

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 audiotape 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 Board of Regents at the November 2012 meeting.

**JOINT MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS* and its
ad hoc GBC PRESIDENT SEARCH COMMITTEE
and INSTITUTIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

High Tech Center, Room 120
Great Basin College, Elko
1500 College Parkway
Monday, April 9, 2012

Video & Telephone Conference Connection to:
System Administration, Reno
2601 Enterprise Road, Conference Room
and
System Administration, Las Vegas
5550 W. Flamingo, Suite C-1, Conference Room

Regents Present:

Regents Committee

Mr. Kevin C. Melcher, Chair
Mr. Robert Blakely
Mr. Ron Knecht
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield
Mr. Rick Trachok (*telephone*)
Mr. Michael B. Wixom

Members Present:

Advisory Committee

Ms. Lisa Campbell, Faculty Senate
Dr. Sarah Negrete, Faculty Senate
Ms. Lynne Owens, Faculty Senate
Dr. Linda Uhlenkott, Faculty Senate
Mr. Norm Whittaker, Faculty Senate
Ms. Janae Johnson, Student Representative
Dr. Mike McFarlane, Administrator
Mr. Brett Murphy, Administrator
Ms. Mary Swetich, Administrator
Ms. Sonja Sibert, Affirmative Action Officer
Ms. Kerry Aguirre, Community Member
Mr. Mike Cosgrove, Community Member
Ms. Rena Hanks, Community Member
Mr. Bob A. Heguy, Community Member
Ms. Anne McMullen, Community Member
Mr. Don Miller, Community Member
Mr. Dave Roden, Community Member
Mr. James Q. Winer, Community Member

Members Absent: Ms. Nancy Gray, Community Member
Ms. Carmen Matlock, Staff Employee Council

Others Present: Mr. Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor
Mr. Scott G. Wasserman, Chief of Staff to the Board of Regents
Ms. Christine Casey, Director of Human Resources

Chair Melcher called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. with all members present except Regents Blakely and Schofield.

1. Information Only - Public Comment – None.
2. Approved – Minutes – The Committee recommended approval of the January 13, 2012, and January 27, 2012, meeting minutes. (*Ref. GBC PSC-2a and GBC PSC-2b on file in the Board Office.*)

Regent Wixom moved approval of the January 13, 2012, and January 27, 2012, meeting minutes.
Regent Knecht seconded. Motion carried. (*Regents Blakely and Schofield were absent.*)

3. Information Only – Chair’s Report - Chair Kevin C. Melcher provided a report regarding the search process and related matters.

Chair Melcher noted for the record Ms. Carmen Matlock had a family emergency and was unable to attend this meeting, however, she has been reviewing the documents and she will be emailing her thoughts to the meeting. Ms. Gray is also out of town on business and is unable to attend.

Mr. Wasserman wanted to establish for the record the nature of the work already accomplished in regard to the search before today and where the process stands at this time. At the beginning of the process the Chairman of the Board appointed a Regents’ President Search Committee comprised of six members of the Board and chaired by Regent Melcher. Additionally, the Institutional Advisory Committee consists of five faculty members, three administrators, one classified/technical employee, one undergraduate student; one graduate student; one alumnus, one affirmative action officer and several community members.

Regent Schofield entered the meeting.

Mr. Wasserman reported the first meeting of the Committee was held approximately five months ago and the Committee discussed the Open Meeting Law (*OML*), the presidential leadership statement and made the decision to hire a search consultant. The System Office then sent and received responses for the Request for Quote (*RFQ*) and brought in several search firms to make presentations. Subsequently, the Committee chose Cizek Associates as the search firm and the Committee also revisited the president leadership statement. At the third meeting Ms. Cizek discussed the search process that would be followed. The Committee gave direction at that meeting to bring back seven semi-finalists for interview. The presidential leadership statement was also finalized at this

3. Information Only – Chair’s Report – (Continued)

meeting and advertising options were approved. Mr. Wasserman noted the discs and documentation for the semifinalists were emailed to all Committee members. He reminded the Committee they are subject to the OML and that the meeting was being recorded. Mr. Wasserman noted he had received a request for this meeting’s audio recording.

Next, he explained Ms. Cizek will lead a discussion on the interview questions an overview of the process she has used thus far and then the Committee will begin the interviews of the semi-finalists. After the interviews there will be an open session where the Chair will invite comments from each member of the Institutional Advisory Committee. The Regent’s Committee will then make the final decision on whom to invite for campus forums and interviews.

