

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

1. Roll Call and Introductions

Denise Baclawski (Provost's), Rafik Beekun (COBA), Cynthia Birk (COBA), Pam Cantrell (COE), Arthur Chenin (Administration and Finance), Amy Childress (Engineering), Joe DeLappe (CLA), Joe DeLappe for Mary Stewart (CLA), Rita Escher for Maureen Cronin (Student Services), Johanna Fricke (SOM), Greg Gardella (IT), Michelle Gardner (President's Division), Howard Goldbaum (Journalism), Guy Hoelzer (Science), Steve Oberg (Research), Ron Phaneuf (Science), Mark Pinsky (Science), Steve Rock (Education), Nelson Rojas (CLA), Stefanie Scopettone (Development), Amy Shannon (Library), JoAnne Skelly (COOP), Patricia Swager (Medicine), Debra Vigil (Medicine), Debra Vigil for Barbara Scott (Medicine), Leah Wilds (CLA), Mark Waldo (CLA), Esmail Zanjani (CABNR),

Absent: Frank Baglin (Science), Terry Henner (SOM), Denise McKee (Medicine), Judith Sugar

Guests: Melisa Choroszy (SS), Stacy Colwell (Davidson Academy), Bob Davidson (Davidson Academy), Jan Davidson (Davidson Academy), John Frederick (Provost), Gena Jones (HR), Tommy Lean (SOM), Tim McFarling (HR).

2. Update: The Davidson Academy: Jan and Bob Davidson & John Frederick, Executive Vice President and Provost

Jan Davidson summarized how the idea for the Davidson Academy began. The Davidson's started the Davidson Institute for Talent Development in 1999, a non-profit foundation to improve the education in the nation. Their first program, Davidson Young Scholars, offered support services for profoundly gifted students and which served approximately 1,000 of these students throughout the United States. The Davidson's created the Davidson Fellows which awarded scholarships in the amount of 50,000, 25,000 and 10,000 dollars to outstanding students. The THINK Summer Institute enabled students (ages 12-15) to earn up to 7 college credits, during the 3 week session. The Davidson's also have an Educators Guild for educators who want to learn more about working with profoundly gifted students. In 2004 they published the book *Genius Denied: How to Stop Wasting Our Brightest Young Minds*. Jan and Bob Davidson had many requests through out the years to open a school for profoundly gifted and talented students. The Davidson Academy was scheduled to open fall of 2006 at UNR and would have space on the 2nd floor of the KNPB building to start. Expected enrollment for the first year would be around 30 students. Some families would relocate to Reno so their children could attend the Davidson Academy. The students would range from 9 – 16 and must be able to perform at a 6th grade level or higher. The programs would be constructed based on each individual student's needs. The Academy would hire professors to teach the classes and work with student projects. When students are ready they would matriculate to regular college classes. The academy would work with university professors and parents regarding what class content the children would be ready for prior to signing them up in a particular class. Stacey Colwell, Program Director of the academy said that most of these children have been reading since they were three and read at a much higher grade level, so they have been exposed to topics at higher maturity level. Bob Davidson said that these students would provide an interesting, highly talented, and motivated group of students to the university environment. These students would increase the pool of National Merit Scholars and put UNR at the top of the list. Also, having these students attending the university would increase the ranking and grading of the university on research. Most students would probably continue on at the university for their college degrees, and their families would be a good core of supporters of the university. Tom Nickles (Recipient of the Regent; Distinguished Teachers Award) taught at the THINK Summer Institute and was awed by the students that took his course, the first day; they had already read all of the materials and were ready to begin discussion. The Academy would provide a strong socio-emotional cooperative learning environment and would deal with issues that are particular to this group of students. The staff of the academy would conduct regular meetings with the students and their families to keep on track with their studies. Senators asked about

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

testing, both neuro-psychological and outcome measures. Testing would not be conducted except for entrance testing. DeLappe asked about testing skills for writing or composing. This is not an area where the academy has had any involvement yet. Wilds thanked the members of the academy for speaking at the senate meeting.

Link to their website: <http://www.davidsonacademy.unr.edu/>

3. Year-End Committee Report: Kent Ervin: Salary and Benefits Committee:

Kent Ervin thanked the committee, Linda Nichols, Benefits Coordinator; Tim McFarling, Director Human Resources; Gena Jones, Vice President Human Resources.

