

UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes December 7-8, 1988

12-07-1988

Pages 92-98

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

December 7-9, 1988

The Board of Regents met on the above dates in the Waterford Room, Carson Valley Inn, Minden, Nevada.

Members Present: Mrs. June F. Whitley, Chairman

Dr. James Eardley

Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher

Mrs. Joan Kenney

Mr. Daniel J. Klaich

Mrs. Jo Ann Sheerin

Mrs. Carolyn M. Sparks

Mrs. Jill Derby, Regent-Elect

Dr. Lonnie Hammargren, Regent-Elect

Members Absent: Mr. Joseph M. Foley

Mr. Chris Karamanos

Others Present: Chancellor Mark H. Dawson

President William Berg, NNCC

President Anthony Calabro, WNCC

President Joseph Crowley, UNR

President John Gwaltney, TMCC

President Robert Maxson, UNLV

President Paul Meacham, CCCC

Vice President Dale Schulke, DRI

Mr. Donald Klasic, General Counsel

Dr. Warren Fox, Vice Chancellor

Mr. Ron Sparks, Vice Chancellor

Mrs. Edna Brigham, Assistant to the Chancellor

Ms. Karen Steinberg, Director of Institutional

Research

Ms. Mary Lou Moser, Secretary

Mrs. Leslie Jacques, Assistant to the Secretary

Also present were Faculty Senate Chairmen Cheryl Bowles (UNLV),

Patricia Crookham (NNCC), Gilbert Cochran (DRI), Tom Kendall

(Unit), Robert Mead (UNR), Paul Nelson (WNCC), Dru Raney (CCCC)

and Dave Wilkins (TMCC).

A workshop for Regents, Presidents, Faculty Senate Chairmen, the Chancellor and the Chancellor's staff was held. Chairman Whitley called the meeting to order, declaring that all attendees were invited to actively participate in discussion of agenda items.

1. Welcome and Workshop Preview

Chairman Whitley and Chancellor Dawson welcomed participants to the Fall workshop and stated that they hoped for a very educational workshop over the next few days and welcomed open discussion on the agenda items. Chancellor Dawson gave a preview of the agenda.

Chairman Whitley introduced newly elected Regents Jill Derby and Lonnie Hammargren.

Thursday, December 8, 1988

2. Boardsmanship

Mr. Robert A. Cashell, Chairman of the Board of Cashell Management Corporation, former Lt. Governor of the State

of Nevada and former Chairman of the Board of Regents, and Mr. William Martin, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Nevada National Bank presided over the discussion on boardsmanship. The discussion included internal workings of a board, such as setting and reaching goals; representing a district, yet maintaining a Statewide perspective; effective decision making; and defining an "excellent" board. Also discussed were external relationships such as serving UNS interests; supporting progress of each institution; representing the System; and demonstrating leadership to the State.

Mr. Martin stated that public and private boards differ mainly by the selection process, but also by setting directions and reaching the goals slated for the organization. The boards are similar in respect to future aspects and competition for funding. The main objective for a board is to set a common goal without losing site of the broader picture.

Mr. Cashell referred to the common goal as a UNS "System-wide" goal which should encompass what is best for the System and the State of Nevada. He suggested that after a member is elected to the Board, he should not remain demo-

cratic or republican, or in fact, should not remain a "district" Regent, but rather a University of Nevada System Regent. There must be compromises within the decision-making process, and members should agree to disagree, then support the final decision.

Mr. Cashell further suggested that in dealing with the Nevada State Legislature, UNS should appear before the Legislature with coordinated representation with at least two representatives -- one to speak and one to listen.

Dr. Eardley stated that he felt the mission and goals of the institutions were very general and may possibly duplicate efforts of other institutions. Dr. Eardley's conception of the Board of Regents' mission was to provide education for students in Nevada.

Mrs. Gallagher stated that the Board has not set goals during the last 2-3 years and felt it was time to set goals for the Board of Regents. She stated that the primary concern of the Board of Regents is the funding and growth of the institutions. With the fast paced growth, she is concerned about maintaining quality education.

