

AGENDA
University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate
April 20, 2006, 1:30 p.m.
RSJ 304

- | | | | |
|-----------|-----|--|------------------|
| 1:30-1:35 | 1. | Roll Call and Introductions | |
| 1:35-2:20 | 2. | Update: The Davidson Academy: <i>Jan and Bob Davidson</i> and <i>John Frederick</i> , Executive Vice President and Provost | Information |
| | | Link to the Website:
http://www.davidsonacademy.unr.edu/ | |
| 2:20-2:50 | 3. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Kent Ervin</i> , Salary & Benefits Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 2:50-3:00 | | Break | |
| 3:00-3:05 | 4. | Request to Approve the March 13, 2006 Meeting Minutes | Action/Enclosure |
| 3:05-3:15 | 5. | Chair's Report | Information |
| 3:15-3:45 | 6. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Kelly Corrigan</i> , Administrative Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 3:45-4:15 | 7. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Howard Goldbaum</i> , Technology Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 4:15-4:45 | 8. | Year-End Committee Report: <i>Steve Hayes</i> , Academic Standards Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 4:45-5:00 | 9. | New Business | Discussion |
| 5:00 | 10. | Adjourn | |

Future Senate Meetings

[UNR Faculty Senate Website](#)

May 10, 2006 at 1:30pm
RSJ 304

Future Board of Regents Meetings

[NSHE Website](#)

June 8 & 9, 2006, TMCC, Reno

August 17 & 18, 2006, Great Basin
College, Elko

UNR Faculty Senate Meeting
April 20, 2006
[Agenda Item #3](#)

**Salary & Benefits Committee
2005-2006 Annual Report
March 31, 2006**

Members

Kent M. Ervin, Chair
Dawn Arnold
Joe Calabrese
Chuck Coronella
Michaun Hayes
Susan Lentz
Angela O'Callaghan

Representatives of the Administrative Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures Committee (for Charge 1 issues)

John Burton
Julie Redding

Charge 1: Review the current UNR guidelines and process for conducting and reviewing salary equity studies. Consider the factors that should be addressed in developing the models for academic and administrative salary equity studies, and make recommendations. Make recommendations on enhancing communication of salary study results to the faculty at large.

- 1) The Salary & Benefits Committee reviewed the previous and planned salary equity assessment techniques. A primary area of concern is that age has been included as an assessment factor for Administrative Faculty (only, not for Academic Faculty) as a substitute for years of experience, which is not currently available in the Human Resources employee database records for Administrative Faculty. We strongly recommend that steps be taken to collect, verify, and use years of relevant experience and relevant educational degrees instead of age in the future. This process would require allocation of sufficient administrative resources and time to complete. The relevancy of experience and educational degrees should be established according to approved position descriptions.
- 2) We recommend that salary equity surveys and adjustments be performed on a regular biennial schedule. The assessments should be done on a schedule to support legislative requests for salary equity funding, then again to adjust salaries when funded. In general, salary equity assessments should become a routine part of the regular salary adjustment process, rather than on an occasional ad hoc basis.
- 3) In the most recent ad hoc salary equity study and adjustment in 2004, only faculty who received adjustments were so informed by letter. We recommend that salary equity adjustments be included in the regular annual salary information letter to each faculty member, along with cost-of-living and merit adjustments. In years where salary adjustments are funded, each faculty member should be informed of his/her equity adjustment amount (zero or non-zero).
- 4) The Salary & Benefits Committee reviewed the information provided to faculty about the recent ad hoc salary adjustment. While the workshops offered in the last round were appropriate and informative, in the future these should be given earlier, before adjustments are ready to be announced, perhaps along with regular workshops about annual evaluations and merit awards. Collective data on the percentages of faculty in various categories

receiving adjustments and the distribution of adjustments amounts should be provided in workshops and on the Human Resources website.

5) Individual faculty have a right to request and to receive information on how their individual salary equity adjustment was determined, including their individual input data and where they stand relative to other faculty in their category. We recommend that the administration clarify procedures for individual appeals of salary adjustment amounts.

6) We recommend that UNR and NSHE make funding for biennial salary equity adjustments a legislative funding priority along with annual cost-of-living adjustments and merit awards.

