

Present: Duncan Aldrich for Amy Shannon (Library), Rafik Beekun (Business Administration), Glenn Biasi (Mines), Glenn Biasi for John Louie (Mines), Buddy Borden (Cooperative Extension), Pam Cantrell (Education), Rod Case (Education), Bob Chaires (Human & Community Sciences), Arthur Chenin (Administration & Finance), Amy Childress (Engineering), Mike Collopy (Agriculture), Joe DeLappe (Arts & Science), Winnie Dowling for Dana Edberg (Business Administration), Rita Escher (Student Services), Johanna Fricke (Medicine), Johanna Fricke for Jamie Anderson (Medicine), Greg Gardella (Information Technology), Chaitan Gupta (Arts & Science), Jerry Johnson (Arts & Science), Trudy Larson (Medicine), Susan Lentz (Human & Community Sciences), Denise McKee (Medicine), Katie Melkonian for Gretchen Bietz (Development), Steve Oberg (Research), Greg Pari (Medicine), 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: None.

1. Introductions

None.

2. Chair's Report

Chair Trudy Larson reported that Rafik Beekun agreed to serve a three-year term as the senate's representative on the Courses and Curriculum Committee, and Arthur Chenin agreed to serve a three-year term as the senate's representative on the Parking and Traffic Board. She thanked them for agreeing to serve. She also commended Beekun for his efforts in facilitating a recent Board of Regents workshop on strategic planning. The regents recognized Beekun for his help at their August meeting in Reno. Since the June senate meeting, the regents met twice. In an abbreviated report on regent actions, Larson said that the reorganization of the College of Arts and Science, and the Mackay School of Mines, was approved in June. At that meeting, the regents also approved the acquisition of the Bishop Manogue School property. At its August meeting, the regents approved an intercollegiate athletics audit report (the first in ten years), and recognized the UNR Integrated Marketing Communications Team for winning the prestigious National Student Advertising Competition in 2003. Three university faculty were recognized along with the students: Bourne Morris (Journalism), Judy Strauss (Business Administration), and Bob Felton (Journalism). Larson reported that the senate executive board received a reorganization proposal to move the Nutrition Department from the College of Human and Community Sciences to the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources. On review of the proposal, the board determined that no committee review would be necessary, and returned it to the provost's office with no opposition. The provost asked the board to revisit the proposal to determine the financial and other impacts on the affected parties. The board agreed to give it further consideration. If the board deems it appropriate, a small review committee of about three members would be convened. The executive board and the president have been discussing administrator evaluations and the process by which evaluations should be conducted. The regents handbook requires that administrators be evaluated periodically by their employees. Evaluation guidelines would not be implemented until reviewed by the senate. Larson referred senators to three handouts that were included in the meeting agenda packet. She said that the senate committee charges would be discussed with the committee chairs over the next few weeks, and that they might be revised. The final version of the charges would be submitted to the senate. The new UCCSN Council of Professional Police Standards Policy was being submitted as information only. The diversity report submitted by Michael Coray was also informational. Larson suggested that, if senators had questions or comments about the report, they should contact Coray directly.

3. Budget Report

Referring senators to the handout that he distributed at the meeting, Executive Vice President and Provost John Frederick gave a detailed report on the

university's 2003-04 budget. The total of state funding for the year was \$203,705,384, allocated as follows: \$145,593,863 for instruction; \$23,091,971 for the School of Medicine; \$2,552,299 for Intercollegiate Athletics; \$6,534,330 for state-wide programs; \$8,277,118 for the agriculture experiment station; \$8,473,086 for cooperative extension; \$2,047,166 for Business Center North; \$2,312,487 for the State Health Lab, \$4,148,064 for the estate fund; and \$675,000 for the applied research initiative. In addition to state funds, it was projected that the university would have about \$105,000,000 in external grants and contracts, and about \$100,000,000 from other non-state sources.. Based on recommendations made by the University Planning Council (UPC), the following priorities would be funded as follows: \$7,954,227 for academic priorities (core curriculum, institute for the environment, college realignment, employee and graduate assistant positions, operating budgets, graduate assistant health insurance, advising, honors program, nursing); \$4,300,000 for information technology (network maintenance, administrative computing support, equipment maintenance, desktop support personnel, desktop replacement); \$500,000 for scholarships; and \$1,240,000 for administrative services (student services, safety and security, facilities management, business services). It was proposed that operating budgets be increased by 8.8% for agriculture, 13.8% for arts and science, 8.9% for business administration, 39.6% for education, 6.6% for engineering, 4.9% for human and community sciences, 10% for journalism, 5.4% for mines, 9.2% for allied health, 9.6% for the libraries, 6.5% for student services, 7.2% for institutional support, and 3.1% operating and maintenance. Frederick said that the increase in the libraries' operating budget was substantial, because it was time to "repay" that unit for having taken a significant reduction the last biennium in order to help the university maintain several faculty positions. Salary savings were projected to total about \$9,500,000. Of that total, \$1,500,000 would have to be returned to the state's general fund., \$2,575,000 would be allocated for LOAs, \$1,800,000 for temporary lecturers, \$600,000 for LOA and lecturer fringe, \$1,125,000 to replace "critical positions," \$1,120,000 for academic functions, and \$780,000 for administrative functions. The indirect cost recovery was projected to be about \$10,000,000, and distributions from student fees were projected to total about \$4,793,766. The system was not able to convince legislators to change the state's policy requiring the university to distribute 25% of its indirect cost recoveries to the state.

