

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

Thursday, May 1, 2025

Members Present:	Dr. Elizabeth Gunn, Chair (Las Vegas) Dr. Tabor Griswold, Vice Chair (Reno) Dr. Kavita Batra (Zoom) Dr. Stefanie Coleman (Zoom) Mr. Jordan Fischette (Zoom) Ms. Erin Frock (Reno) Ms. Christina Hall (Zoom) Ms. Lynda King, NSHE Chief Counsel Designee (Las Vegas) Mr. José Melendrez (Zoom)
Members Absent:	Ms. Luisa Bautista Ms. Patricia Charlton, NSHE Interim Chancellor Ms. Tara Marjerrison Dr. Alison Netski Ms. Michelle Sposito Ms. Lindsey Wolterbeek
Others Present:	Dr. Daniel Archer, NSHE Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, designee for Chancellor Charlton (Las Vegas) Ms. Renée Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs (Reno) Ms. Donna Healy, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs (Reno) Mr. Chris Nielsen, NSHE Task Force Counsel (Reno)

Dr. Veronica “Roni” Dahir, Director, Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies; Research Services Grants and Projects Analyst, College of Liberal Arts
Mr. Armen Asherian, Director, Office of Institutional Equity, College of Southern Nevada (Las Vegas)

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 9:07 a.m. with a quorum present.

1. Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

2. Chair’s Report

- Chair Gunn noted that two new Task Force members were approved at the recent Board of Regents meeting, including Luisa Bautista, student representative at Nevada State University, and Tara Marjerrison, Campus Victim Advocate at Truckee Meadows Community College.
- Chair Gunn and Ms. Lynda King have connected with NSHE system colleagues statewide to discuss where boundaries may overlap regarding the Task Force work.
- We will continue to collaborate with our institutional colleagues regarding survey data.
- Regarding [Assembly Bill 465](#), Chair Gunn expressed her appreciation to Ms. Lynda King following this item.

3. Minutes

- The Power-Based Violence Task Force approved the minutes from its March 3, 2025 meeting. ([Ref.3 - Power-Based Violence Task Force meeting minutes, March 3, 2025](#))

Mr. Jose Melendrez moved for approval of the March 3, 2025, meeting minutes. Ms. Lynda King seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Policy Recommendation

The Task Force considered approval for a policy recommendation to the Board of Regents to incorporate the definition of power-based violence as set forth in NRS 396.1285 in its Policy Against Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment (Title 4, Chapter 8. Section 14).

- Ms. Lynda King noted that there is strong support among the Title IX officers throughout the state for this recommended policy change and consensus that there is no need for a separate stand-alone policy.
- Mr. Jordan Fischette thanked Ms. King and Chair Gunn for their work on this effort.

Mr. Jordan Fischette moved approval of the recommendation to the Board of Regents to incorporate the definition of power-based violence as set forth in NRS 396.1285 in its Policy Against Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment (Title 4, Chapter 8, Section 14). Ms. Christina Hall seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Subsequent Survey Calendar and Additional Data Analysis of First Survey

- Dr. Veronica “Roni” Dahir thanked Chair Gunn, Vice Chair Griswold, and other members of the Task Force for their assistance and guidance with the development of the original survey.
- Dr. Dahir also extended thanks to Dr. Jennifer Lowman for the development of prior campus climate surveys and to all of the student survey participants.
- Dr. Dahir noted that many of the items were included in the prior surveys and reviewed the presentation findings from some of the key demographics. ([PBVTF 5a](#))

Discussion

- Dr. Kavita Batra asked if the Likert scale used was validated.
 - Dr. Dahir responded that a lot of items were taken from previous surveys and that Dr. Jennifer Lowman presented on the validation of the items used in previous versions of the survey at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), Great Basin College (GBC), and Western Nevada College (WNC) for multiple years.
 - Calculated percentages were used in the demographic report.
 - In order to compare across institutions, they had to create a composite score; calculated means were used for the current report.
 - The University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) data was affected by the incident on that campus.
- Chair Gunn thanked Dr. Dahir and noted that the presentations were linked within the agenda.
- Ms. Lynda King thanked Dr. Dahir and asked if there is a trend or areas of the survey that the Task Force should review, including consent, reporting, etc.
 - Dr. Dahir noted that the topics have already been reported; all of the items reported in the current presentation are the trends that should be focused upon at the institutions.

