

UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes February 3-4, 1993

02-03-1993

Pages Unnumbered

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

February 3-4, 1993

The Board of Regents met on the above date in the Carson Valley
Inn, Minden, Nevada for a Regents' Workshop.

Members present: Mrs. Carolyn M. Sparks, Chairman

Mrs. Shelley Berkley

Dr. Jill Derby

Mr. James Eardley

Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher

Mr. Madison Graves, II

Dr. Lonnie Hammargren

Mr. Daniel J. Klaich

Mrs. Nancy Price

Mrs. June F. Whitley

Members absent: Mr. Joseph M. Foley

Others present: Chancellor Mark H Dawson

President Anthony Calabro, WNCC

President Joseph Crowley, UNR

President John Gwaltney, TMCC

President Robert Maxson, UNLV

President Paul Meacham, CCSN

President Ronald Remington, NNCC

President James Taranik, DRI

Mr. Donald Klasic, General Counsel

Mr. John Richardson, Vice Chancellor

Mr. Ronald Sparks, Vice Chancellor

Ms. Mary Lou Moser, Secretary

Also present were Vice Presidents/Deans Bill Bishop (DRI), Ashok Dhingra (UNR), William Bonaudi (NNCC), Robert Hoover (UNR), Herb Peebles (CCSN), Lorrie Peterson (WNCC), John Scally (TMCC), John Unrue (UNLV), and Faculty Senate Chairmen Bill Baines (TMCC), Carolyn Collins (CCSN), Michon Mackedon (WNCC), Allen Mc Kay (DRI), Ed Nickel (NNCC), Ellen Pillard (UNR), and Robert Skaggs (UNLV).

A workshop for Regents, Presidents, Academic Vice Presidents, Faculty Senate Chairmen, the Chancellor and the Chancellor's staff was held February 3-4, 1993 in Minden, Nevada.

1. Discussion on Academic Master Plans

Dr. Jill Derby, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, called the Academic Planning Workshop Session to order at 8:30 A.M. Thursday, February 3, 1993, with all Regents present except Regent Joseph Foley.

Dr. Derby stressed the urgency to examine closely the academic planning activities of the Campuses. She turned the meeting over to Vice Chancellor Richardson, who reviewed the outline of events for the two-day workshop.

Vice Chancellor Richardson briefly reviewed the UCCSN Planning Schedule. He stressed that the schedule includes time frames for integration of the components of planning adopted by the Board of Regents which include: System mission statements, academic master plans, capital construction priorities, biennial budget and legislative planning reports. He urged all those in attendance to keep this schedule in a prominent place and refer to it often.

Vice Chancellor Richardson cautioned that no single method of planning is best for each institution. Planning is an evolutionary process where the System will learn from its mistakes, and the governing board of a multi-campus system has a much more difficult job than does a board of a single institution. Each institution is unique and variables differ at each. While keeping this in mind, the Board must consider the interaction among the 7 institutions for long-range planning.

Vice Chancellor Richardson asked that the Regents, in examining the institutional academic master plans, not focus on the new and unusual, instead focus on everyday "nitty-gritty" of the operations; to assess whether the plans set direction and state a plan for growth; and to ascertain that objectives set forth are achievable.

Vice Chancellor Richardson stressed that the Board must only accept and approve institutional plans when they feel comfortable with them.

PRESENTATION OF CAMPUS ACADEMIC MASTER PLANS - Each institution was given 40-45 minutes for an overview of academic

master plans on file in the Board of Regents' Office. After each review Vice Chancellor Richardson briefly discussed general observations, strengths of the plan and issues which, if clarified or addressed could improve the plan.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PLANS:

NORTHERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (NNCC) - President Ronald Remington and Dean William Bonaudi presented the Northern Nevada Community College Academic Master Plan "Challenges of the '90's 1993-95".

Dean Bonaudi encouraged the Board of Regents to recognize the uniqueness of each of the Community Colleges in the State. He gave a slide presentation which included a map depicting NNCC's 45,000 square mile service area. NNCC is realizing a growing segment of young students right out of high school who are selecting NNCC as their College of first choice.