Mr. Klaich stated his concerns and felt that the Board is fearful of the future in regard to growth, funding, identity and reapportionment.

President Calabro stated that Nevada is in a positive position in comparison to other western states and that we shouldn't be so hard on ourselves.

Mrs. Sparks agreed with President Calabro and felt that the credibility of education in the State of Nevada is returning. She felt that the System was giving quality education, but was in need of additional classroom space.

In reference to institutional goals, Chairman Whitley stated that long-range goals will direct the Board and institutions to develop common goals.

President Crowley stated that the institutions were not capable of strategic planning for the System. The institutions are very diverse. The Council of Presidents are addressing this issue, but suggested we should not develop one strategic plan. In regard to this issue, President Berg stated that he felt that institutions should not be required to follow other institutions' policies, because

of the diversity.

Faculty Senate Chairman Dru Raney stated that there should be a commitment to shared governance within the System.

Mr. Cashell stated that the Board may be creating its own problems. There is a strong need to communicate, compromise and be realistic. Communication is the major problem for private and public boards. Regents should be able to communicate among themselves. He suggested that the Board honestly critique itself. The Board should set goals for itself and direct these goals to helping the institutions.

He advised listening to and working with Presidents. The Board should not get involved in Campus politics. The Board should utilize its people on Campuses and work as a team.

The question was asked, "What makes a good Board member?".

President Crowley felt a board member should hire, fire and nurture administration; not get involved in Campus politics; advance ideas, then stop when appropriate; and get along with each other by understanding strengths and weaknesses of fellow members.

Faculty Senate Chairman Patricia Crookham felt that the

Board should listen to Faculty Senate Chairmen. The Faculty Senate Chairmen represent thousands of people and their concerns.

Mrs. Gallagher stated that, in her opinion, a Regent should listen to faculty, gather information from faculty, and the faculty should have access to a Regent. A Regent must listen, but can't make promises. A Regent should always notify the President if they will be on the Campus.

Mrs. Sheerin suggested that the Board become educated on national education issues and be able to discuss these issues and attain goals set forth. She further suggested that the Board be evaluated once a year, as the Presidents are.

In closing, Mr. Cashell suggested that the Presidents become more creative at meetings; there should be no name calling or spreading of rumors; the buck stops at the Chairman; the Chairman must be vocal and be able to confront the issues.

Thursday afternoon, December 8, 1988

3. Agenda for the Future

Vice Chancellor Warren Fox opened the discussion by stating that Nevada's growth has increased 56% over the past 10 years and is predicted to continue to increase. Growth affects research, developmental education, buildings, faculty, staff and recruitment of students.

The following are issues facing the University of Nevada System:

A. "Access" concerns the ability of potential students to enroll in higher education. The facts are 1) many more students plan to enroll in postsecondary education in Nevada; 2) State population is growing; and 3) Regents endorsed a policy to encourage increased access for those who have not traditionally participated in higher education. Questions to ask ourselves are 1) do we have the current capacity to maintain access?; 2) can we enroll all who apply?; and 3) do we need enrollment caps?

President Maxson stated that he felt UNS has a good ratio between institutions and State population. If the System should adopt capping, there would be no alternatives to fall back on. The Universities do not have critical mass of full-time students, especially

in certain programs such as foreign languages, to support capping.

B. "Quality" concerns our ability to offer high quality instruction to students who enroll, and quality research and public service. Facts are 1) quality is a very difficult attribute to measure; 2) more programs are accredited or seeking specialized accreditation; 3) impressions of UNS institutions seem to be more positive by Nevadans; and 4) UNS is raising admission standards at the Universities. Questions to ask ourselves are 1) can we assure quality and accommodate growth?; 2) how do we measure quality?; and 3) how do we convey quality to students?

Mrs. Sheerin pointed out that quality is the driving force behind support for higher education. President Calabro stated that he felt quality and access maintained an equal position on the scale of higher education. President Maxson stated that growth is increasing quality.

