GREAT BASIN COLLEGE
PRESIDENT’S COUNCIL
September 11, 2012
9:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Mark Curtis, Mike McFarlane, Lynn Mahlberg, Sonja Sibert, John Rice, Kris Miller, Bret Murphy, David Freistroffer, Alex Porter, Cathy Fulkerson, Gaye Teras

ABSENT: Jolina Adams

1. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the President’s Council meeting on August 28, 2012, were approved.

2. SGA Update – Alex Porter reported the Welcome Back Week went really well. The student luncheon was extended to 2 pm. The movie night had over 70 people at the beginning. Over 60 stayed for the movie. The scavenger hunt had a lot of students participating and SGA gave away cash prizes. Friday Follies had 12 people for beach volleyball. This next week is elections week. Monday is the club and info fair. Tuesday IAV bingo to every site from 7 to 9:45 pm. Wednesday will be another movie night. Thursday will be cosmic bowling at Telescope Lane. The SGA game room is getting more use. More participation in student activities. Probably see more students hanging around when food service starts up.

3. Faculty Senate Update – David Freistroffer changed his schedule to make all the President Council meetings. He reported the Faculty Senate chairs have been discussing the e-learning initiative. A consultant has been hired to figure out what NSHE can do to improve. The chairs are skeptical because they are not seeing an emphasis on quality and best practices but in efficiency. They are also concerned that the Chancellor and some Regents have unrealistic expectations about e-learning i.e. teaching more students for same amount of money. The consultants seemed surprised at the amount of e-learning that the NSHE community colleges are doing. Mike reported he was told this is not an attempt to create a Nevada virtual university. Lynn says it is purely fact finding according to what she heard from her student services counterparts.

David reported that the Faculty Senate committees are formed. The Personnel committee is larger and Laurie Walsh is the chair.

4. Classified Council Update – Gaye Terras reported that there is a change to the classified bylaws that will clarify that the vice chair moves up into the co-chair when that seat becomes vacant. All other vacant seats will require re-election. The bylaw change will be presented at the next PC meeting for their approval.

5. Institutional Planning & Effectiveness – Cathy Fulkerson provided the 2012 National Community College Benchmark report. PC reviewed the various data contained in the
report. The public meeting rates should be used. It shows we are using our buildings at the 92nd percentile. Talked about the professional development funds per FTE.

Cathy mentioned a draft policy determining the hard dates for end of semester reporting. That date has huge impacts. We are hoping for June 15.

6. **President’s Report** – Mark Curtis reported he has been asked by the Chancellor to report on any collaboration between us and other institutions. He needs 2 or 3 bullet points by Thursday at noon. Even if it is discussion policies and issues and working together to solve within NSHE. We are doing more than what he probably thinks we are doing.

Mark announced there is a college wide meeting this Friday at 10:00 a.m. to discuss the formula funding. We know everything that we are going to know for the short-term.

Anything can happen during the legislative session. Mark will highlight the two recommendations – the Regents’ recommendation and the Legislative Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education recommendation and the differences of each proposal (see attachment). The end result is the same for each proposal - $4.5 million cut. The BOR proposal is a phased in mitigation that means a $759,000 cut on July 1, 2013 and more cuts in the following years. The Legislative Committee’s recommendation is to hold harmless for two years with a sunset of the total $4.5 million on July 1, 2015. We basically have 3 years to make a case to the legislature. We won’t gain anything by getting angry. We need to make a case that we need more money. Mark does not want to look at any layoffs or curricular review this year or next academic year. If one of the recommendations is implemented we might have to get into some of those discussions in a year and a half. We need to look at completions. The legislature will review recommendations and what the legislature comes up with and plan from there. Mark is optimistic that the good work that GBC has been doing for quite some time will be recognized and mean something. Mike said NSC gave a presentation on instructional strategy. We need to give a 20 minute presentation on our instructional strategy to show the success and efficiencies that we have, especially with our scheduling and how we use the internet and IAV. Mark’s role will be to inform and will ask staff to start looking within their own units for ideas and feedback on efficiencies and ideas to save money. It is tiring but we still have to look at it.

7. **Miscellaneous**

Mark Curtis reported the visit with the Governor on August 31st went well. The Governor was adamant that it is not a cut but redistribution. The same amount of money is going to NSHE. The Governor invited Mark to come talk to him privately in Carson City. The Governor was impressed with what we are doing.

