

University of Nevada, Reno
2004-05 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes January 13, 2005

RSJ 304

Meeting 8

Present: Jamie Anderson (Medicine), Denise Baclawski (Provost's Division), Frank Baglin (Science), Rafik Beekun (Business Administration), Cynthia Birk (Business Administration), Buddy Borden (Cooperative Extension), Rod Case (Education), Rod Case for Pam Cantrell (Education), Arthur Chenin (Administration & Finance), Joseph DeLappe (Liberal Arts), Rita Escher (Student Services), Bill Follette (Liberal Arts), Johanna Fricke (Medicine), Greg Gardella (Information Technology), Michelle Gardner (President's Division), Howard Goldbaum (Journalism), Terry Henner (Medicine), Guy Hoelzer (Science), Susan Lentz (Human & Community Sciences), Denise McKee (Medicine), Steve Oberg (Research), Ron Phaneuf (Science), Stefani Scopettone (Development), Amy Shannon (Library), Mary Stewart (Liberal Arts), Judith Sugar for Bob Chaires (Human & Community Sciences), Patricia Swager (Medicine), Mark Waldo (Liberal Arts), Leah Wilds (Liberal Arts). Absent: Amy Childress (Engineering), Debra Vigil (Medicine).

1. Introductions

John Frederick (Provost's Office), Cary Groth (Athletics), Gena Jones (Human Resources), James Dean Leavitt (Board of Regents), John Lilley (President's Office), Tim McFarling (Human Resources).

2. Request to Approve the December 8, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Chair Leah Wilds noted that there were two typos that needed to be fixed, one in section 7, should have read "from a class" not "form a class" and the second typo in section 10 should have been "soul searching" not "sole searching." Susan Lentz said she would like the minutes amended regarding President John Lilly's comment "that there was no intention of closing the law library" to reflect that the law library was closed to all except judges and that there was more to the library than the 20,000 online journals.

MOTION: Gardella/Baglin. To approve minutes as amended.

ACTION: Approved unanimously.

3. Chairs Report

Chair Leah Wilds said that she hoped everyone had a chance to read the president's email this week, in which he addressed the articles in the Reno Gazette Journal (RGJ) regarding our treatment of animals among other things. Wilds was saddened by the negative attention that occurred from these articles. Both Lilley and Pollard were doing everything they could to manage the issue. If anyone had questions regarding this, it could be discussed under new business or with Lilley when he gave his report. The Faculty Morale Committee was continuing its work, and was thinking about sending out a short survey to all faculty. The results of the survey would be presented to both the senate and the provost's office. Once the morale issues were identified, then solutions would be developed using the recommendations made in

the responses. Assistant Vice President of Human Resources Gena Jones had put together a task force on employee training and development. The goal of the task force was to identify areas in which all types of employees on campus could benefit from training and employee development initiatives. Wilds, Program Officer Patty Chambers, and Faculty Senate Manager Robin Gonzalez were serving on the task force. At the last meeting the taskforce was divided into subcommittees to develop ideas for all categories of employees which were: academic faculty, administrative faculty, classified staff, and executive employees (deans and above). Tim McFarling was the contact person for anyone who would like to serve on these subcommittees. Wilds reported that Lilley informed her that central administration had decided not to conduct a search for a new Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations, but to appoint John Carothers as permanent vice president. A search would be conducted for an associate vice president of development. Lilley made the decision after observing the good job Carothers did since assuming the interim vice president position and after consulting with numerous constituencies on and off campus. Wilds did not feel that there were any issues with this, and asked senators to hold their comments for new business. The presidential evaluation data had been given to an outside consultant to tabulate and submit an analysis of that data. The search for a new chancellor was moving slowly and Wilds said she would keep the senate informed.

4. Visit with Regent James Dean Leavitt

Regent James Dean Leavitt said that he was proud to be elected to serve on the Board of Regents and he felt there was nothing more important than higher education. He would like to see higher goals for higher education, individual and group performance standards for regents, and better monitoring of regents. He cared deeply about higher education and was trying to hasten his learning curve. He said that he was a regent of the system, not north or south, and that he felt it was very important to be unbiased toward any particular region. Senators asked Leavitt about the termination policy, regent civility, region bias, and the chancellor search. Leavitt said that while the termination notice was not a way of doing business in private industry that it might be appropriate for the education system. He felt that it was important as a regent to represent the entire system. He also spoke to program duplication by saying that each institution had its own area of excellence and that they should develop programs specific to each institution. On the issue of the new chancellor, he said he would like to see more continuity and hoped that when a new chancellor was hired that s/he would stay for about 10 years. Leavitt said that the goals for higher education should be quality not quantity. He thanked the senate for inviting him. He also expressed to the senate that he would remain accessible to faculty. He would like to get to know faculty and have them get to know him.