4. Committee Memberships

Larson called for an approval of the senate executive board's recommendations for members and chairs to its six standing committees, and the University Merit Policy Committee.

MOTION: Beekun/Collopy. To approve the executive board's recommendations for members and chairs to the senate committees and the merit policy committee.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

5. Professional Development Leave Committee

An election was held to fill 4 three-year vacancies on the University Professional Development Leave Committee. A ballot including the names of seven faculty was presented to the senate. The faculty whose names were included on the ballot nominated themselves on the spring 2003 committee preference form, and all agreed to serve if elected. Johnson Makoba (Arts & Science), John Mills (Business Administration), Raj Siddharthan (Engineering), and Bill Wallace (Arts & Science) were elected.

6. UCCSN Code Revisions

Referring senators to the proposed revisions to the Board of Regents Handbook, Larson reviewed the UCCSN Code and Board Policy Statement revisions applicable to university faculty. The proposed revisions were the culmination of extensive discussions between the chancellor and system senate chairs over the past two years. Senators expressed three primary concerns: There were two concerns regarding the addition of a new evaluation rating termed "needs improvement." First, senators agreed that it seemed inappropriate to use "needs improvement" for university faculty. Some senators said that "satisfactory" was considered marginal, and that

faculty who received a rating of "satisfactory" probably needed some improvement. Others said that they thought that the addition of "needs improvement" would give supervisors an excuse for not doing meaningful evaluations. Morris, 2002-03 senate chair, explained that last year's Council of Senate Chairs and the chancellor agreed to the use of "needs improvement" because it would give supervisors a formal method of letting faculty, especially tenured faculty, know that they must improve or they'd receive an unsatisfactory. Paul Starrs suggested that, if there was a need for this new rating, the term "needs improvement" was not substantive. He suggested the word "marginal" be used instead. Second, senators said that the language instructing that the rating of "needs improvement" could be used only for two consecutive years was confusing. It could be interpreted to mean that a faculty member who received a rating of "needs improvement" for two consecutive years, and had not improved satisfactorily in the third year, would receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" the third year. It also could be interpreted to mean that a faculty member who received a rating of "needs improvement" one year, and had not improved satisfactorily in the second year, would receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" in that same year (the second year). With reference to the proposed revisions to the code, regarding standards for recommending tenure, senators said they thought that the language allowing institutions to set criteria within each standard was confusing. The language instructed that the "criteria must be consistent with the provisions of the [code] and must not be less stringent than the standards provided in this subsection. . ." There were no criteria set by the code, so there were none with which to be consistent, and comparing "criteria" to "standards" was misleading and inappropriate.

MOTION: To ask the senate chair to discuss the senators concerns and comments with the Council of Senate Chairs and chancellor, and that the final version of the proposed code changes be submitted to the senate for final approval prior to being submitted to the Board of Regents.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

7. UNR and Faculty Senate Bylaws

MOTION: To table action on the proposed revisions to the UNR Bylaws and Faculty Senate Bylaws.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

8. New Business

Beekun expressed concern that the senate standing committee memberships and chairs were established without input from senators and past committee members. Larson explained that the memberships were established by the executive board, based primarily on the results of committee preferences submitted by faculty in the spring. The out-going committee chairs were asked for recommendations.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.