Charge 2: Explore the idea of a central human resources office where new employees go when they first come to campus to complete all of their new hire paperwork. The paperwork is entered immediately into the system by a centralized expert who can also provide benefit enrollment and other employee information

Charge 3: Explore the feasibility of changing the contract start dates for new hire B contract faculty (first year only) to ensure their benefits eligibility coincides with their first day of employment (start dates after the first of the month result in a delay of benefits activation until the first of the following month). A change to the start date may impact all institutions and appropriate consideration should be given to the need for all institutions to review any recommendations made.

Charges 2 and 3 both relate to deficiencies in the process for bringing new hires on board. Specifically, there has been a recognized lack in follow up and coordination between the time when an offer is made and when a new faculty member arrives on campus. The Faculty Human Resources Office is addressing these deficiencies by creating a new “On-Boarding” program, which will provide uniform instructions and information to candidates with the offer letter, then follow-up after an acceptance and through arrival. These activities will be coordinated by Human Resources with the departments and units. Human Resources is also increasing the frequency of faculty orientation programs. The committee lauds these efforts, and recommends that the On-Boarding program be allowed to be fully developed before further considering the idea in charge 2 of a centralized office for new-hire processing. Even with such an office, coordination with the hiring units and departments would be necessary. The proposal in Charge 3 was meant to address the problem of new hires not having the opportunity to select their medical plan options before the 30-day time limit from the start date. UNLV partly handles this by using an August 1 start date but paying 2/12 of the annual salary for August for new B-contract faculty. However, that would still not address the more fundamental problem of communicating with new hires about their benefits in a timely fashion. Also, it would eliminate the option of new faculty being covered by benefits in July. We recommend that the new On-Boarding program be allowed to address this communication and benefits enrollment timing problem, rather than changing the start date.

Charge 4: Review the options for faculty retirement investment plans (RPA, 403b, 457). Collect information on how the various vendors (TIAA-CREF, AIG VALIC, Fidelity, ING, Hartford) are selected and how their performance is monitored. Make recommendations for further study of the performance and costs of the current vendors and/or of possible improvements in the offerings. Review need for education of faculty on retirement investment products and strategies.

The 403b plans are overseen by the NSHE Retirement Plan Advisory Committee and the 457 plans are overseen by the State of Nevada Deferred Benefits Committee. The investment company vendors (TIAA-CREF, Fidelity, and AIG-VALIC for 403b and ING and Hartford for 457) are reviewed by these respective committees on an annual or semi-annual basis and those committees irregularly issue new Requests for Proposals. However, the investment climate and offerings of various mutual fund companies have changed substantially since the current sets of vendors were established. The Committee is particularly concerned that the current vendor options no longer include a company with highly competitive low-expense mutual funds. Studies show that the expense ratio of funds is a primary predictor of relative future performance. No aggregate information could be obtained on the actual average performance of the investments chosen by faculty in the various plans. Concerns have been expressed that for some vendors, individual performance data is also difficult for faculty to obtain from their

quarterly reports or the websites. “Roth” versions of the 403b and 457 plans were enacted by Congress recently, but are not currently offered to faculty. We recommend that Faculty Senate request to the two state-wide advisory committees that they (1) broaden the options to include a vendor specializing in high-quality low-expense-ratio mutual funds, (2) require that vendors provide uniform investment performance data both for individuals and in aggregate reports, and (3) establish Roth plan options.

Regarding education of faculty on retirement investments, it is generally felt that many faculty members are poorly informed about their retirement investments. Information is mostly provided now by representatives of the various vendors, who are also interested in promoting their own plans. The Benefits Office employees are not in a position to provide investment advice to faculty because that would entail fiduciary responsibilities. However, the university or Faculty Senate could invite independent outside speakers who are experts in retirement investment strategies to help educate faculty members.

Recommended Charges for 2006-2007

1. Monitor the implementation of regular salary equity studies, in particular the elimination of age as a factor for Administrative Faculty salary equity surveys.
2. Monitor the selection of investment vendors by the NSHE Retirement Plan Advisory Committee and the State of Nevada Deferred Benefits Committee. Review the feasibility of a study on actual performance of these plans.
3. Review the possibility of establishing an educational program on retirement investment strategies for faculty.
4. NSHE plans to issue a new Request for Proposals in the next year for voluntary ancillary insurance and benefit program vendors (e.g., additional life insurance, long-term-care insurance). The committee has concerns whether faculty who buy ancillary insurance with a current vendor will be able to continue that plan or transfer without penalties to a new vendor. The committee should review and make recommendations regarding the Request for Proposal.

