

University of Nevada, Reno
2003-04 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes October 16, 2003

RSJ 304

Meeting 5

Present: Jamie Anderson (Medicine), Rafik Beekun (Business Administration), Glenn Biasi (Mines), Gretchen Bietz (Advancement), Buddy Borden (Cooperative Extension), Pam Cantrell (Education), Rod Case (Education), Bob Chaires (Human & Community Sciences), Amy Childress (Engineering), Mike Collopy (Agriculture), Joe DeLappe (Arts & Science), Dana Edberg (Business Administration), Johanna Fricke (Medicine), Greg Gardella (Information Technology), Leah Gorbet (Administration & Finance), Chaitan Gupta (Arts & Science), Chaitan Gupta for Jerry Johnson (Arts & Science), Trudy Larson (Medicine), Susan Lentz (Human & Community Sciences), John Louie (Mines), Denise McKee (Medicine), Bourne Morris (Journalism), Steve Oberg (Research), Amy Shannon (Library), Paul Starrs (Arts & Science), Mary Stewart (Arts & Science), Shelley Von Berg (Medicine), Jill Wallace (Provost's Division), Leah Wilds (Arts & Science), Ken Wilson (President's Division). Absent: Rita Escher (Student Services), Greg Pari (Medicine),

1. **Introductions**

Dick Bjur (Research), Travis Hoppe (ASUN), Lisa Loomis (Sagebruch), Demonthesis Papilieu (Classified Staff Employee), Michael Sanderfer (GSA), Carly Sweder (ASUN).

2. **Meeting Minutes**

MOTION: Bietz/Biasi. To approve the minutes of September 18, 2003 meeting, as published.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

3. **Chair's Report**

Chair Trudy Larson reported the following. The executive board received from the provost a proposal to create the Institute for the Environment. After a preliminary review of the proposal, the board sent the provost a request for consideration of several revisions—mostly requests for additional information. The board will be convening an ad hoc review committee. Larson invited senators to volunteer to serve on the committee, or recommend others for service. The board had not yet received the deans' comments regarding the Nutrition Department reorganization, but Larson expected the information to be submitted before semester's end. The subcommittee of the Merit Review Committee was preparing to present its report and recommendations to the larger committee soon. The Merit Review Committee would submit the report and recommendations to the senate for review and action. No changes would be implemented until the senate was consulted. At the October Board of Regents meeting, the following topics were discussed: evaluations of the chancellor and institution presidents (UNR will evaluate President John Lilley in spring 2004), part-time faculty salary schedules for each of the institutions, and a proposal to establish a fellowship for orthodontists at the UNLV Dental School. The regents approved the acquisition of the Bishop Manogue property. The chancellor will charge the regents' Workload Task Force to determine a method by which faculty would document the amount of time they devote to teaching. The senate chairs have indicated an interest in also asking the task force to discuss documentation of productivity.

4. **Visit with Regent Marcia Bandera**

UCCSN Regent Marcia Bandera, who was appointed by the governor last year to complete the term vacated by Dorothy Gallagher, introduced herself by describing her educational and work background. She also shared a bit of information about her personal life. She apologized for not having been able to take advantage of the senate's invitation to attend a meeting last year. Having had experience in the public school system, higher education, and health services, Bandera said she thought one must have a "tough hide" and good sense of humor to succeed in those environments. She said she was sorry that past boards of regents had a bad reputation. The current regents would have "lots of work to do to meet the current