- Vice Chair Griswold asked about the items that were not on the 0-5 scale and if they were too close (lacking sufficient distinction) to visually reveal a trend.
 - Dr. Dahir responded that follow-up testing has not been done on the mean differences between males and females; she did not want to mix up the means and frequency reporting in the presentation slides.
- Mr. Armen Asherian, Title IX Coordinator at the College of Southern Nevada (CSN), asked if this was the first survey done at CSN.
 - Dr. Dahir responded that this was the first survey done by her group at CSN.
 - Chair Gunn added that the fall 2023 survey was the first inter-institutional survey.
- Mr. Asherian asked if there will be a subsequent survey and if there are key items that we as a system want to work on.
 - Dr. Dahir responded that it is up to the Task Force to determine the use of subsequent surveys and that she will reach out to Mr. Asherian regarding this question.
- Chair Gunn noted that Dr. Dahir's presentation reported trends that will be reviewed as we consider next steps and a subsequent survey.
- Chair Gunn stated that to the extent that funds are available, the Task Force will discuss plans, including timing of a subsequent system-wide survey and possibly continuing conversations with UNR.
- Chair Gunn shared that when the work was begun in 2022, she and Dr. Griswold were also in contact with the [Center for Research Evaluation and Assessment](#) (CREA) at UNLV.
 - Considering having a balanced approach, we may want to look at the scope of work and timeline that they might undertake for a subsequent survey.
 - They could begin with a literature review and conduct measurements and comparative analysis of the survey instrument in fall 2025.
 - In spring 2026, they could work to validate questions, collaborate with the Task Force, and begin to examine correlations from previous surveys for a possible subsequent survey in fall 2026.
 - Chair Gunn stated that she is not recommending that the UNLV center be used for a future survey, but was sharing information regarding the survey options.
 - If UNLV is considered for the survey, the CREA Center would be selected for this purpose.
 - Their staff would help craft and administer the survey, then provide the data analysis, which were the same services as provided by UNR.

- Ms. Lynda King noted that she likes a balanced approach; the statute allows for a survey to be available, but it is not required.
 - Although there are currently no funds allocated, that should not prevent the Task Force from creating a timeline and then presenting a survey proposal to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents for funding.
- Chair Gunn noted that the Board of Regents could ask for this task to be done with the next target survey date in the fall of 2026.
- Mr. Jordan Fischette stated that this is a doable timeline and that it would be fiscally irresponsible not to explore UNLV as an alternative option to UNR.
 - Chair Gunn noted that both institutions have the depth and expertise to handle the work.
- Ms. Lynda King asked at what point we will need to have board approval if we look at the fall of 2026, noted that board deadlines need to be considered, and asked if approval in September 2025 would provide sufficient time.
 - Chair Gunn noted the Task Force would need to review and revise/evaluate the survey and recommend it to the board; September 2025 may be too soon to have the survey ready.
 - Chair Gunn provided a summary of Item 5 discussion:
 - Some key areas and trends in the survey and a possible timeline for moving forward with the next survey have been identified.

6. Assembly Bill 465 ([AB 465](#))

The Task Force discussed the provisions of AB 465, which is currently under consideration by the Nevada Legislature. (Refs. [PBVTF-6a](#) and [PBVTF-6b](#))

- Ms. Lynda King noted that the original bill was very extensive; it included provisions for K-12 and higher education and a new definition of harassment, which greatly expanded the scope of responsibilities of NSHE institutions in regard to conduct occurring in a very large, technically boundless jurisdictional scope.
 - Concerns have been addressed by K-12 and higher education, including the possible inclusion of the new definition of harassment, which could have invalidated work/research that has been done by the Power-Based Violence Task Force, and possibly renaming that committee.
 - Prior to the bill being heard in the assembly committee, those provisions relating to the Task Force were removed; we are grateful that there will be no impact on the existing survey and data analysis.
- The bill still relates to the Task Force in its current, more narrow form.

- This will impact the work done by the Title IX offices; there is an inextricable link between the Task Force and the Title IX offices.
- The bill was amended on April 30; in the second amendment, the word “harassment” is maintained but is not defined.
 - The definition of harassment is as it is defined in the criminal statutes under harassment and stalking, which is when a person threatens bodily injury to a person or other physical damage to property, and that person has a reasonable fear that the threat will be carried out.
 - It also includes the definition of power-based violence.
- The bill provides immunity from civil liability.
 - If an institution were to be faced with a lawsuit that alleges liability for harassment, it would be shielded by immunity.
- Some of the language that mirrors the K-12 language is not quite as applicable for higher education; it would be difficult in higher education to coordinate with class schedules, etc.
- The hope is that the Chancellor’s office will be able to engage in more discussions with the Assembly member and the bill sponsors to work through issues.
 - We want to support and comply with the bill, which does indicate what supportive measures should be in place, many of which are already in place.
 - In higher education, factors such as academic freedom and financial aid present challenges that do not exist in the K-12 environment.
- The Nevada coalition and students share concerns related to barriers to reporting; we are hoping that a coalition representative will attend future meetings and guide the work of the task force.
- The supportive measures are already defined in the statute.
- We will look at the best way to move forward with additional policy recommendations.
- Chair Gunn thanked Ms. King for her follow-up related to the bill.

7. New Business

- Ms. Christina Hall asked if the task force could have an additional update regarding the outcome of AB 465 at our next meeting.
- Chair Gunn noted that the survey timeline will also be a topic of discussion at the next meeting.

8. Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.