The Committee would like to thank Gena Jones, Tim McFarling, and Linda Nichols for their cooperation and assistance and for providing information for our reviews.

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
March 13, 2006**

1. Roll Call and Introductions

Denise Baclawski (Provost's), Arthur Chenin (Administration and Finance), Amy Childress (Engineering), Maureen Cronin (Student Services), Mariah Evans for Esmail Zanjani (CABNR), Michelle Gardner (President's Division), Greg Gardella (IT), Howard Goldbaum (Journalism), Guy Hoelzer (Science), Ron Phaneuf (Science), Ron Phaneuf for Frank Baglin (Science), Mark Pingle for Rafik Beekun (Business), Mark Pinsky (Science), Steve Rock (Education), Steve Rock for Pam Cantrell (Education), Nelson Rojas (CLA), Nelson Rojas for Joe DeLappe (CLA), Barbara Scott (Medicine), Barbara Scott for Johanna Fricke (Medicine), Stefanie Scoppettone (Development), JoAnne Skelly (COOP), Mary Stewart (CLA), Mary Stewart for Mark Waldo (CLA), Rich Stone for Steve Oberg (Research), Judith Sugar (HCS), Patricia Swager (Medicine), Debra Vigil (Medicine), Jeanne Wendel for Cynthia Birk (Business), Leah Wilds (CLA).

Absent: Bob Chaires (HCS), Terry Henner (SOM), Denise McKee (Medicine)

Guests: John Frederick (Provosts), Gena Jones (HR), Bill Kuechler (COBA), Tim McFarling (HR), Bruce Shively (PBA).

2. Request to Approve the February 16, 2006 Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Chenin Baclawski To approve the February 16, 2006 minutes as written.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

3. Chair's Report

Chair Leah Wilds reported that many faculty attended the chair's luncheon, and one of the discussions was regarding the student absence policy that was designed to permit students to get professors' cooperation for university activity related absences. The academic standards committee recommended the policy in 2005; however, the university's general counsel said that the policy was not permitted by the code. The executive board had met with System Counsel Dan Kliach regarding the interpretation of the code by the university's general counsel, Mary Dugan. Dugan's interpretation of the code was very rigid on this and other issues. Cindy Pollard and Bourne Morris met with the executive board and conducted a presentation of a new logo and idea for commencement that would bring national coverage to the university. They had the idea of graduating student wearing Stetsons, instead of mortar boards. Pollard and Morris would be invited to present at the April 20, 2006 senate meeting. The executive board spoke with Mark Brenner, Vice President of Research about research faculty and bridge funding. There was no money available at this time for bridge funding, but Brenner was in the process of creating a policy to allow for a more reliable source of bridge funding. He would work with the Senate as the policy evolves. The Board of Regents would be meeting March 16 & 17, 2006 at the university campus. Each campus had been asked to showcase a faculty & student and Fred Harris, from the Goodman Brain Computation Lab, would be presenting at the Regent's meeting

on Thursday morning. The university would also host a reception (invitation only) for the regents, presidents, senate chairs, and student leaders Thursday night in the Savitt Medical Library. The showcased projects for the reception were scheduled to include CABNR with wine tasting and information and a tour of STAN a human simulator. Wilds highlighted some Board of Regent's agenda items she thought that senators might be interested in hearing: Thursday - Student and Academic Affairs Committee – Millennium Scholarship, Mayor Jim Gibson, University Criteria – Student Success Model, Peer Review Process, Lieutenant Governor Lorraine Hunt. Friday - Health Sciences Center, market based salary schedules, ERP project update, and proposal to ban events on campus that promote or advocate violence. Note that on the consent agenda, approval of tenure for the following senators Pam Cantrell, Howard Goldbaum and JoAnne Skelly.

4. Peer Review

Wilds reported that the peer review process used during the last year did not allow for a final determination, but the peer review process that the bylaws and code committee recommended would allow for a final decision. Wilds would present the new policy to the Regents' at their March meeting. The existing peer review process required that both evaluations (the supervisor's and the peer review committees') remain in the faculty member's personnel file.

