

Governance & Policy Committee

October 2019

October 11, 2019

9:15 a.m.

Boardroom, McNamara Alumni Center

1. 2019-20 Committee Work Plan

Docket Item Summary - Page 3

Draft Work Plan - Page 4

2. Discussion of Open Policy Issues Related to Board Conduct

Docket Item Summary - Page 6

Presentation Materials - Page 11

3. Plan for Advancing Revisions to Namings Policy

Docket Item Summary - Page 27

October 10-11	
	 This discussion will build on the comprehensive review of three policies related to Board conduct: v ; and provisions directly related to Regents within The committee will review areas of consensus, and discuss open policy issues. Feedback from the committee will inform development of specific policy language for review in December 2019 and potential action in February 2020. On April 26, 2019, the Board adopted a resolution directing the President to recommend revisions to Board of Regents Policy: that establish clear principles and procedures to guide future renamings. President Gabel will outline her plan for accomplishing this work.



BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

Governance & Policy

June 14, 2019

AGENDA ITEM:

- Running for partisan elective office
 Conflict of interest related

These five areas are outlined below

1. Communicating with the Media

•

4. Running for Partisan Elective Office

This language was likely intended to shield the University and the Board from becoming entangled in partisan issues, but some Regents have questioned whether this provision is needed or advisable.

The questions before the Board are:

Should policy require resignation upon announcing candidacy for partisan elective office, or should conflict of interest provisions govern in this situation? If conflict of interest provisions govern, should resignation be required upon election to a partisan elective office?

5. Conflict of Interest Related to a Regent's Family Member Ourrent Board policy establishes that a conflict of interest arises when a family member of a Regent has a financial interest in matters before the Board. When this occurs, the Regent must consult with the General Counsel to identify a plan to mitigate the conflict. This is usually accomplished through recusal from voting on the matter in question.

Some Regents have suggested that University employment by a family member should also constitute a conflict requiring mitigation. (Elsewhere in policy, family member is defined as,

The question before the Board is:

Should Board policy extend conflict of interest provisions to include family member employment at the University?

BACKGROUND

The co09BFr5 TJETBACBA1 108.02ET EMC PP MICID 14 BD0087008AF4 T[BA[poli035 Tmn]) 5(c) 4(lup1 0 0 1 411

University of Nebraska

Requests for studies by individual Regents that are going to take considerable staff time must be approved by the Executive Committee of the Board.

University of Texas

Page 11 of 27

Page 12 of 27

Page 13 of 27

Page 14 of 27

Page 15 of 27

Page 16 of 27

Page 17 of 27

Page 18 of 27

Page 19 of 27

Page 20 of 27

Page 21 of 27

Page 22 of 27

Page 23 of 27

Page 24 of 27

Page 25 of 27

Page 26 of 27