The Academic Master Planning at NNCC included input from a wide audience from the College community and the entire service area. The plan touches on the need to examine housing a "University Center" at the Elko Campus and points

out the growing number of shared programs with both of the State's Universities. It addresses the need to acquire housing for students who must attend the main Campus for specific programs. Dean Bonaudi discussed the importance of contract education to programs such as the nationally recognized diesel and welding programs which are made possible by ventures with the mining industry.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed the strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. Recognizing the signs of reduced growth over the next biennium, the NNCC plan addresses the need for refinement and efficiency. The plan focuses on 11 basic goals and 13 strategies.

Regents discussed the Ely Center as a perfect example of the mission of a Community College and the community support of education. Mr. Klaich asked that President Remington keep the Board of Regents informed as the concept for a University Center on the NNCC Elko Campus is explored. Mrs. Whitley inquired about the concept of acquiring apartment housing near the Elko Campus and the ability of NNCC to dedicate the apartments for student use.

Calabro and Vice President Lorrie Peterson reviewed the Western Nevada Community College Academic Master Plan for 1993-95.

Vice President Peterson related that the 17,971 square mile service area currently includes 2 Campuses, 9 Centers, 5 prison sites and multiple instructional sites. The demographic forecast indicates that the population in Gardner-ville-Minden will equal that of Carson City by the year 2010. If WNCC is to successfully address the projected increasing demand for higher education in that area, ground-work must start now.

Vice President Peterson pointed out that academic planning is limited by current facilities, and that acquiring additional facilities is a high priority in the WNCC planning efforts. She said that System Space Need Assessments indicate that WNCC has the greatest space need, yet the State's financial inability to fund new space is forcing the College to do more with less.

Vice President Peterson reviewed the multiple missions and strategic directions of WNCC, and briefly discussed the issues and strategies for strengthening of the following 5

key programs at the College:

University Transfer Programs

Applied Science and Technology

Business and Industry Partnering

Developmental Education

Community Services

Student Support Services

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed the strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. The plan identifies the near term strategy for all program areas to be consolidation and upgrading of existing programs, with limited expansion into new program areas.

Dr. Eardley pointed out that the Tadlock Report, conducted by outside consultants for the System in the 70's, addresses identification of instructional sites, sharing of resources, and coordinating of programs. He suggested that a copy of this report be examined to assess its applicability to the current discussions of Community College off-campus sites.

Mrs. Gallagher suggested that University outreach programs

on Community College Campuses is not a mission of the Community Colleges, rather it should be included in the mission of the 2 Universities. Doug Burris, Director of Community College Affairs, discussed how interactive television will assist in the System outreach efforts, as well as providing a medium for staff development, collaborative programs and maximize use of facilities.

TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE (TMCC) - President John Gwaltney and Vice President John Scally reviewed the TMCC Academic Master Plan - 1993-95. President Gwaltney pointed out that the plan was developed around the key question, "How can TMCC best serve the needs of the community?"

Vice President Scally said that a committee established to develop a plan for the College, addressed assessment and enhancement of programs, and looked at the programmatic needs of the College. Three major themes emerged in the process:

Accountability

Faculty Development

Economic Diversity

The System strategic directions to which TMCC is committed to support, provides the framework for accountability. Vice President Scally stated that the parameters for planning are restricted because of budget restraints. To offer programs on the cutting edge TMCC plans to be flexible and more aggressive in future fund raising efforts.

Dr. Derby complimented TMCC on the process used to develop the academic master plan, and on the strategy developed to assess accountability.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed the strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. The TMCC plan identifies the major challenges for the Campus during the next 4 years as providing a trained workforce. Objectives are identified for each of the areas of the College mission. Each program and support service is given equal importance.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA (CCSN) - President Paul Meacham and Vice President Herb Peebles presented the CCSN 1993-95 Academic Master Plan. President Meacham stressed the individuality of the Community Colleges in Nevada. He pointed out that CCSN has a rural as well as an urban role in the southern part of the State.

Vice President Peebles stated that a major goal in the CCSN academic planning effort was to develop an ongoing process for studying evolving educational needs of various components of the service areas, and development of innovative curricula for meeting those needs. He reviewed goals identified and objectives designed to accomplish these goals.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. Selected goals are identified for each area of the Community College mission, with specific objectives developed to accomplish these goals. The plan calls for efforts in all 6 areas of the mission to meet the changing and expanding educational needs of the population, and to undertaking a leading role in economic development efforts.

