

UCCSN Board of Regents' Meeting Minutes October 18-19, 1990

10-18-1990

Pages 74-78

BOARD OF REGENTS

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

October 18-19, 1990

The Board of Regents met on the above date at Mt. Charleston Inn,
Nevada, for Fall Retreat.

Members present: Mrs. Dorothy S. Gallagher, Chairman

Mrs. Shelley Berkley

Dr. Jill Derby

Mr. Joseph M. Foley

Dr. Lonnie Hammargren

Mr. Daniel Klaich

Mrs. Carolyn M. Sparks

Mrs. June Whitley

Members absent: Dr. James Eardley

Others present: Mark H Dawson, Chancellor

Dr. Warren Fox, Vice Chancellor

Mr. Ron Sparks, Vice Chancellor

Mr. Donald Klasic, General Counsel

President Anthony Calabro, WNCC

President Joseph N. Crowley, UNR

President John Gwaltney, TMCC

President Robert Maxson, UNLV

President Paul Meacham, CCCC

President Ron Remington, NNCC

President Jim Taranik, DRI

Ms. Mary Lou Moser, Secretary

Also present were Faculty Senate Chairmen Paula Funkhouser, TMCC;

Isabelle Emerson, UNLV; Mike Mc Farlane, NNCC; Don Carlson, WNCC;

Robert Brown, UNR; Steve Mizell, DRI; Alan Balboni, CCCC; and

Karen Steinberg, UNS; Sue Baker, UNS; and Pamela Galloway, UNS.

Chairman Dorothy Gallagher called the retreat to order at 10:40

A.M. on October 18, 1990, explaining the purpose of the retreat

was an exchange of ideas for the University of Nevada System.

Session I - Communications within UNS

Mrs. Gallagher introduced Mr. George Janik, Association of Governing Board's Board Mentor Program. Mr. Janik explained that he had served as a member of the Kent State Board of Trustees for over 13 years, and as a Professor of Business at that Institution.

In reviewing the higher education movement, Mr. Janik stated that in the 1960's enrollment was high, hiring of faculty was at an all-time high, money was readily available, and tenure was the motivating factor of faculty. The 1970's showed a drop of employment with less dollars available. In the 1980's the "baby boom" was gone, enrollments slowed, Campuses began to adjust to older students, and were faced with a growing senior faculty. Currently, higher education is faced with higher tuition costs and students are asking for quality education.

Discussion centered on:

Policy making vs. Administration.

The relationship between Regents and the CEO. The

Chancellor as a coordinator, or as the conduit from President to Chancellor to Board. Presidents need to make the Chancellor aware of all situations, but should be able to contact Regents individually.

Board relationships with other constituencies.

Education is an industry that doesn't measure itself.

There is no trouble grading students; but teaching quality is never assessed.

Board committee structure. A Board should work through its committees; should trust the actions of the committee. committees should not meet the day of the Board meeting, or, if they do, discuss information at one meeting to place on the agenda of the following Board meeting. Chancellor and his staff should be the staff to committees, provide the information and background materials, and interpret those materials to the committee and Board, and should be trusted for the input presented.

The Community College and University missions/philosophies are different, should be recognized as being

different, and UNS might consider holding separate meetings.

Opposed to students and faculty as members of a Board and having voting privileges. Board must listen to their concerns, but only listen, and refer the matter to the President and/or the Chancellor.

Planning is essential to good management of higher education. Academic and facilities planning must be long range and must be updated constantly. Long range planning is a joint responsibility of the Board and its Officers.

Board responsibilities are the making of policy, hiring the CEO and Presidents, Board organization/job descriptions for Officers including the Vice Presidents/Chancellors (second in command), and assessing the effectiveness of the Board.

New Board members must be given a thorough orientation.

The group divided into breakout sessions for Regents, Presidents and Faculty Senate Chairmen for discussions on ef-

fective communications and reported in general session the

following:

Board of Regents:

The committee structure needs to communicate more effectively to Board members. (If used effectively, the Board then is supposed to "rubber stamp" the actions of the committee.)