Mr. Wasserman asked that the Committee members only attend the forums in their campus capacity and not as members of the Committee. He asked the members not to advocate for one candidate over another because it would be inconsistent with their role on the Institutional Advisory Committee. On April 24th they will reconvene and the consultant will report on the campus visits. The Committee will discuss interview questions for the finalist’s interviews to be held that day. After the interviews there will be an open session to allow members to provide their input on the finalists. The Regents’ Committee will then select one to two candidates for recommendation for the full Board’s consideration.

4. Information Only - Discussion of Interview Questions - Ms. Marti Cizek of Cizek Associate, Inc. led a discussion on questions to be utilized during the interview process. The Committees reviewed and considered the proposed questions. (*Handout on file in the Board Office.*)

Ms. Cizek reported Chair Melcher and she went on a “road trip” and visited each of the major sites. They listened to the employees and community members about important issues they felt GBC was facing, as well as the challenges and opportunities. This process produced a body of key challenges and opportunities, including recognition that GBC is a rural institution with a large service area and that part of its mission is to educate rural Nevada. The sites are unique and have their own strengths and challenges GBC has a marketing opportunity tied to a clear vision of the institution. Distance education is important for the future of the college. During the tour they saw GBC wants to continue programmatic quality and range and there is need for more data driven decisions.

Taking all these factors into consideration, she worked with Chair Melcher to develop interview questions that capture ideals important to the institution and that will give Committee members enough information to reach informed decisions. The GBC Semifinal Candidate Interview Questions are set out sequentially here, followed by member comments after each interrogatory:

4. Information Only - Discussion of Interview Questions – (Continued)

1. Highlight aspects of your professional experience you think would make you a good fit as president of Great Basin College. Explain the particular factors in this presidency that have motivated you to pursue this opportunity with us. Describe the process and time frame you think would be necessary to get to know and understand this college. How will you go about it?
 - Has research been done on GBC?
 - Good linkage between candidate skills and experiences and GBC
 - Rural
 - Distance Education
 - Unique programmatic offerings – 2 year, 4 year, online, vocational/technical education, transfer, certificate, continuing education;
 - Specific programs mentioned
 - How long to get to know us?
 - Visit all sites?
 - Listen; communicate

Regent Knecht was concerned none of the questions address the budget challenges or the formula funding issues. Chair Melcher stated since the formula funding is still being developed, he did not know whether the candidates would have sufficient knowledge about the issues. He pointed out question four provides an opportunity to discuss budget processes.

2. How would you cultivate links between Great Basin College, its other campuses and sites and the communities it serves? How might you foster community support for the college? Please give examples of ways you have fostered both internal and external communication, relationships and partnerships in your previous institutions.
 - CBO's (*Community Based Organization*)
 - Business and industry relationships and partnerships
 - Serves on boards
 - K12
 - Legislature - local, regional, state
 - Institution Governing Board interaction
 - Effective communication internally with various employee groups, students, sites
 - Generation of alternative revenue streams – Fundraising, Foundation partnership, capital campaigns, business and industry programmatic partnerships, grants
 - Internal versus external balance

Dr. Uhlenkott noted she was interested in whether the candidates' view themselves as internal or external; in other words, does the person see themselves within the college campus or more community based? Dr. Uhlenkott felt an additional rubric would suffice.

4. Information Only - Discussion of Interview Questions – (Continued)

3. In considering the instructional programs and delivery infrastructure, please describe programs of a comprehensive modern community college. What role will information technology have now and in the future on instructional delivery systems? What needs to be considered in the formulation of these programs?
 - Student focused
 - Strong academic and work preparation focus
 - Indicates an interest in community needs
 - Discusses global awareness and skill preparation
 - Expresses an understanding of how to balance traditional and non-traditional instructional delivery techniques
 - Expresses multi-faceted experience in instructional delivery
 - Cites examples of success (*measures*) in on-line and hybrid learning and instructional delivery
 - Discusses how community colleges should respond to evolving employer needs and employee skill sets.
 - Expresses the importance of technology security systems to support student learning and growth

Ms. Swetich asked what the Committee was looking for when asking the last bullet. Ms. Cizek explained that as an institution relies more on electronic transfer of data, security will become a bigger issue.

4. Describe processes you have used to resolve difficult budget issues and what role you played. Were others involved? Provide an example.
 - Strategic planning link
 - Partner with CFO and other subject matter experts
 - Competing resources?
 - How was the issue communicated initially
 - Who participated in the decision-making process
 - How was the ultimate decision communicated
 - Involvement of those impacted by the decision

Ms. McMullen did not see a question that directly related to internal management style. Ms. Cizek stated they may get a sense of the candidate's leadership style when they answer question two. Dr. Negrete asked for a follow-up question on how a candidate will work with statewide groups on the budget.