challenges and opportunities” in higher education. She said she realized that the system was growing fast in both enrollment and programs. She said she thought that the UCCSN Master Plan would have to be meaningful, and that the system should make the effort to be efficient while maintaining quality. She said she thought the system wasn’t doing enough to communicate the positive side of the system’s story, and that the media focused mostly on negative stories. With reference to the issue of the regents’ role in the tenure approval process, Banders said she supported the idea that regents give final approval. However, she did not support the idea that regents should scrutinize applicants’ work history or use their final approval as a means to create “mischief.” Regarding the media’s version of events at the October regents meeting, specific to the process for moving to rescind it’s August approval of UNLV fee increases to build a new student union and recreation building, Bandera clarified that everyone was afforded the opportunity to submit comments to the board in advance of the meeting. At the meeting, the regents’ chair, Anthony Stavors, opened the floor to public comment on the motion to have a motion to rescind the August decision. No one volunteered to comment. Bandera, a member of the regents’ Workload Task Force, would be attending, by invitation, the NFA’s October 27, 2003 open forum on that subject. Bandera reported that she was also a member of the regents Health Education Task Force. The task force would be discussing the future of the academic medical center and the UNR School of Medicine. There was some interest statewide in establishing a stand-alone “health science university,” administered by a president who would report directly to the regents. The university would include the system’s programs in medicine, nursing, dentistry, radiology, dental hygiene, etc. The task force would probably be discussing the matter over a period of time. Denise McKee asked how faculty could provide comment. Bandera encouraged faculty to contact her if they wished to comment on the issues of the day. Steve Oberg asked Bandera what she meant when she talked about being efficient. Bandera said that she thought “efficiency” included, for example, minimizing paperwork, functioning under necessary but limited rules so that the work of the system wasn’t “bogged” down, and being well informed before decisions are made. Paul Starrs asked Bandera what the Workload Task Force would be doing. The task force was charged essentially to “define what faculty did” and what was the “product” of the work of faculty, departments, and units. Mary Stewart said she didn’t think that using a business model for defining workload was appropriate for higher education, and that quantity was not the only factor that should be considered. Bandera agreed, and said she wanted to receive input from faculty. Faculty should not assume that the task force had any preconceived notions about faculty workload or productivity, and faculty should come forward to educate the regents about what they do and how they do it. Referring to the regents outstanding teaching award, Paul Starrs commented that there were constraints on the kinds of information faculty could include in their submission of supporting documents, and that faculty do much more than “just teaching classes.” Some of what they do can only be communicated narratively. Bandera agreed. She said she thought the word “productivity” might have sounded too business-world, and that all the aspects of faculty responsibilities should be included in defining workload. Amy Shannon suggested that the definition should also take into consideration “effectiveness.” Bandera agreed, but she did not think that information from “opinion polls [would be] enough. Bob Chaires said he thought it was difficult to measure productivity using value statements and models that were developed by people who might not come from the same kind of institution, for example a research institution, that was being studied. He said that the task force should take into consideration that productivity would differ between disciplines. Referring to workload and formula funding, Amy Childress asked whether the regents would develop a formula for research. When Bandera suggested that it might not be quantifiable, Childress said she thought that research was more quantifiable than teaching. Bourne Morris said she thought that faculty were good “at explaining and defining what [they did] to each other, but not to those outside the university. She suggested that a group of university faculty and/or senators could draft a definition and description of workload, to be forwarded to the task force. Starrs agreed. He said the thought the press tended to focus on the negative. After Bandera left the meeting, Larson said she would convene an ad hoc committee to draft a definition and description of workload. She asked senators to volunteer or recommend colleagues for membership on the committee.

5. **UNR Bylaws: Mediation**

In response to the senators' September request for information about the cost of mediation services, Larson presented information provided by the John Paul Jones Group. Chaires and Louie said that, regardless of the costs, they didn't think mediation should be eliminated. Dana Edberg said she thought that mediation as part of the grievance process was poor timing. Senators agreed, and it was suggested that mediation remain an option to faculty, but that it should take place prior to filing a grievance. Senate secretary Patty Chambers explained that, based on the current bylaws regarding grievances, it would be difficult to offer mediation prior to filing a notice of grievance. Before most grievances can be filed, the reconsideration process must be exhausted. Faculty have only 15 working days after exhausting the reconsideration process to file a grievance. Larson and Chambers agreed that the matter should be discussed with administration.

MOTION: Wilds/Chaires. To close the discussion.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

MOTION: Wallace/Wilds. To take the topic off the table for action.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

MOTION: / . To approve the proposed revision to UNR Bylaws 34 and 35, as presented.

ACTION: Failed (17 opposed, 6 approved).