Mike McFarlane presented the process by which the Budget and Facilities committee uses to dispense the equipment money. This is the practice they use. Please review so we can discuss at the next PC meeting.
Budget and Facilities. This committee communicates the current budget status and process to the Faculty; designs, implements, and participates in a process ensuring full Faculty participation in budget preparation and disbursement; provides recommendations for the priority of capital expenditures; provides budgetary input into the College Master Plan; and distributes the funds accumulated through the Technology Fee. In addition, this committee receives input from staff, faculty, students and interested persons concerning the plans for or problems with proposed and/or existing campus buildings, parking, and landscaping. The Vice President for Administrative Services shall be an ex-officio member of this committee.

Budget and Facilities Committee Equipment Submission Policies and Procedures

1) All equipment request forms need to be filled out by the department chair or a designee. In the case of a division, each department in the division needs to submit their own equipment request form.
2) All computer requests need to be coordinated through computer services.
3) All IAV/AV requests need to be coordinated through the Office of Classroom Technology.
4) All equipment request forms need to be approved by the department’s vice president or dean before submission to the Budget Committee. (This request was made by the President’s Council.)
5) The equipment requested should be listed in order of highest priority first on the equipment request form.
6) Each piece of equipment requested needs to be accompanied by a statement on how the equipment will support the department’s strategic plan and the continuous improvement of the program.
7) Each piece of equipment requested needs to be accompanied by a statement on how the equipment will benefit the students, not the instructors.
8) The submission deadline for equipment request forms is October 1st.
9) No applications will be accepted after the deadline.

Budget and Facilities Committee Equipment Allocation Policies and Procedures

1) The requests will be reviewed and the committee will do a preliminary allocation list.
2) If a question arises or clarification is needed, the committee chair will contact the department chair and request the chair to come to the second meeting to answer any questions.
3) The second meeting date will be made public in Faculty Senate or by email. Any department chair or designee is welcome to come to this meeting to present the reasons for their requests in person.
4) The final allocations will be prioritized and prepared to be presented at the President’s Council.
5) If an equipment request is held up in President’s Council, the remaining equipment allocations will move forward for approval in Faculty Senate.
6) If an equipment request is denied by the President’s Council, the department will have the opportunity to submit a new request for equipment of similar value.
7) Departments are required to purchase the equipment which has been requested and awarded. Any savings realized over the estimated and awarded amount will remain in the equipment account and will not be used to purchase additional items by the department. It will be reallocated by the committee per the priority list.
8) Deadline for ordering equipment will be March 31st.

Budget and Facilities Committee Building Review Policies and Procedures
1) The committee will review proposed new construction and remodeling to verify that all exterior and interior designs are compatible with the present buildings.
2) The committee will discuss requests or problems on a case by case basis as the need arises.
3) The committee reserves the right to forward any issues to the President’s Council if they feel it necessary.
## Current Funding Proposals and Their Effect on GBC Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years From Now</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year Starting</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue
- **Tuition & fees + State Appropriation**: $17,000,000

### Board of Regents
- **Phased Implementation**: ($759,523)  
- **Total Revenue**: $16,240,477

### Committee to Study Higher Ed. Funding in Nevada
- **Hold Harmless for 2 Years with a Sunset**: ($4,566,160)  
- **Total Revenue**: $12,433,840

- Full Formula Implementation Going Forward
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 4, 2012

TO: NSHE Board of Regents

COPY: NSHE Presidents

FROM: Daniel J. Klaich, Chancellor

RE: Formula Funding Committee

After your meeting Friday, August 24, 2012, the Regents representing the Board on the Committee to Study the Funding of Higher Education (Chapter 375, Statutes of Nevada 2011) forwarded to the Committee a report of the Board’s actions. Yesterday the Committee met for almost nine hours to deliberate and make final recommendations on revisions to the formula by which higher education is funded. You will receive a more complete report of that meeting and its recommendations at your regularly scheduled meeting next week. However, below is a quick snapshot of the actions of the Board last Friday compared with the actions of the Committee. I have used the letter to the Committee from Regents Geddes, Page and Wixom as the format of this report, excerpting from the letter the Board’s actions and then noting the Committee’s actions after it in bold caps.