The Board needs to get information for decision making in a more timely manner. The staff should interpret the information in a succinct manner, and the information must be of quality.

The Board needs to agree on the committees of the Board as the appropriate body for deliberation on issues vs. bringing issues to the full Board.

The Board needs to schedule committee meetings at different times to provide for communication (trustee to trustees) and ensure time for input from all constituencies prior to the full Board meeting.

Presidents:

Standing committee meetings on different days than the Board meeting.

One day Board meeting and fewer Board meetings.

Audit Committee meeting once a year, combined with Budget Committee.

Education/orientation for Regents on 1) University issues, 2) Community College issues, 3) DRI issues; possibly hold one day workshops on each.

Consensus that there is a critical success factor in the informal line of communications between Chancellor and Presidents. Mutual satisfaction with current approach.

The Chancellor's Office will distribute the results of each agenda item appearing on the Council of the Presidents' meeting agenda immediately following that meeting.

Faculty:

Have social events on Thursday evening of Board meetings to provide a means for interaction/communication.

Seek a diversity of opinions on academic issues; use informal workshops; discussions in an academic setting vs. a parliamentary setting.

Increased Community College meetings; Regent meetings on Community College Campuses is appreciated. There is a concern that understanding cannot be obtained only through items that appear on the agendas.

Increase faculty presentations such as the presentations made by the NNCC faculty; presentations be issue oriented.

Review annually the recommendations from the Community College Faculty Relations Committee.

Insure release time for Faculty Senate Chairmen, including the Unit Senate Chairman.

The three groups, Regents, Presidents and Faculty Senate Chairmen, reviewed the goals set at the 1989 retreat and established goals for 1990-91. These are on file in the Regents' Office.

Section III

Discussions were held on the following:

Prisoner Education

Regent Foley expressed a need for UNS to be involved in educating prisoners confined in Nevada. Presidents Calabro (WNCC) and Remington (NNCC) reported on their programs being conducted within the prisons. It was agreed that this is very costly education, that new sources of revenue must be found for its support, and that a committee should be established to investigate the possibilities.

Academic Planning

Vice Chancellor Warren Fox reviewed academic planning

in the System, stating that in 1981 the publication "Nevad 2000" was established and is updated every two years for presentation to the Nevada State Legislature.

In 1983 all Campuses submitted plans. In 1986 the Board adopted a policy for the regular submission of academic plans, which were due in July, 1990. There is now underway a comprehensive academic Master Plan for UNS.

Consultants were hired and have visited the State and Institutions. The Campus plans will be reviewed by the consultants and when their comments become available, they will be sent to the Board. Some Campuses are revising their recently adopted facilities plans to conform to these new academic plans.

A questionnaire had been sent to retreat participants on UNS goals and issues for 1990-95. The results, discussed by Dr. Fox and Ms. Karen Steinberg, showed resources such as funding budgets and for administration and communication, faculty, accountability/assessment, minority education, Community College concerns, mission and goals of the Institutions, articulation, economic development, access, quality/excellence, admissions requirements and developmental education. UNS issues were tallied by groups as follows:

Regents: Resources - funding, budgets and facilities; planning; and growth.

Presidents: Resources - funding, budgets, and faculty issues; accountability/assessment.

Faculty Senate Chairmen: Resources - funding, budgets, and facilities; growth; faculty issues.

Chancellor's Office Staff: Planning; resources; funding, budgets and facilities; growth.

Presidential Leave

President Crowley was given a four-month Presidential leave in 1989, at which time he did research at Brasenose College at Oxford. He discussed his report to the Board (see attached) and the recommendations of 1) adoption of a policy; 2) include eligibility criteria and obligations upon return, 3) assignment of presidential respon-

sibilities during leave, 4) assisting with replacement of President while on leave, and 5) informing the public of the leave.

A Chancellor's Committee will draft a policy for Board consideration.

The retreat adjourned at 1:15 P.M.

Mary Lou Moser

Secretary

10-18-1990