6. **Senate Apportionment**

Larson referred senators to the executive board's recommendation for apportionment of representation from the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science. The board's recommendation accommodated the reorganization of the College of Arts and Science and the Mackay School of Mines into the two new colleges. Louie and Glenn Biasi expressed concern that the board seemed to make the recommendation without consideration of how it would affect representation of the mines faculty. In the discussion that followed, executive board members explained the reasoning behind the recommendation. Some senators shared the concern of Louie and Biasi; others indicated that the recommendation seemed reasonable. Mike Collopy suggested that the recommendation be revised so that the representation from the College of Science be determined by a vote of that colleges faculty. The names of the current arts and science senators and the mines senators would be submitted on the ballot.

MOTION: Wilds/Gardella. Call for the question.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

MOTION: Shannon/Wilds. To approve the executive board's recommendation for apportioning representation to the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science, as presented.

ACTION: Failed (15 opposed, 7 approved, 1 abstained).

MOTION: Collopy/Louie. To approve the executive board's recommendation for appointing representation to the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science, as amended.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

7. **Intellectual Property Policy**

Special Assistant to the Vice President for Research Dick Bjur referred senators to the latest version of the proposed policy, that was distributed to them by email. He reported that the new version incorporated changes based on the senators October 2, 2003 comments, as well as comments he received from Jim Richardson. He offered to consider additional comments. Speaking on behalf of a faculty member who contacted her, Larson asked about ownership of books written as a result or part of research. Bjur confirmed that the policy has not changed; the faculty member retains ownership—unless s/he has made other

arrangements. He said that the policy has not changed with regard to copyright. Collopy said that a colleague had indicated to him that, in his (the colleague) experience, 60% to the faculty member was extremely generous. Collopy also commented on materials for which granting agencies own the data but give publishing rights to the faculty members. Bjur said it was a “touchy situation” because sometimes the granting agencies won’t approve publication. He said he’d try to clarify in the policy that there are exceptions to the rules. Glenn Biasi said he didn’t think the policy adequately addressed the use of computer software for desktop publishing. Bjur agreed and said it might be better to use the word “publish” instead of “word processing.” Senators said that they thought they needed sufficient time to consult with their constituents about the intellectual property policy, as well as the conflict of interest policy. They asked Bjur if they could receive electronic versions of the IP policy two weeks in advance of the November 6, 2003 special senate meeting. The reply was yes. Director of Sponsored Projects Cindy Kiel told Chambers she was not sure she could submit the final version of the CoI policy one week prior to the November 6, 2003 meeting. It was agreed that, if Kiel could not submit the policy ten working days prior to the meeting that the matter would be postponed until December 10, 2003.

8. **New Business**

ASUN Arts and Science representative Travis Hoppe referred senators to the handout that was distributed just prior to the meeting, and he distributed a second handout, “Student Evaluations Act.” Hoppe said that he wanted to develop a web page that would include all summary reports on student evaluations of courses. Because evaluation reports were kept in faculty personnel files, and the UCCSN Code and UNR Bylaws do not specifically identify evaluation reports as information that can be made public, he was asking the senate for its support in changing the code and bylaws. He said he thought that making the information public would be of benefit to the students and the faculty. He suggested that, if student evaluation summaries were made public, students would take them more seriously and faculty accomplishments would be publicized. He said he didn’t agree with the notion that faculty would cave to the pressure and begin assigning higher grades just so students would evaluate them more positively. Nor did he think that most students would enroll in classes where unearned higher grades were given. Hoppe said that he consulted with a few faculty about his proposal. Some thought that student evaluations should be left confidential. One faculty member responded by asking Hoppe how he’d feel if someone wanted to make his records public; he sent the faculty member his transcripts. Hoppe reported that provost John Frederick said he’d support the changes if the senate supported them. Senators commended Hoppe for his goals. They did not agree with the method, expressing concern about the possibility of students using evaluations to create mischief, the lack of mechanisms for controlling such mischief, and the resources required to create and maintain the web page. Larson reported that she consulted with the Council of Chairs about the proposal, and it received no support. They were concerned that students would remain anonymous, but the faculty members would be identified. They also didn’t have confidence that all student evaluations were meaningful. It was suggested that Hoppe consider other methods for educating students about courses and professors. Hoppe said he would appreciate receiving comments from faculty, and that he was willing to schedule an open forum for faculty and students to discuss the matter.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.