C. "Cost of Education" concerns both what the Campus must spend to offer programs of study, and the students'

ability to pay a fair share of education. The facts are 1) cost of education is rising; 2) students' perceptions of the cost of education are greater than the actual costs; 3) cost of education to the student in Nevada is low in comparison with other states. Questions to ask ourselves are 1) what is the appropriate share of the cost of education for the student to bear?; 2) what is an appropriate tuition policy for the UNS?; and 3) what can/should the UNS do to assist the parents with the cost of education their children (financial aid, tuition assistance programs)?

D. "State Resources" must be increased to provide access and quality. The facts are 1) enrollment growth alone will require increased resources; 2) to make significant improvement in quality, even more resources are required; and 3) the UNS share of State allocations is not increasing. Questions to ask ourselves are 1) does the State have the resources required to meet the growth in enrollments?; 2) does the State have the resources required to meet the growth in enrollment and implement quality programs?; 3) what is the appropriate role for the UNS in educating Nevada's citizens to the cost of quality higher education?; and 4) what is the role of

the Board in obtaining resources?

E. "Campuses/Facilities" must provide adequate space and facilities to provide instruction to increasing numbers of students. The facts are 1) our Campuses are currently close to or exceeding capacity; 2) construction and equipment costs are rising; and 3) UNS has significant unmet capital construction needs. Questions to ask ourselves are 1) are our current Campuses adequate to meet current and future demands?; 2) do we meet demands best by increasing the size of Campuses or building new Campuses?; and 3) how do we decide where to build?

F. In preparing the agenda for the future, questions to ask ourselves are 1) what is the role of the Board of Regents in preparing the agenda? and 2) what directions for the future of the University of Nevada System should we pursue?

Vice Chancellor Fox requested that each participant answer a questionnaire, which he and Mrs. Karen Steinberg tallied, analyzed and presented to the participants, which is filed in the Regents Office.

Friday, December 9, 1988

4. Financing Higher Education

The cost of education is rising, and coupled with Nevada's growth, the UNS faces tough, complex questions on financing education into the 21st century. Discussions were centered on the State of Nevada's recently released revenue study prepared by The Urban Institute and Price Waterhouse, and its impact on UNS; the UNS 1989-91 Budget Request and priorities; and Estate Fund procedures.

Vice Chancellor Ron Sparks reviewed the budget, priorities and formulas. He stressed that the funding for the Base Budget was ultimate priority of the UNS, with faculty salaries as next in line. The Faculty Senate Chairmen unanimously supporting funding for the Base Budget with the hopes that faculty salaries would be then increased. The Chairmen stated they will deliver the message to their faculties.

Vice Chancellor Sparks commended Mrs. Karen Steinberg and Dr. Jim Rimpau for their deciphering of the letter from Price Waterhouse in regard to the future of Nevada planning.

The study indicated that under current conditions UNS could operate with a \$7 million increase. Mr. Sparks indicated that UNS needs \$15-16 million in State General Fund money next fiscal year just to take care of the enrollment increase. The study also indicated that the estate tax and slot tax should not be dedicated for education. The Chancellor's staff submitted information on enrollment figures, projections, etc. to The Urban Institute and Price Waterhouse, but the information was not used in the final study. Therefore, the study is very alarming to UNS.

Mr. Klaich stated that a citizens advisory group will be meeting on December 12 to address the needs of the State of Nevada and present them to the Legislature.

Dr. Hammargren suggested that the Chancellor's staff submit a report on the student to The Urban Institute and Price Waterhouse, before the final report is printed.

Chancellor Dawson suggested a special teleconference meeting of the Board of Regents be slated to approve a Handbook change to the Policies and Procedures of the UNS Estate Fund and to send the proposals back to the Estate Fund Committee for reconsideration.

Vice Chancellor Fox stated that he felt the Board should reaffirm to the public that it is not the intent of the Board to let these funds go into the General Fund. He emphasized the need to obtain the funds for the submitted proposals.

Chancellor Dawson thanked the participants of the workshop for their openness and felt that the workshop was indeed a success.

Chairman Whitley expressed her thanks to Chancellor Dawson and Secretary Moser for preparing the workshop agenda and arranging for the facilities.

The workshop adjourned at 11:20 A.M. on Friday, December 9, 1988.

Mary Lou Moser

Secretary of the Board

12-07-1988