Principles supporting the Board’s action with respect to the funding formula proposal:
1. Equity in funding.
2. Easily understood, simple and transparent, thereby restoring credibility.
3. Allow the respective institutions the flexibility to become more innovative, entrepreneurial and efficient.
4. Clear accountability metrics for performance and reporting upon which we all can rely that supports the state’s goal of graduating more students.
5. Align the fundamental interests of the State with the mission and goals of the System.
6. Fundamental philosophical and operational shift from a model based upon inputs (enrollment) to one based on outputs (completion and graduation).

WHILE I BELIEVE THESE TO BE CONSISTENT WITH WHAT THE COMMITTEE HAS SAID, I DO NOT THINK IT APPROPRIATE TO CHARACTERIZE THE ACTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE BEFORE IT FINALIZES ITS REPORT TO THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION.
Actions by Board and corresponding Committee action noted in ALL CAPS:

1. Allocation of general funds only, with retention of fees and tuition at the respective campuses and no offset of State funding. COMMITTEE APPROVED.

2. State funding for course completions of resident students only. COMMITTEE APPROVED; SEE DISCUSSION BELOW REGARDING DEFINITION OF COMPLETION

3. Funding based upon a weighted student credit hour concept as measured by the discipline matrix developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. COMMITTEE APPROVED, BUT 10% RESEARCH FACTOR ELIMINATED AND ADDITION 10% WEIGHT ADDED ACROSS ALL DISCIPLINES AT THE UPPER DIVISION, MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL LEVEL FOR THE UNIVERSITIES ONLY NOT ADD ON TO TOTAL WSCH (COST AND IMPACT NEUTRAL)

4. Student credit hour projection based upon flat projections rather than multi-year weighted averages. COMMITTEE APPROVED

5. Partial support for small community college administration at WNC and GBC. COMMITTEE-APPROVED

6. Operation and maintenance to be considered within weighted student credit hour concept COMMITTEE APPROVED with the exception of direct O&M support for research facilities at UNLV and UNR. COMMITTEE DID NOT ACT

7. Support for the research mission of UNLV and UNR by means of weighting of upper division and graduate courses. COMMITTEE APPROVED BUT 10% RESEARCH FACTOR IMBEDDED IN DISCIPLINES WEIGHTING NOT ADD ON TO TOTAL WSCH (COST AND IMPACT NEUTRAL) SEE #3 ABOVE

8. No additional weighting for remedial credit hours. COMMITTEE APPROVED

9. The professional schools will remain as separate line-item budgets within the System. COMMITTEE APPROVED

10. A formula based administrative budget for the Desert Research Institute as presented to both the committee and the Board. COMMITTEE APPROVED

11. Funding for the performance pool from a carve out of appropriated general funds at a level of 20% which will be implemented in 4 years with 5% annual increments beginning in FY 2015. COMMITTEE APPROVED

12. Structure of performance pool (measured outcomes) as presented to the committee. COMMITTEE DID NOT ACT BUT REQUESTED BOARD TO APPOINT A WORK GROUP TO FINALIZE METRICS AND WEIGHTS. CONSIDER SEPARATE POOLS FOR EACH INSTITUTION.

The Board did not specifically readdress the issue of what constitutes a successful completion at its August 24 meeting. However, the Board has been advised both of the committee’s concerns in this regard and the subcommittee’s tentative resolution of that issue, namely the prospective exclusion of failures as a result of non-attendance from the weighted student credit hour count and therefore from State funding. COMMITTEE ACCEPTED RECOMMENDATION OF SUBCOMMITT STATED ABOVE

The Board recommended funding for the Knowledge Fund of $10,000,000.00 (Not appropriated to NSHE) COMMITTEE DID NOT ACT
Finally, the Board considered a proposal to phase in and mitigate the impact of the new funding model, and it accepted the recommendation to accomplish such mitigation through a combination of one-time State general funds, partial deferral of the reallocation, and implementation of additional budget cuts. **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED FULL MITIGATION WITH NEW STATE FUNDING (HOLD HARMLESS) FOR TWO YEARS ONLY**

In closing this report, I note that the committee had wide ranging discussions on many aspects of higher education policy that arguably were beyond the scope of the committee charge. As a result of those discussions, the committee will recommend a number of policy concerns to the Board that they felt were more appropriately within the governing domain of the Board but as to which there was some consensus. We will report on those recommendations separately.