the message of higher education.
- Ability to influence the stakeholders to support higher education.

In response to a question from Regent Melcher, Chairman Trachok stated he anticipated the first Chancellor Search Committee meeting to be held mid-September.

Regent Doubrava believed it was appropriate for the Board to reexamine the authority and powers given to the Chancellor position in 2004. Chairman Trachok stated the meeting was noticed for that type of action and he expected the discussion to include such ideas and he would take them into consideration. Regent Doubrava was uncomfortable with the terminology of the Bylaws as they pertain to the Chancellor's duties. He added the duties of the Chancellor should be determined prior to the Chancellor search beginning.

Regent Leavitt believed it was imperative for the next Chancellor to change the culture between the Board and the Presidents.

Regent Geddes did not think any changes to the job description were needed. He believed the processes in place were working.

Regent Stephens agreed that the process for hiring and firing Presidents does work. The problem right now is that the perception is that the Regents do not have control and do not manage the Chancellor.

In response to a question from Regent Anderson, Vice Chancellor Nielsen stated the Chancellor can recommend termination of a President for cause but only the Board of Regents can act on it.

Chairman Trachok believed it was important for the Board to be disciplined in order to attract the very best candidates for the position of Chancellor. The Board is ultimately responsible for the hiring and firing of Presidents, so if the language in the Bylaws is confusing it should be reviewed.

The meeting recessed at 10:55 a.m. and reconvened at 11:04 a.m. with all members present except Vice Chairman Wixom.

7. No Action Taken – Strategic Plan for the Nevada System of Higher Education (Agenda Item 6) – The Board discussed the development of a strategic plan for the NSHE. (Refs. BOR-6a, BOR-6b, BOR-6c and handout on file in the Board Office.)

Regent Page left the meeting.

The Board of Regents, Chancellor White and Vice Chancellor Nielsen discussed the following topics as they relate to the development of a strategic plan for the NSHE: obligations of the System and Board of Regents; how the Board operates and wants to operate; accessible and affordable education for students; strategic goals of the System; meeting the policy commitments of the state; ways to implement the strategic plan; and how to measure the success of the strategic plan.

Vice Chancellor Crystal Abba, Academic and Student Affairs, presented the education goals of the “Generations to Come” Nevada’s Strategic Planning Framework.

Chancellor White stated the System should focus on goals and suggested the following: improved educational attainment; greater education enrollment, retention, and progression; higher graduation rates and the elimination of the equity gaps; increasing research expenditures and commercialization activities; and workforce development.

Regent Stephens believed the goals are key issues that are relevant to the time and will allow the Board to be responsive to the needs of the state. She noted key components she would like to see during the strategic planning process: what are the aspirations of the System; how are those aspirations related to the specifically identified goals; and what are the constraints.

Chairman Trachok stated the next phase of the strategic planning discussion will be at the January special meeting. Chairman Trachok hoped the Board would identify four to five areas to begin concentrating on as it relates to strategic planning. Chairman Trachok reiterated four points Vice Chairman Wixom made previously that the Board must hold itself accountable for:

- Finance and facilities.
- Student success.
- Workforce development.
- Research.

Chairman Trachok stated the Board must have readily measured metrics that are being constantly being monitored so each President and Regent know how the System is doing.

Chancellor White stated the System must develop a report for the Legislature, which includes each institution’s strategic goals, as well as the goals of the System. There are many conditions for success that have traditionally been treated as goals of the System, and some of those conditions may be wanted as stand-alone goals. A separate step includes improving transparency and accountability.

7. No Action Taken – Strategic Plan for the Nevada System of Higher Education (Agenda Item 6) – (Continued)

Chancellor White stated there was a lot of time between now and the January special meeting to do preparatory work with constituencies about their expectations for the System. He asked for direction from the Board as to what it would like the staff to work on in the interim.

President Hilgersom liked the December 2011 document titled *Strategic Directions for the Nevada System of Higher Education* but believed it needed refinement as it relates to mission differentiation.

Regent Geddes stated he would like to see an update of the December 2011 document as a starting point to include Vice Chairman Wixom's four focus points.

Chairman Trachok asked the Presidents to submit to Chancellor White metrics they would like used to measure their institution's performance.

The meeting recessed at 11:56 a.m. and reconvened at 12:18 p.m. with all members present except Vice Chairman Wixom and Regent Crear.

8. Approved – Board Self-Assessment (Agenda Item 5) – The Board approved Title 1, Article V, new Section 28, Annual Board Self-Evaluation policy with suggested changes related to special meetings. (Refs. BOR-5a, BOR-5b, BOR-5c and BOR-5d on file in the Board Office.)

Dr. Dalpe stated when the Northwest Accreditation Board visited TMCC for its seven-year accreditation report one of the recommendations was for the governing Board to develop, adopt and implement a systematic method for evaluating its performance. President Richards noted CSN received the same recommendation.

COS Gould pointed out if a survey process was used to evaluate the Board all documents would need to be made public under the OML. A second option would be to hold a public meeting to evaluate the Board of Regents.

Regent Stephens asked for clarification if it was the Board as a whole or as individual members of the Board completing the self-assessment. Chairman Trachok believed it was both. He stated there is a confidential self-assessment with each individual member and then an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Board itself. COS Gould believed the policy was intended to be a Board evaluation.

Regent Stephens stated because the Board fluctuates with its membership an appropriate training mechanism should be put in place along with a set of metrics that an effective Board member should be doing.

8. Approved – Board Self-Assessment (Agenda Item 5) – (Continued)

COS Gould stated there is a Regent orientation in place for newly elected Regents. Beyond that training, there is a comprehensive list of concepts that are not only relevant but most likely being looked at by an accreditation body as to kinds of things the Board may want to look at while completing a self-assessment.

Regent Geddes requested that the reference to a “special meeting” in subparagraphs one and three be revised to read “at any meeting”.

Regent Stephens moved for approval of Title 1, Article V, new Section 28, Annual Board Self-Evaluation policy with Regent Geddes’ suggested change and to direct staff to proceed with the formal approval process, which requires two readings at two regular Board meetings. Regent Geddes seconded. Motion carried. Regents Crear and Wixom were absent.

9. Information Only – New Business – Regent Lieberman asked for a discussion related to communications within the System.

10. Information Only – Public Comment – None.

The meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

Prepared by:

Angela R. Palmer
Special Assistant and Coordinator
to the Board of Regents

Submitted for approval by:

Dean J. Gould
Chief of Staff and Special Counsel
to the Board of Regents

Approved by the Board of Regents at the October 21, 2016, meeting