Mr. Burriss wrapped up the review of Community College academic master plans. He reiterated the need to enhance partnership with private business by expanding programs to meet the technical needs of the State. Each of the Community College plans focuses on the 6 strategic directions adopted by the Board of Regents in 1992, incorporating the directions with specific goals and objectives.

Dr. Derby congratulated the Colleges on the more concise focus of 2-year versus 4-year academic master planning at the Community Colleges. A shorter time-frame planning allows a closer relationship between academic planning and economic development of the State.

Dr. Hammargren applauded the Colleges for planning efforts on 2+2 and transfer programs. He suggested the need to strengthen transferability among the 6 teaching institutions, and asked about articulation for out-of-state students.

Dr. Burris responded that because of the work of the transfer center committees on each Campus, transfer among the State's institutions is being addressed. However, there are no specific set transfer policies nationally, transfer credits are analyzed by the receiving institution's registrar and faculty.

Mrs. Gallagher stated that with the advent of interactive telecommunications and discussions of University Centers located on Community College Campuses, it is time to examine the concept of having specific service areas.

President Calabro said that there now exists overlap in service areas, and that when a specific course is requested in an area the Presidents discuss which Campus can best service that area. An example of a recent endeavor between NNCC and CCSN to offer a rural Nursing Program was discussed. President Remington said there is room for conflict between institutions, but thus far dialogue and cooperation between Colleges has worked well.

Mr. Graves discussed the issue of duplication of programs and how the use of interactive telecommunications could reduce duplication. He congratulated the Community Colleges for responsiveness to their service areas.

The Community College Presidents urged the Regents to examine the 6 missions upon which the academic master plans were built as equal in importance, and reminded them that although each Campus is unique, they all come together to serve the needs of the citizens of the State.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS (UNLV) - President Robert Maxson and Vice President John Unrue presented the UNLV 1993-97 Academic Master Plan. President Maxson reminded

the Regents that UNLV is a young institution, once referred to as "Tumbleweed Tech". During the past several years the University raised \$1 million every 35 days. The academic plan which places strong emphasis on undergraduate education, was developed at the departmental level.

Vice President Unrue reported that the Campus goals are consistent with the Board approved strategic directions.

Goals of the Campus include greater emphasis in the several areas such as:

Diversity

Assessment and Advisement

Interactive Telecommunications

Faculty Workload

Improving Teaching Skills of Graduate Assistants

Careful Review of Existing Programs

He pointed out that, because UNLV is land-locked, the academic plan includes the need to explore the idea of a branch Campus somewhere in the Las Vegas Valley area.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. The plan high-

lights aspirations in various areas. The process of setting priorities has begun, particularly in the area of new academic programs. The emphasis of the UNLV plan is on growth and expansion to meet the needs of the growing southern region of the State.

Vice Chancellor Richardson's written observations on the Universities' plans raised the question of whether it is desirable to have two comprehensive Universities in the State on the two University Campuses which specialize at the graduate level. He said he often hears the question regarding this issue.

Vice President Unrue pointed out that this is a very sensitive issue at UNLV. Although the issue has never been specifically addressed by the Board of Regents, UNLV is essential to the economic growth in the area of almost a million people. He said that for many years the University has moved in the direction of being a comprehensive institution, and pointed to approval of the many Ph. D. programs over the last several years.

President Maxson stressed that UNLV has made a commitment to undergraduate education. Tough decisions have to be

made which are sometimes unpopular with the faculty but are totally necessary for the Campus. Mr. Klaich stated that a focus on undergraduate education is good as is a system to effectively evaluate faculty effectiveness. He stated that he feels the Universities have not done a good job of briefing the Board about what is being done in undergraduate education, and acknowledged the commitment stated in the planning documents addressing the issue.

Dr. Derby applauded UNLV's goals to strengthen undergraduate education, efforts in faculty and student cultural diversity and the plan to improve pay of part-time instructors while reducing the number of part-time instructors at the Campus.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO (UNR) - President Joseph Crowley and Vice President Robert Hoover reviewed the UNR plan, "Approaching the 21st Century: An Academic Master Plan for the University of Nevada, Reno". President Crowley stressed how important it is that the Campus community have ownership in the academic master plan.