Ms. Swetich asked if anyone could ask a follow-up question. Ms. Cizek replied anyone could ask questions, but they just wanted to make sure follow up questions were consistent with the spirit of the original questions asked.

5. Do you have any questions of the committee?

3. Information Only – Chair’s Report – (Continued)

Chair Melcher asked Ms. Cizek to give a synopsis of the process thus far. Ms. Cizek stated the application materials had been distributed for the candidates of GBC President for consideration. They are approximately 12 weeks into the search. The firm is pleased with the caliber of the individuals who have been attracted to the position. The firm is confident there will be a successful outcome. The application deadline for the search was March 19, 2012. The position was advertised in a variety of publications and Cizek Associates accepted applications generated from the advertising efforts, from proactive search efforts and from nominations and referrals through the application deadline.

Regent Blakely entered the meeting.

Concurrent with the advertising efforts Cizek Associates launched their search effort, which included identifying and contacting community college presidents across the nation. The firm also contacted strong step-up candidates, members of the local community, including chambers and professional associations, and prominent national associations whose memberships are populated by community college leaders. The firm has followed up on nominations and referrals throughout the search process and there have been many. They have contacted people by email, letter and by telephone call. They have solicited nominations and personal interest with everyone that has been contacted as appropriate.

610 people have been contacted during this search. There were 51 people who expressed initial interest in this opportunity. Of these, to their best understanding, the diversity representation is nine females, six African Americans, two Hispanic, three Asian Pacific Islanders, and one Native American. This supports an overall diversity composition of approximately 41%.

The 51 interested applicants were screened on paper for minimums, desired qualifications, and an indication of experience in the areas identified in the challenges and opportunities in the presidential prospectus, resulting in 11. Each person in the initial group was interviewed by telephone. All questions were derived from the presidential prospectus and all parties were asked the same questions, with additional probing questions dependent on the answers given. The interviews were approximately one hour in length and that screen resulted in the seven recommended today for consideration.

Of these seven candidates, four were recruited by the firm, two applied and one was nominated. The firm has vetted these candidates by conducting public domain background searches on each candidate, and reviewed internet and public domain sources of information that cannot be substantiated because the posting streams are anonymous. They have worked with the candidates to fully vet anything from these sources that could be potentially viewed as controversial.

Cizek Associates has the obligation to keep their evaluations at a professional level; they look closely at anything that could negatively impact a candidate’s viability. No issues were found to jeopardize the viability of these semi-final candidates. Each of these candidates has the technical skills necessary to perform the duties of GBC President.

3. Information Only – Chair’s Report – (Continued)

Each brings with them different experiences, styles and personalities gained in different environments. It will be the Committee’s charge to determine issues of chemistry for GBC. In response to a question from Regent Knecht, Ms .Cizek clarified that 11 people were interviewed by telephone. At this point Cizek Associates if of the opinion that the search is progressing well and on schedule.

The most current national statistics on salary show the average compensation for a community college president is \$171,000 per year. Within the context of this search they found salary ranges to be broad. Research has shown that people with the skills GBC is seeking, are being paid cash compensation of \$125,000 to 130,000 per year.

Cizek Associates is very pleased with the caliber of candidates, especially those in competing environments. They find the NSHE salary range is competitive. Perquisites, such as housing allowance, and moving expenses have been recruitment factors in some situations. A few people contacted earlier in the search had higher salary ranges and the firm was unable to attract them. The rural location is attractive to all candidates being interviewed today. There were concerns expressed regarding the size of the service area by some interested parties but those people are not in the current pool. GBC is not particularly well-known, but people are struck by the diversity of the educational delivery platforms and the fact the college is offering four year degrees. People are amazed the college is doing so many things for so many people.

Chancellor Klaich thanked Ms. Cizek for her level of professionalism and hard work throughout this process.

The meeting recessed at 9:10 a.m. and reconvened at 9:32 a.m.

5. Information Only – Presentation and Interview of Semi-Finalist Candidates - Ms. Marti Cizek presented the applications and background information of the semi-finalist candidates. The Committees then interviewed the following semi-finalist candidates, in order presented, for the position of GBC President. *(The audio recording of the full meeting and reference material are on file in the Board Office.)*

- Mark A Curtis
- Patricia K. Adkins
- John Patrick Rice
- Christopher Louis Dyer
- John M. Garic
- Peggy D. Kennedy
- Gregory Benson

Each candidate responded to a series of interview questions. *(Listed in Item #4)*

The meeting recessed at 3:32 p.m. and reconvened at 3:42 p.m. with all members present.