5. Update on Presidential Search

Guy Hoelzer reported that Alberto Pimentel and Regent Stavros Anthony held an open forum on March 3, 2006. Pimentel met with the executive board and senators who requested to attend the lunch meeting. Senators who attended had praise for Pimentel's expertise and listening skills. Hoelzer said his opinion was that the search committee would receive a list of 6 to 10 names on Friday, March 31, 2006, the committee would meet and review the files of the candidates and meet with them on the following Monday, at the Airport Plaza. The committee would then narrow the list down to 3 or 4 finalists that would come to campus. The search committee would need to move quickly as the candidates are taking a risk of losing their jobs by interviewing for a position at another institution.

6. New Business

Wilds reported that the faculty morale taskforce was moving forward with 360 degree evaluations of the deans. The taskforce asked the dean's offices to forward evaluation forms. Some colleges conduct dean's evaluations every 3 to 5 years, and some colleges had not procedures in place to evaluate deans. The taskforce was interested in comprehensive evaluations of deans. JoAnne Skelly asked about the new sick leave policy. Gonzalez stated that the policy was more beneficial to faculty, as now they could accumulate more leave during the year, and only at the end would it be adjusted to a maximum of 96 days. The old policy never allowed sick leave to go over 96 hours.

7. Update ERP Taskforce

Bill Kuechler and Howard Goldbaum reported that the committee had met both of their objectives within two meetings. The committee was formed to delay and request that regents reconsider the ERP process. The regents' task force decided to halt the process and go back to individual campuses for input. The regents' taskforce stopped negotiations with the vendors and agreed to look at a decentralized model. The university's task force was going to serve as an advisory and oversight group. This group would encourage the other campuses to create their own committees and to each have their task force chair

communicate with the other institutions. Vice Chancellor Lee Alley offered to step back, but his offer was not accepted at this time. At the last regents' taskforce meeting Presidents Carpenter, Harder, and Crowley spoke out against the way the ERP process was being handled and that the campuses had little or no say in the process. Three things came out of that meeting: to establish a high level committee that was not comprised of technical people, to suspend negotiations with the 2 vendors, and to authorize a rewrite of the RFP. NSHE was planning on asking the legislature for 17 million dollars towards the ERP system. Arthur Chenin asked who would bring forward concerns regarding institutional research and the data that would be needed for them. Kuechler said that the issue was not unique to institutional analysis and research. Goldbaum said that he felt that those concerns would be met by the university's task force. John Frederick, Executive Vice President and Provost said that the issue was implementation, and that over the next 5 years the institutions would be subject to a period of pain, and that the task force would prepare the university to go through this process as painlessly as possible. The process while painful in the short term, would have long term benefits. The regents' technology taskforce agreed to set up a meeting this spring with Bruce Shively, student services, human resources, UNR's ERP task force. The process would be similar to the accreditation process.

8. Bylaws Revisions

The bylaws revisions passed. Eighty-six voted to approve or disapprove entire bylaws. 6 faculty voted by chapter and 14 faculty members voted to approve or disapprove the individual bylaws. Wilds said that arguments could be made that the low voter turn out was a sign of apathy, or that it was because faculty trust in the process and the committee and the senate. The executive board had been working with Klaich and Bart Patterson to have all institutions general counsel to be on the same page in regards to interpretation of the code. The bylaws were meant to flesh out the code, and only when there was a conflict would the code trump the bylaws. Jeanne Wendel would like something in writing that says administrators have to follow bylaws. Hoelzer said that he believed that President Joe Crowley felt that bylaws should be followed. Bylaws are required by the code, so how could administration demean them, there was discussion at highest level and resolution was expected in the very near future.

Greg Gardella said the issue related to administrators following bylaws was separate and apart from our efforts to make sure that same interpretation occurred at all NSHE institutions and felt that a resolution would work in support of those efforts. There was discussion regarding whether or not this was an appropriate time to pass a resolution or if the senate should wait until Klaich had a chance to work on the issue. Wilds said that if the resolution was passed, that she would let Klaich know that it was in support of his efforts.

MOTION: Gardella/ Goldbaum. To approve the resolution as amended to read: Be it resolved that the university administration at all organizational levels are expected at all times to follow the university, college, department bylaws, and the administration manual.

