

Minutes are intended to note: (a) the date, time, and place of the meeting; (b) those members of the public body who were present and those who were absent; and (c) the substance of all matters proposed, discussed and/or action was taken on. Minutes are not intended to be a verbatim report of a meeting. An audio recording of the meeting is available for inspection by any member of the public interested in a verbatim report of the meeting. These minutes are not final until approved by the Task Force at a future meeting.

MINUTES

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION TASK FORCE ON POWER-BASED VIOLENCE

NSHE System Administration Office Building
4300 South Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

and

NSHE System Administration Office Building
2601 Enterprise Road
Reno, Nevada 89512

Tuesday, September 24, 2024

Members Present:

Dr. Elizabeth Gunn, Chair (Las Vegas)
Dr. Tabor Griswold, Vice Chair (Reno)
Dr. Kavita Batra (Zoom)
Dr. Stefanie Coleman (Las Vegas)
Ms. Erin Frock (Reno)
Ms. Christina Hall (Zoom)
Mr. José Meléndrez (Zoom)
Dr. Alison Netski (Zoom)
Ms. Michelle Sposito (Zoom)

Members Absent:

Ms. Lisha Allison
Ms. Patricia Charlton, NSHE Interim Chancellor
Mr. Jordan Fischette
Ms. Lynda King
Mr. Shaun Mabanta
Ms. Lindsey Wolterbeek

Others Present:

Dr. Daniel Archer, NSHE Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, designee for Chancellor Charlton (Las Vegas)
Dr. Roni Dahir (Zoom)
Ms. Renée Davis (Reno)
Ms. Zeva Edmondson, Director, UNR Office of Equal Opportunity and Title IX (Reno)
Ms. Donna Healy (Reno)
Mr. Chris Nielsen (Reno)

Dr. Elizabeth Gunn, Chair of the Power-Based Violence Task Force, welcomed all members of the Task Force to the quarterly meeting which was called to order at 9:00 a.m. with a quorum present.

1. Public Comment

- Kent Ervin, Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA), requested that the Task Force examine the incidence of power-based violence by monitoring the institutional responses to reported incidents.
 - A request was made to recommend that the Board of Regents require each institution to provide comprehensive and uniform public annual statistical reports on Title IX and other discrimination cases, for both students and employees, including the numbers and types of cases, investigations, and outcomes and the times between initial reports and resolutions.
 - A request was made to use the current meeting's new business agenda item to request an agenda item on this issue.

2. Chair's Report

- Chair Gunn noted that she met with Vice Chair Griswold and Dr. Roni Dahir of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) Survey Center.
 - They reviewed the survey data and the task force input from its last meeting regarding existing programs and gaps analysis, hoping to identify one or two action steps for the next task force meeting.
- Chair Gunn also stated that she met with Dr. Stefanie Coleman regarding engaging with colleagues in athletics across our institutions.
- Regarding statistics and reporting, Chair Gunn noted that she will soon be meeting with Eric Gilliland, NSHE Chief Human Resources Officer, who is heading the conversation regarding convening of the Title IX coordinators.
- Chair Gunn reminded the Task Force that they are charged with considering programs across institutions, possible policy recommendations, awareness campaigns, advocacy for personnel, and the surveys and that sorting through these topics would continue in the meeting conversations.

3. Minutes

Mr. Jose Melendrez moved approval of the June 27, 2024 meeting minutes. Dr. Kavita Batra seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Additional Data Needs and Next Survey Timeline – UNR Survey Center

- Chair Gunn introduced Dr. Roni Dahir, Director, Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies and Director of Survey Operations at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR).
- Dr. Dahir stated that the Climate Survey report has been finished and is ready to be published.

- Additional analysis for three institutions has been requested and is underway for UNR, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) and the College of Southern Nevada (CSN); the additional reports will be completed by the end of October.
- One institution has requested the raw data for their own analysis; Dr. Dahir will respond to that request.

Discussion

- Chair Gunn noted that the [system wide report](#) is already available on the [NSHE website](#).
- Vice Chair Griswold shared that a meeting has been tentatively scheduled with Dr. Dahir to discuss the additional reports.
- Chair Gunn noted that the survey timeline references a biennial schedule; the next survey needs to take place in fall, 2025.
 - Those who have been involved understand the intense labor involved, including several survey drafts, ensuring that the timeline aligns with the Board of Regents meetings, and the behind the scenes work done at the institutions.
 - Dr. Dahir clarified that the dissemination of the next survey would be in fall of 2025; the results would be expected in spring of 2026, which will likely go into the summer as did the previous survey.
- Dr. Stefanie Coleman asked if the Board of Regents would need to approve the dissemination of the next survey.
 - Chair Gunn confirmed the task force is a recommending body to the Board of Regents; it is the Board of Regents' decision.
- Chair Gunn reminded the task force members to engage with the legislation, which contains language that is extremely descriptive and prescriptive with listing of requirements.