6. Information Only - Open Session Regarding Applicants for GBC President - An open session was held to discuss the semi-finalists for the position of GBC President. The members of the Institutional Advisory Committee provided the Regents' President Search Committee with their assessment of the semi-finalists for the position of GBC President.

Mr. Norm Whittaker, Faculty Senate, stated his choice was Dr. Curtis due to his strong background in technical education. He said he wanted to meet with everyone one on one when he first arrived to get to know his staff. Mr. Whittaker was impressed with his publications in the technical field. He has a technical background but also has the educational background. Mr. Whittaker felt he had done his research about the campus. Mr. Whittaker felt Dr. Kennedy would also be a fit for the campus. She would interact well with the community and also the industrial partners. Dr. Garic seemed to have a sense of humor and did his research of the campus. Mr. Whittaker felt like he would be a good listener. He has a technical background.

Mr. Dave Roden, Community Member, chose Dr. Curtis, Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Benson.

Ms. Lynne Owens, Faculty Senate, chose Dr. Kennedy because she had previously established a teaching and learning facility and GBC was in need of one. Her additional choices were Dr. Benson, who seemed to understand GBC and the region and Dr. Adkins.

Mr. Bob Heguy, Community Member, noted his top three choices were Dr. Curtis, Dr. Garic and Dr. Benson. Dr. Curtis provided an excellent presentation and he covered all the questions quickly. Mr. Benson had the vocational experience. Mr. Garic is an innovator and very vocation experienced.

Mr. James Winer, Community Member, chose Dr. Curtis, Dr. Garic and Dr. Kennedy.

Ms. Anne McMullen, Community Member, related Dr. Curtis and Dr. Garic demonstrated knowledge of GBC that was important. They had done their homework and seemed to have an understanding of the area. Dr. Kennedy offers experience and she liked her stability and background. Her legislative experience was very strong.

Dr. Sarah Negrete, Faculty Senate, said her three choices were Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Benson and Dr. Adkins.

Dr. Mike McFarlane, Administrator, felt Dr. Benson had to be interviewed because he was the only one that understood the culture of the service area. Dr. Dyer had a lot to say but had the most things to address. Dr. Adkins and Dr. Kennedy would be his third choices.

Mr. Don Miller, Community Member, chose Dr. Benson, Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Curtis. Mr. Miller felt Dr. Benson was more articulate than the rest and was able to get to the point a little more readily.

Ms. Rena Hanks, Community Member, echoed Mr. Miller, and chose Dr. Benson, Dr. Curtis and Dr. Kennedy.

6. Information Only - Open Session Regarding Applicants for GBC President – (Continued)

Ms. Lisa Campbell, Faculty Senate, stated each of the candidates had their own special attributes. She chose Dr. Benson, Dr. Curtis and Dr. Garic.

Dr. Linda Uhlenkott, Faculty Senate, chose Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Benson and Dr. Curtis. She appreciated Dr. Curtis' vitae and its organization. He was one of the few who mentioned the Pahrump campus. He talked about the nursing degree and felt that showed an awareness of what was happening at GBC. Dr. Uhlenkott liked how Dr. Kennedy talked about her plans for communication. Dr. Benson had a real understanding of the rural area and how much he would have to travel. Dr. Uhlenkott expressed a fear of leaders who say they are going to facilitate, because she wondered if that meant they were unwilling to make the hard decisions. She was struck that he knew the committee members and was able to ask specific questions of them.

Ms. Mary Swetich, Administrator, indicated Dr. Curtis, Dr. Benson and Dr. Garic as her choices.

Ms. Janae Johnson, Student Representative, chose Dr. Curtis, Dr. Benson and Dr. Kennedy.

Mr. Brett Murphy, Administrator, chose Dr. Curtis, Dr. Garic and Dr. Kennedy. He liked Dr. Curtis as a candidate because he had done his homework. He has worked with government and state agencies to get development money for programs. He knew what interactive video is. Mr. Murphy felt the balance between the technical and academic side was impressive for Dr. Garic. Dr. Kennedy mentioned business, industry and mining, so she had done her homework. She has worked with legislators and has business experience.

Ms. Sonja Sibert, Affirmative Action Officer, felt Dr. Curtis had well rounded experience from his various positions. Dr. Benson and Dr. Kennedy were her other choices for the many reasons already mentioned. Ms. Sibert wanted to add Dr. Garic would be the most personable and approachable.