ACTION: Passed, 5 opposed

Meeting adjourned 4:05 pm

Faculty Senate
Administrative Faculty Personnel, Policies & Procedures Committee (AFPPP)

2005-06 Final Report

Submitted by: Kelly Corrigan on 3/29/06

Committee Membership:

John Burton
Kelly Corrigan
Frank Flavin
Marilyn Ming
Stefanie Scoppettone
Mary Sedgwick
Julie Redding

A. Committee Annual and Standing Charges:

1. Charge #1: Identify Administrative departments with active Personnel Committees along with a description of their activities. Make appropriate recommendations to the Senate regarding the need and application of personnel committees for administrative departments.
2. Charge #2: Continuing charge from 2004-05. Appoint two representatives from this committee to assist the Salary and Benefits Committee with the following charge. "Review the current UNR guidelines and process for conducting and reviewing salary equity studies. Consider the factors that should be addressed in developing the models for academic and administrative salary equity studies, and make recommendations. Make recommendations on enhancing communication of salary study results to the faculty at large." Let the Chair of the Salary and Benefits Committee know the names of the two representatives. No need to report; the Salary and Benefits Committee will present the report and recommendations to the senate.
3. Standing Charge: Conduct brown-bag meetings of the administrative faculty, at least one per semester, to provide them an opportunity to discuss the issues of the day or to provide them with information about benefits, policies and procedures, etc. Participants from past brown bags requested that the sessions be held some where other than the Down Under Café. It is recommended that the future AFPPP consider and honor this request.

B. Committee Activity:

1. Charge #1
 - Actions taken: As reported mid-year, the committee obtained a list of administrative faculty by department in order to identify departments to be contacted about Personnel Committees. (665 administrative faculty in 138 "departments".) The committee created a telephone survey and identified positions to survey (Department Chair, HR Specialist or Dean as appropriate). Each committee member completed his/her assigned telephone surveys.
 - Research and findings: The College of Sciences, College of Education, Biochemistry Department, School of Journalism, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, and Student Services are the "units" (21) which have some type of "personnel committee" or in some cases "peer review committee". These committees tend to be involved in the evaluation of both administrative and academic faculty with the exception of the Student Services committee. This involvement comes at varying stages of the evaluation process. The representation and authority of the "personnel/peer review committee" is not consistent across these colleges and departments. In some departments where there is "peer review" for academic faculty, administrative faculty are reviewed through the same process even though they may have no true "peers". If administrative faculty are doing research like academic faculty, they seem to be evaluated in a similar fashion ("personnel/peer review committee"). Only in Student Services, comprised almost entirely of administrative faculty, does the "personnel committee" have differing responsibilities. Their personnel committee handles personnel

questions on an ad hoc basis but does not participate in annual reviews, nor does it appear to have significant authority. The AFPPP discussed many of its concerns with the inconsistency of personnel/peer review committees, their existence, authority, and structure, and that they tend to relate to academic faculty rather than administrative faculty where they exist. Our findings have also revealed a potential need to define “functions” of administrative faculty across the university which may play into further actions. For example, there are administrative faculty who also teach, there are administrative faculty in Deans and Directors positions who have authority over academic faculty, there are administrative faculty in non-academic units of the University, etc.

- Recommendations: In evaluating its findings, the Committee developed a two-fold recommendation. First, the Committee feels that there is no need for an administrative personnel committee to exist within every department or college within the University. In order to address administrative personnel questions, issues, research new processes, obtain feedback, etc. we recommend the creation of a single administrative faculty personnel committee. We recommend that it fall within the jurisdiction of Human Resources but would include 2 members of this Committee (AFPPP). This global committee would act as a resource to administrative faculty on an individual basis as well as to department heads and Deans who have administrative faculty within their areas. If a College or department wants to pursue the use of peer review for administrative faculty within its area(s), this committee could assist in defining true peers across the different colleges and departments within the University. If this recommendation is not acceptable, a smaller step of surveying administrative faculty themselves regarding the need for a “personnel committee” may be conducted. The second component of this recommendation involves addressing the annual evaluation process and form used for administrative faculty since this seems to be the role of the “personnel/peer review committees” that exist. This Committee is aware that the Faculty Senate's Morale Task Force has also been considering this issue. In meeting with Patty Charles of the Task Force, this Committee originally discussed assuming responsibility for addressing these issues however, in very recent developments, Human Resources has convened an Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force. After having the AFPPP Chair attend the first meeting held March 29th, the Committee recommends having one representative sit on this Task Force to address the administrative faculty evaluation form and process.