5. Services and Gaps Analysis – Next Steps

- Chair Gunn noted that in the previous meeting, the task force reviewed and discussed ideas regarding the institutional presentations, which included information regarding on-campus services and off-campus institutional connections as well as inter-institutional convenings.
- The task force can continue to move forward and think about recommendations to bring forward for a vote at the next task force meeting and/or think about organizing the work by the major categories within the bill, including:
 - Survey policy
 - Memorandums of understanding (MOU's) with external agencies
 - Awareness campaigns and how to organize them
 - Recommending advocacy
 - Recommending a victims' advocate position
 - Needs / gap analysis

Discussion

- Dr. Stefanie Coleman noted that there are new Title IX regulations and asked it would be beneficial to work with the Title IX coordinators to avoid duplication of efforts.
 - There is programming, awareness, and advocacy imbedded in the coordinator positions.
 - It would be advantageous to all of us and our time to partner with them.
 - Mr. Chris Nielsen noted that Ms. Lynda King, NSHE Senior Associate General Counsel, is well-versed in Title IX and it would be beneficial to have a conversation with her at some point in-between meetings.
 - Chair Gunn noted that she has a meeting scheduled with Mr. Eric Gilliland, NSHE Chief Human Resource Officer, to discuss where and if the task force work overlaps with work of the Title IX coordinators.
 - Dr. Jose Melendrez suggested that it should be a priority to look at best practices that are working within the system.
- Ms. Christina Hall noted that she agreed with Dr. Melendrez and that there was effort put into the first survey; it makes sense to add, in addition to the survey, a recommendation or focus around awareness and prevention efforts.
 - There is a big difference between an awareness campaign and a true violence prevention effort which addresses the risk and protective factors.
 - We need to narrow down what we need to tackle.
- Dr. Coleman noted that she wholeheartedly agrees that there is a difference between awareness and prevention; she asked about advocacy and if it is in our scope to advocate for victims.
 - She stated that it sounds like folks feel like no one is listening and if we need to step in and focus on advocacy, ensuring that folks feel heard.
- Ms. Christina Hall agreed that prevention and awareness effort are wonderful, but they need to be done in conjunction with a solid foundation regarding advocacy, including policies and procedures that establish avenues for folks to advocate for themselves and institutional support for that advocacy.
- Dr. Coleman noted the best place to start with awareness is in athletics; ensuring that our student athletes understand the scope of what this looks like.
 - With the trifecta of marketing, awareness, and advocacy, as well as feedback from athletics directors, Title IX coordinators, and anybody who works in the ombudsman type of space, we can really make a difference.
 - As we draft a new survey, we may be able to ask some questions for students who did not know that they could advocate for themselves or did not know that there is a space for these types of concerns.

- Ms. Zeva Edmondson, Director, UNR Office of Equal Opportunity and Title IX, shared that if that if the advocacy discussion topic were to fall under Title IX, fairness must be kept in mind in respect to both the complainants and the respondents; we need to provide services for everyone involved in these types of concerns.
- Chair Gunn noted that the discussion has been regarding advocacy and awareness and drew attention to the wording in the legislation (Section 8) which says that “the Board of Regents may require an institution within the system to provide programming on awareness and prevention.”
 - These are two separate things but they interact with each other.
 - If the Board of Regents requires an institution to provide programming on awareness and prevention of sexual misconduct, the program must include, without limitation, items on a long list including language around consent, drugs, and alcohol, and so forth.
 - With this language, we have the guidance on how to go about the directive in the legislation.
 - Regarding advocacy, Section 7 reads “The Board of Regents may require an institution within the system to designate an advocate. If the board requires this designation, an institution shall designate existing categories of employees who may serve as an advocate.”
 - We can think about a timeline of how we want to work on these pieces; holistically, these things need to happen together.
 - We have some good data from our survey and from our institutions regarding the good work that is already happening, and we have the language in the legislation.
 - It sounds like the emerging interests of the Task Force are around the awareness campaign and advocacy.
 - We want to be sure that the institutions have the necessary underlying support, which goes back to our gap and needs analysis.
 - We need to decide if there is anything missing or any kind of recommendation we might want to consider within or across institutions before going down this path.
 - We need to determine if we see any areas where we want to make recommendations for programming, staffing, and coordination and how to link the directives in the legislation with what is already existing in our institutions and identify additional work to be done.
 - In terms of advocacy and awareness, one avenue is to have those who are already engaged in that work provide presentations to the Task Force and make recommendations for a more in-depth look into that work.
 - We can look at best practices on how to coordinate this effort across the institutions.
- Ms. Christina Hall stated that institutions vary with having advocates within and outside of Title IX offices; it is helpful to have the option of having two