The committee made the following recommendations:

1. That steps be taken to collect, verify, and use years of relevant experience and relevant educational degrees instead of age in the future.
2. 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.
3. Those 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. That the administration clarify procedures for individual appeals of salary adjustment amounts.
5. 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.
6. 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.

Some of the questions asked by senators were: why couldn't faculty go on social security or at least have the option to choose between SS and the state retirement plan. Why could a person of a certain age, take money out of a personal IRA, but not their university IRS? Could a list of frequently asked questions be listed on the website?

Recommendations by the committee for the next year's charges:

- Monitor the implementation of regular salary equity studies, in particular the elimination of age as a factor for Administrative Faculty salary equity surveys.
- 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.
- Review the possibility of establishing an educational program on retirement investment strategies for faculty.
- 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

MOTION: Gardella/Baclawski. To Approve Report and Recommendations of the Committee

ACTION: Passed, 1 abstention.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

4. Request to Approve March 13, 2006 Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Zanjani/Rojas. To approve the minutes as written

ACTION: Passed Unanimously

5. Chair's Report – Leah Wilds

Chair Leah Wilds encouraged senators to attend the open fora and receptions for the presidential candidates. To date, the regents have voted to approve all the recommendations of the advisory committee. Wilds talked about items that would be on next years agendas for the senate, they would continue to look at the code and bylaws and would work with system counsel and administration regarding the code and bylaws issues, the senate would be working on allowing evaluations to be grieved again, housing issues, sick leave accrual, reviving the Institutional Budget and Planning committee (107), and developing charges for the senate standing committees. Wilds also asked that the outgoing senators stay for the 2nd part of the May 10, 2006 meeting to participate in it, and impart their wisdom and experiences to the new senators. Senators requested that parking issues be added to the agenda for next year. Wilds asked for senators to bring their ideas forward for other agenda items and topics that they would like discussed next year. At the May meeting, Wilds requested that all senators stay through the changing of the guard and pass their tips and information to the new senators.

6. Year-End Committee Report: Kelly Corrigan, Administrative Faculty Personnel Policies & Procedures Committee

Kelly Corrigan thanked her committee members for their service and the senate for allowing committee travel funds to members.

The committee made the following 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.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

- 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.
- 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.

The committee recommended the following new charges for next year:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

MOTION: Gardella/Beekun. To approve and accept the report and recommendations of the committee

ACTION: Passed unanimously

7. Year-End Committee Report: Howard Goldbaum, Technology Committee:

Howard Goldbaum thanked the committee members for their hard work. The committee’s main recommendation was to have the senate and the executive board request more funding for the software acquisition program. Last year they could only fund approximately 1/3 of the requests. The IT survey should roll out on Monday, which was designed by Shannon Rahming. The university was participating in a trial of SMARTTHINKING a new web based “remote tutoring” service. If faculty would like to participate please contact Goldbaum. The committee also looked at issues regarding: Cable access, email storage size, the new phone system, and SPAM issues.

Senators were concerned about the number of new software programs that faculty had to learn. Some of the software issues were Digital Measures, and the new search software, some senators would like to see more expertise from IT on niche software.

Gardella suggested that the Niche software concerns should be considered for the committees next years charges.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

MOTION: Shannon/Chenin. To approve the report and recommendations with the suggestion from Gardella.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

8. Year-End Committee Report: Steve Hayes, Academic Standards Committee:

The report was approximately 50 pages so an executive summary was sent out with the packet, the committee conducted a survey, and 332 faculty participated in the survey and reported approximately 1,030 instances of academic dishonesty over the last 3 years. The recommendations of the committee were as follows:

1. To increase 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

4. 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

5. 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.
6. 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.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes April 20, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 13

- 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.

The committee recommended that the next year's committee draft an honor code.

There was discussion regarding the Q grade and if it would create legal issues and grade point averages. The Q grade would only stay on the student's record if the student did not take the course on academic dishonesty, or if it was a repeat or an egregious offense. Senators questioned what a significant or egregious offense would be. They also discussed how important it was to educate the student as to what academic dishonesty consisted of and to educate faculty on the policies. Melisa Choroszy spoke about the Q grade and that it would have to go through NSHE. NSHE has a grading system, so a change such as this would need to be agreed upon by all of the colleges in the system and then approved by the Board of Regents. More discussion ensued on these topics

MOTION: Phaneuf/Beekun. To approve the recommendations of the committee

ACTION: Passed, 1 opposed 3 abstentions.

9. New Business:

None

Meeting Adjourned 5:05 pm