2. Charge #2

- Actions taken: Two AFPPP Committee members are members of the Salary and Benefits Committee. The Chair of the AFPPP attended the initial Human Resources Administrative Faculty Compensation Committee meeting on March 20th. It appeared that the Salary and Benefits Committee would be providing their findings and recommendations to this HR Committee.
- Research and findings: See Salary and Benefits Committee report.
- Recommendations: The AFPPP supports Salary and Benefits Committee recommendations including “we strongly recommend that steps be taken to collect, verify, and use years of relevant experience and relevant educational degrees instead of age in the future. This process would require allocation of sufficient administrative resources and time to complete. The relevancy of experience and educational degrees should be established according to approved position descriptions.” The AFPPP agrees that since degrees and years of experience are on the PDQs that they also be considered in any salary assessments. The AFPPP feels that it is critical for a Salary and Benefits Committee member represent their findings and recommendations to HR.

3. Standing Charge

- Actions taken: Fall brown bag - “My Performance Evaluation – what do I do, when do I do it and how do I do it?” This topic received an overwhelming response so a second session was added. The brown bag was video-taped in order to make it, the PowerPoint presentation and Q & A's available on the Faculty Senate and HR websites. Spring brown bag – “Who Moved My PDQ? *Subjects covered included: Who updates my PDQ and when? How is it determined if it needs to be considered for a new rank? How was the initial rank determined? What are the criteria looked at in determining the salary/rank of the position/PDQ (salary surveys)?*” The brown bag was web cast in Las Vegas and Reno and video-taped. The PowerPoint presentation and Q & A's are available with the video-tape on the Faculty Senate and HR websites.
- Research and findings: Fall brown bag - Actual attendance at the first one, including committee members was 42(46 RSVP) and 52 (74 RSVP) attended the second session. Spring brown bag - Actual attendance for Reno and Las Vegas locations total including committee members was 38 (47 RSVP).

- Recommendations: Continue to host brown bag luncheons. Next year consider a Human Resources “panel”. Highlight the specialty of each panel member in the promotion of the luncheon in order for administrative faculty to understand the extent of the questions that may be answered. Consider surveying administrative faculty for future topics of interest.

C. Suggested Charges for 2006-07 Committee:

1. Continuing:
 - a. Charge #2 if needed by the Salary and Benefits Committee.
 - b. Standing Charge
2. New:
 - a. Assign two committee members to sit on a Human Resources Administrative Faculty Personnel Committee. As per our first recommendation in Charge #1, this global committee would act as a resource to administrative faculty on an individual basis as well as to department heads and Deans who have administrative faculty within their areas. If a College or department wants to pursue the use of peer review for administrative faculty within its area(s), this committee could assist in defining true peers across the different colleges and departments within the University.
 - b. Assign one committee member to sit on the Human Resources Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force to address the administrative faculty evaluation form and process. The AFPPP can then provide input into the form and process.
 - c. Work with HR to assess the composition of the faculty at the University to determine whether more emphasis needs to be placed on administrative faculty issues. Investigate the ratio of academic faculty to administrative faculty for the past 5-10 years.

2005 Year-End Report to the Faculty Senate from the Technology Committee (111)

For the April 20, 2006 Senate Meeting

Faculty Software-Granting Process

1. The faculty software-granting process resulted in 62 applications from academic and administrative faculty.
2. The committee's funding for the 2005-2006 academic year was \$20,000, allowing the funding of 23 projects, or about 1/3 of the requests, in whole or in part.
3. Those awarded funding grants in most cases had their software installed and available for use before the end of the first semester.
4. Last year, the 111 Committee asked the Senate to seek additional funding to enhance the faculty software-granting program. As this is the only program specifically designed to fund faculty requests for software, it seemed to the committee that \$20,000 is not a sufficient amount to effectively respond to the needs of faculty within both their teaching roles and their research expectations.

Although the Senate Executive Board did request this additional funding last year, the additional monies were not forthcoming. We were encouraged by the Vice Provost, however, to submit this request again for the next fiscal year.

Therefore the 111 committee once again is asking the Senate to forward such a request.