Vice President Hoover explained the UNR 21st Century Committee, a committee of 40+ individuals who developed

the Campus academic master plan. The Committee had vision, developed a plan for the next 5 years and allocation of resources for the next 2 years. Vice President Hoover reviewed the historical changes in the focus of higher education in this country since WWII, resulting in a totally changed country from 40 years ago. Instead of the defense/cold war motivation of 40 years ago, research Universities now must focus heavily on societal problems such as environment, energy, families, health & wellness, and information resources. Other forces affecting planning efforts include change in relative wealth; significant changes in preparation of students; rapid changes in information technology; growing financial problems of the states (as more and more federal responsibilities are off-loaded on the states and non-educational programs are competing for the same funds); greater focus on accountability; and higher expectations of public higher education institutions.

It was the intent of the plan to assess implications of change - to examine programs for relevancy to the future, and to add programs that will be necessary to future generations. Vice President Hoover reviewed the 6 fundamental goals for the University during the coming 5 years (on file

in the Board of Regents' Office), and specific objectives and strategies for achieving them.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. He pointed out that the UNR academic plan uses an issue-oriented focus, allowing the articulation of priorities and choices based on the larger picture. 6 fundamental goals and 7 priorities are identified for the next 5 years.

President Crowley suggested that a clear definition of "comprehensive" for each institution be developed. Vice Chancellor Richardson agreed and stated that he posed the question of comprehensive Universities to stimulate Board discussion about re-affirming the need in the State for its two "comprehensive" Universities.

Vice President Unrue stressed the importance of having plans approved for Northwest Association accreditation visits. It was agreed that although some revision is necessary, the plans will be presented at the next Academic Affairs Committee meeting.

and Vice President William Bishop presented a draft of the DRI Academic Master Plan. President Taranik explained that DRI has had a continuous planning effort since 1987.

Vice President Bishop explained the DRI Academic Master Plan addresses an institutional commitment to continued activities that support the academic programs of the teaching Campuses of the System and to expanding current activities in response to specific, merging opportunities.

The DRI strategic plans, updated every 18 months, has the academic master plan as a component. The strategic plan identifies 9 major goals, and 3 operational goals.

Vice President Bishop reviewed the many joint academic programs currently in place in which DRI faculty teach at the Universities, and the many joint programs that are being developed for involvement at UCCSN institutions.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reviewed strengths of the plan and ways in which it could be improved. He observed that DRI plans a significant increase in its academic involvement with UCCSN Universities and Community Colleges over the next few years. It will seek more state-of-the-art

laboratory capabilities which will support a growing number of graduate students, and develop a strong global environmental change reasearch-and-education program within the System.

The meeting reconvened at 8:40 A.M. Thursday, February 4, 1993, with all participating present except Regent Joseph Foley.

2. Discussion on Strategic Directions

Vice Chancellor John Richardson reminded the group that in December 1992, Campus and System Office staff were asked to review the 9 strategic directions and objectives adopted by the Board of Regents in January 1992, and report accomplishments over the last year. The reports were compiled and summarized in the System Office and were included in the packet of workshop information.

Ms. Karen Steinberg, Director of Institutional Research, briefly reviewed the summary report. She reported that the Board of Regents, the System Office and individual Campuses were very successful in meeting the goals identified. All 9 strategic directions and most of the objectives were addressed over the past year. Ms. Steinberg reviewed the 9

strategic directions and pointed out the objectives in each area that were not addressed.

Participants were placed in one of 4 small groups with an appointed group leader and group facilitator. Each group was asked to review the current strategic directions and make recommendations for changes. The following recommendations for action were suggested:

- (1) Review the 9 strategic directions for continued relevance.
- (2) Rank strategic directions in groups of "high", "medium" and "low" to indicate some priority for action over the next year.
- (3) Review recommendations from the July Academic Retreat for inclusion in the strategic directions and objectives.
- (4) Review objectives for continued relevance, importance in achieving the goals of the strategic directions, and clarity of the objective.

The small groups reviewed strategic directions and objectives, and drafted recommendations for change.

Vice Chancellor Richardson reported that the Academic Affairs staff in the Chancellor's Office would compile the results of the small group discussions and report to the Board of Regents at a future meeting.

Dr. Derby, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, thanked the workshop participants, and gave special thanks to Vice Chancellor Richardson and Ms. Steinberg for organization of the workshop activities.

The workshop adjourned at 12:30 P.M.

Mary Lou Moser

Secretary of the Board

02-03-1993