- separate advocates as a way to serve most effectively those who have experienced power-based violence.
- We want to meet the needs of the community where they are at; having the summary of each institution's resources is helpful.
 - If we pool our resources and knowledge, we can help improve how we are serving students statewide.
 - This could also include some of the outside groups that are collaborating with NSHE.
 - As mentioned at a prior meeting, we need to streamline our efforts across the state.
 - Dr. Stefanie Coleman stated that we need to be mindful that some institutions' Title IX offices are staffed by only one person.
 - There needs to be some scoping of students regarding their understanding of the word "consent."
 - There are a number of students who are not really sure when it starts and stops and that it can be revoked at any time; sometimes that may lead to a hesitation to speak up.
 - Dr. Kavita Batra noted that in addition to the survey data, one piece that is missing is qualitative investigation; this could include a quick environmental scan or some focus groups or interviews with students regarding their perceptions about their institutional environments and doing some thematic analysis.
 - Dr. Allison Netski discussed reviewing more data related to the "the burden," including the number of cases and the amount of time it takes to process them.
 - As noted by Nevada Faculty Alliance (NFA), annual reporting would be something to look into, including what the current annual reporting requirements.
 - Chair Gunn thanked everyone for their comments, feedback, and sharing their expertise.
 - There is some consensus around asking those who are already doing the advocacy work to come share their findings with the Task Force; there may also be interest in some parallel work with the external agencies.
 - We need to refine the order in which we want to do these things; we need to understand what exists in order to make the recommendations; the creation of committees could be an avenue to move forward with this work.
 - Mr. Chris Nielsen, Special Counsel to the Board of Regents, confirmed that every public body has the ability within the Open Meeting Law rules to create committees.
 - Chair Gunn noted that she will be sending out emails regarding the formation of subcommittees.

6. Marketing Awareness and Outreach

- Chair Gunn noted that part of our role is to make information public.
- Ms. Christina Hall clarified that the Task Force is a body which can make recommendations to the Board of Regents.

- Since each institution has different resources available, we need to be mindful of not recommending an unfunded mandate.
- Potentially, we could look at grant opportunities to help with implementation of recommendations at the institutions; UNLV recently received a large federal grant to implement violence prevention programming.
- Chair Gunn noted that this is an opportunity to shape this conversation across the institutions.
 - While we are bound by the language in the legislation, we can be innovative and creative about how we go about this work.
- Mr. Jose Melendrez asked about the possibility of convening town hall forums to share best practices and capture different information.
 - Mr. Chris Nielsen stated that typically, workshops are agendized much like public meetings with quorum and notification rules, etc.
 - Proposals and options regarding these types of meetings can be discussed offline with Chair Gunn.
 - Mr. Melendrez noted that type of meeting setting could help to build community around the topic and collect information from participants.

7. New Business

- Dr. Stefanie Coleman suggested inviting the NSHE athletic directors to a meeting to discuss how they approach awareness among their student athletes regarding the topic of power-based violence and an understanding of Title IX.
- Chair Gunn noted that another item could be ensuring the understanding of the the delineation of the Task Force work and Title IX efforts.
 - Another item could be inviting advocates from throughout the state (both within and beyond our institutions) to help us better situate the work that is being done and formulate future recommendations.
- Mr. Jose Melendrez asked if the public comment item submitted by NFA could be considered as a future agenda item.
 - Chair Gunn noted that it might be encompassed in the discussion regarding the differentiation between Title IX office work and the Task Force's work.
 - Mr. Chris Nielson stated that he sent an email to initiate further discussion with Chair Gunn and Ms. Lynda King regarding the topic.

8. Public Comment

- There was no further public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:14 a.m.