IT Survey

Within its other charge — to conduct a survey regarding faculty perceptions of the range of IT services, the committee (with Senate Executive Board agreement) elected to partner with IT in this effort. The resulting survey instrument has been edited and modified at several stages by the 111 committee. It is scheduled to be rolled out during the week of April 17th

iNtegrate Project

The committee named a representative (George McKinlay) to the NSHE *iNtegrate* project. Feedback from George and from others on our campus led the 111 committee to suggest the formation of an *ad-hoc* committee to investigate shortcomings within the *iNtegrate* process. The concerns expressed by this group, added to the voices of others throughout System, resulted in the *iNtegrate* project returning to the campuses for additional meaningful input.

Other Issues Addressed by the Committee

- "SMARTHINKING" is a new Web-based "remote tutoring" service that is now in use at UNLV and TMCC. Our IT people wish to investigate the service for possible deployment here at UNR, and they've asked the Faculty Senate Technology Committee to find colleagues willing to take a look at it.
- What are our new spam-fighting technologies and what are the potential impacts on faculty email functionality?
- What can be done to increase the amount of storage available in email Inboxes?
- When can we conclude an agreement with Charter Communications so that faculty – and classrooms – can have access to broadcast and cable TV content?
- The new phone system (see <http://www.it.unr.edu/pbx.asp>)
- Implications of merger of *WebCT* with *BlackBoard*

UNR Faculty Senate Meeting
April 20, 2006
[Agenda Item #8](#)

Year End Report to the Faculty Senate from the Academic Standards Committee

April 13, 2006

Executive Summary

The 101 Committee was charged this year with examining the policies and procedures relevant to academic dishonesty among students. We were asked to conduct a review of the methods used by faculty in the application of sanctions for cases of academic dishonesty; to review the policies, processes and functioning of the Office of Student Judicial Affairs; and to make appropriate recommendations for how the University should identify and sanction cases of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty.

The committee was composed of Steve Hayes (Chair), Ellen Baker, Charles Carslaw, Peg Farrar, Guy Hoelzer (ex officio), Gwen Hullman, Duane Karna, Ann Kenniston, Jeff LaCombe, Frank Lucash, John Mahaffy, Louis Marvick, Pat Ragains, and Jill Wallace

The committee organized itself into four subcommittees:

Subcommittee A – Faculty experiences

This subcommittee examined how UNR faculty members currently handle cases of academic dishonesty, and what their experiences and concerns were

Jeff LaCombe (sub-committee chair), Ellen Baker, Peg Farrar, Steve Hayes

Subcommittee B – Comparable institutions

This subcommittee examined comparable institutions and how they handle academic dishonesty

Charles Carslaw, Ann Kenniston

Subcommittee C – Student Judicial Affairs

This subcommittee look at the policies, procedures, and operations of the Office of Student Judicial Affairs (SJA)

Gwen Hullman (sub-committee Chair), Duane Karna, Frank Lucash

Subcommittee D – Definition, Detection, and Sanctions

This subcommittee look at definitions and identification of academic dishonesty, especially plagiarism, what current technology is available to detect it, what kinds of support and encouragement might be needed for faculty to address this problem more vigorously, and what the possible options are for sanctions against it.

Pat Ragains (sub-committee Chair), John Mahaffy, Louis Marvick, Jill Wallace

Each sub-committee met regularly to complete its work. The committee as a whole met ten times over the year.

Because the scope of our work was very large, we have prepared this report in two parts. This first part describes our formal recommendations. The second part of the report describes the data relevant to these recommendations and our reasoning that led to them, and provides supplementary materials.

It is the view of the committee that academic dishonesty issues require much more forceful and effective action on the part of the faculty, students, and administration. UNR is experiencing a significant amount of academic dishonesty. Our survey of UNR faculty (described in detail in the body of this report) found that the 332 UNR faculty who responded reported dealing with an estimated 1,030 instances of academic dishonesty over the last three years (of an estimated 92,600 students in specific classes for those reporting). In line with national trends, faculty and administration are looking for better answers, as is shown by this very committee and by similar recent efforts across campus (e.g., COBA).

There seems to be broad consensus that the manner in which UNR should deal with this issue must be more pro-active, effective and coherent. Doing so will necessitate a change in the overall campus awareness and culture on this issue—including faculty, the administration, and students. We view the present recommendations as a series of steps in that direction rather than a final answer.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Discouragement of Academic Dishonesty

Visibility

- The President and/or Provost should make clear to the University community the importance of the issue of academic dishonesty to the integrity of the University.