7. Approved – Decision By the Regents' President Search Committee - The Regents'
President Search Committee discussed and assessed the semi-finalists for the position of GBC President and selected finalists for the position of GBC President.

Regent Trachok stated it was helpful to hear the Institutional Advisory Committee's (IAC) input and he also liked to have the opportunity to listen to the semi-finalist candidates. Cizek Associates did a wonderful job. Regent Trachok had a good feeling about Dr. Benson and Dr. Kennedy based on their experience and some of their responses to the questions. Regent Trachok stated it was a tough decision between Dr. Garic and Dr. Curtis, but he would choose Dr. Curtis if he had to, but would like to see both if they could.

Regent Knecht felt the slate of candidates was outstanding. It was difficult to separate them, but he would lean toward Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Curtis and Dr. Benson.

7. Approved – Decision By the Regents’ President Search Committee – (Continued)

Regent Wixom’s initial thoughts were Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Benson and Dr. Garic. He was very interested in seeing how the community responded to Dr. Curtis. In particular, Regent Wixom was focused on his technical and workforce experience. Because of the support he would choose Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Benson and Dr. Curtis. But he was also inclined, if logistically able, to bring back four and add Dr. Garic to the list.

Regent Blakely indicated his choices as Dr. Curtis, Dr. Garic and Dr. Benson.

Regent Schofield chose Dr. Benson, Dr. Garic and Dr. Kennedy.

Regent Melcher’s choices were Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Benson. He also would go along with Dr. Curtis in the group to be interviewed.

Regent Melcher felt there were some great candidates. He stated he would like to see the Committee stick with three finalists as it would make the process and forums much easier.

Regent Wixom moved to invite Dr. Gregory Benson, Dr. Mark Curtis and Dr. Peggy Kennedy to Elko for interviews for the finalists of GBC President. Regent Blakely seconded.

Regent Wixom stated if the Chair felt the process was better off with three rather than four candidates then would definitely agree. Regent Melcher felt they could do a better quality job with three candidates. Regent Blakely asked that Dr. Garic be informed he was in the running.

Motion carried.

Regent Trachok moved to approve Dr. John Garic as an alternate. Regent Blakely seconded. Motion carried.

8. Information Only – Process and Schedule for Finalists - The Committees discussed strategies for interviewing finalist candidates including development of an interview schedule, identifying the form and substance of interview questions for the finalists and a method to conduct and assess interviews.

Ms. Cizek noted she had worked with Ms. Mardel Wilkins in terms of identifying the components to consider as they populate the final candidate interview schedule. They wanted to make sure t they included appropriate tours, meetings with internal and external stakeholders groups, and a public forum which will allow any individual that was unable to attend any of the other organized meetings the opportunity to listen and be heard. The precise schedule is still under consideration and is a work in progress. Ms. Wilkins added there will be some challenges with room, as related to interactive video and the other sites, but they are working to address the issues.

8. Information Only – Process and Schedule for Finalists – (Continued)

Ms. Cizek opened the floor to suggestions for interview questions. Chair Melcher stated input can be sent by email to Ms. Cizek.

Mr. Roden asked that candidates be asked if they are aware of the western issues, such as land ownership, that GBC deals with. Chair Melcher added they will also have land maps for all the finalists as requested.

Mr. Murphy asked for a question about management and leadership styles; how they perceive their management style toward business and GBC.

Dr. Negrete asked for something more specific on how much faculty input are they expecting or willing to accept in their decision making.

Ms. McMullen wanted them to understand they will be IT drivers at GBC and that they need tolerance for the budget issues they will face at GBC.

Dr. Uhlenkott asked for a question specific to strategic planning, their awareness of the accreditation process and their shared governance definition and description.

Dr. McFarlane wanted to ask the candidates where they see themselves in three years and what their vision is for GBC.

Mr. Murphy wanted to explore partnerships and also technical education.

Mr. Whittaker asked that they tell the committee how they have been involved in workforce development and fundraising.

Ms. Swetich would like to know how they are going to make the relationship better between the centers and the main campus.

Dr. McFarlane felt they needed to answer what they felt their role would be at the smallest institution in the state.

Ms. Owens wanted to see a strengthening of all the programs at GBC.

Ms. Swetich asked for clarification on whether they could attend the forums. Chair Melcher stated they should not be an active participant in the forum, but are allowed to attend any of the forums as they see fit.

9. Information Only - New Business – None.

10. Public Comment – None.

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Prepared by:

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

Submitted for approval by:

R. Scott Young
Deputy Chief of Staff
to the Board of Regents