Education and Resources

- A faculty workshop designed to help discourage academic dishonesty should be created and made available to faculty on a voluntary basis. The procedures to be followed in such cases should be included in this training. Faculty should learn about proactive strategies to prevent academic dishonesty (e.g., creating multiple tests, Turnitin.com), not just the methods to address it once it has occurred.
- Faculty and student Web sites on academic dishonesty issues, resources, and an online tutorial defining plagiarism and how to avoid it, should be established.
- New faculty orientation should thoroughly address these issues.
- Students should be made aware of the University policies on academic dishonesty and the resources available to understand and avoid it in a pamphlet to be handed out at new-student orientation.
- Faculty should be made aware of the current University policies on academic dishonesty (e.g., the need to report cases of dishonesty to SJA).

- The university should make available standard language for course syllabi concerning the definition of academic dishonesty/plagiarism and the academic and disciplinary sanctions that will be imposed should it occur. We suggest that SJA be tasked with generating that language.
- Additional resources should be provided to SJA and other units tasked with the additional prevention, training and enforcement activities envisioned in this report in order to enable practical application of the increased campus importance being placed on dealing effectively with academic dishonesty.

Detection

- The campus should buy a license to Turnitin.com adequate to cover faculty wishing to use it. The nature and of this software program will be described in more detail in the main body of the report, but in brief it allows faculty to require that papers submitted for courses be submitted to a web portal and screened for possible plagiarism.

Methods for Addressing Academic Dishonesty

Reporting

- A streamlined, web-based reporting system should be put into place that would allow instructors to inform the Office of Student Judicial Affairs easily of cases of academic dishonesty.
- The time frame for faculty to report on incident of academic dishonesty should be extended to 15 working days

Sanctions

- The campus should adopt a policy successful pioneered at the State University of New York – Stony Brook: Students should receive a “Q” for courses in which there has been significant academic dishonesty indicating that this has occurred. For purposes of the student’s grade point average, a Q is treated as an F. Upon successful completion of a non-credit course on academic dishonesty, its social costs, and methods for avoiding it, the Q would be changed to the grade determined by the original instructor, for a non-egregious first time offender. These sanctions are in addition to any other disciplinary and academic sanctions provided through normal processes. In the case of egregious offences or in the case of a repeat offences the potential for deletion of the Q grade from a student’s record would not normally be possible.
- If a student retakes a course with an existing poor grade received due to academic dishonesty, the original grade should not be removed from the transcript.
- While the limit of an academic sanction assigned by the instructor is an F in the course, as part of judicial review, instructors themselves should have the right to request additional sanctions as part of the judicial process of determining additional administrative sanctions (such as the right to refuse re-admission to the course section taught by them).
- A mechanism should be developed for noting on the student’s transcript actions taken regarding academic dishonesty that do not involve a specific course (e.g., research projects; TA work; etc).

The permanence of this notation should be treated the same as the Q grade for in class dishonesty.

- A student's home department should be informed of incidents of academic dishonesty, so that advisors and other key parties will be informed of the student's situation
- UNR should develop sanctioning guidelines and case studies to guide faculty in the academic sanction area. Normally, the minimum penalty should be at least a grade of "F" on the assignment; in many cases, a grade of "F" in the course should be the appropriate penalty. We recommended offering a 1 or 2 step grade reduction for the entire course in addition to the current choices. It should be a very exceptional situation in which students would be permitted to rewrite plagiarized essays, retake exams on which cheating has occurred, or withdraw without penalty from courses in which an accusation of academic dishonesty has been made.

Policy Clarity and Future Directions

- We recommend that the University Code of Conduct and Policies (section IV, "Academic Standards") should in separate sections lay out explicitly the nature of possible academic and administrative sanctions, and distinguish these two types of sanctions clearly.
- Beyond our specific recommendations in this area, a more comprehensive and consistent set of guidelines for disciplinary action in both the academic and administrative sanction area should continue to be developed and implemented. These should involve progressively more severe disciplinary actions based on the degree of academic dishonesty. In the administrative sanction area, repeated instances should be treated very seriously.
- We recommend that a future committee draft an honor code for the University