5. **Intercollegiate Athletics Report**

Athletic Director Cary Groth said that the university had a good healthy athletic program and that there were three priorities. The first priority was academic retention, for which a director was hired. The second priority was to develop space for tutoring, and the third was to recruit and train quality athletes and staff. The goal of the university is to maintain the notoriety of spring 2004 with the Sweet Sixteen as opposed to the notoriety of certain events during the summer of 2004. Athletics would conduct more thorough background checks and provide guidance and mentoring to students. In the past, there had not been enough support, training and resources for the students. Mark Waldo asked about the university working with Big 10, 12 and PacWest schools. Groth replied that it was very important for the university to be involved in games at least as far as the Midwest. The program needed to grow to compete against Bowl Champion Schools. Groth said that games would be played earlier in the day and be more family oriented. A draft of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board report would be submitted to the president. The board needed to: have more authority, develop policies and procedures, meet more often, and develop allies. The IAB draft proposed that each college appoint 2 representatives to the IAB. Groth said they were hoping to get more public service announcements (PSAs) from colleges to fill spots on the Wolfpac Sports Network. The colleges could create PSAs about their college and departments for national and local TV. Groth reported that all professors would receive athletes' schedules and a travel schedule. Hopefully this would assist the professor and the athlete regarding grades and absences. Absences due to travel were a problem and she was not sure how to fix that. Groth said that depending on what happened at NCAA, preseason might be eliminated and that would make a difference in travel related absences. Groth would like to have the academic advisors and the director give a presentation to the senate. Also she reported that there would be a brunch to award athletes' academic excellence and encouraged faculty to attend and help pass out awards.

6. **Vice President for Research/Dean Graduate School Search: Election of Nominees for Membership on the Search Committee**

A list with the names of 14 nominees and a bio for Steve Hayes was passed out prior to the meeting. The senate was asked to select ten nominees to submit to the president. Lilley would select 5 of the 10 to serve on the search committee. The following faculty were elected as final nominees: Ian Buckle, Pam Cantrell, Vincent Catalano, Bill Follette, Steve Hayes, Cindy Kiel, Colleen Murray, Steve Oberg, Kenton Sanders, and Steve Wheatcraft.

Break

7. **Executive Board Election**

A special election was held to fill one at-large seat on the senate executive board. Guy Hoelzer was elected.

8. **New Business**

Wilds said that Vice President of Human Resources Gena Jones needed more members on the academic and administrative subcommittees for training and development. It would be a great learning experience for faculty to serve on either subcommittee. Senators had questions about the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR) and the Hussein Hussein. Wilds recommended they read the email sent out by Lilley and hold questions for his visit at the meeting. Chambers said that, as was indicated in the media, Hussein had exhausted the grievance process here on campus and had hired an attorney. Gardella said he found Hussein to be very principled and very caring about what happened on campus and was shocked to see that he was mixed up in this. Wilds was saddened by the other papers picking up the story, especially since the reporter had refused to speak with other people on campus who had additional information and could give a more balanced view. Reno Gazette Journal (RGJ) reporter, Lenita Powers called Wilds, but Wilds declined to comment as she had not been part of the grievance process. Wilds said she could not add any factual information.

9. **Campus Master Plan**

Executive Vice President and Provost John Frederick reported on the articles that appeared in the RGJ regarding the allegation of animal abuse and UNR. Frederick and Vice President of Marketing and Communication Cindy Pollard met with the RGJ Editorial Board regarding the subjectivity of reporter Frank Mullen. The reporter had been trailing the story for 5 months and had not met with the dean of agriculture. The university sent 3 dozen corrections to RGJ and only four were published. Most of the events published in the RGJ were of historical nature and had already been addressed by the university. The faculty member mentioned in the article had filed a lawsuit, so the university would not publicly comment on the allegations. Frederick also reported on the Master Plan that was approved by the Board of Regent's on December 2, 2004. He distributed a handout that showed the scope of plan or vision over the next 50 years. During that time the university expected to reach several horizons at 10, 16-20, 24 and 30 years, and was considering programming needs, enrollment growth, space needs to figure out the total building space at each horizon. The medical buildings would be almost a separate campus. Evans would be a major avenue through campus as the university expands. There were limitations on the south and west sides of the university, so it would be easier to purchase larger parcels on the east side of campus. One of the major constraints would be the Union Pacific railroad line as it would remain an active spur. There might be areas of private commercial ownership inside the campus boundaries. The new events center would be in the area of the existing Livestock Events Center. Senators were concerned about the lack of parking in the Master Plan. Frederick said that the

handout showed only parking structures, not flat ground parking.

10. President's Report

President Lilley thanked the faculty for their participation in his evaluation. He also thanked Dean Thawley, Pollard and Frederick for the time they spent dealing with the CABNR issue. They would be monitoring the situation closely. If there were problems, they would face them head on and then move on them. Frank Baglin asked about the decision to make John Carothers the Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations. Lilley responded that the market is fierce for development people, and that it was not who the person knew, but knowing how things worked, as well as follow through, discipline and the ability to find the money. The foundation leadership and Lilley felt that Carothers would be good in the position as he had the needed qualities. Lilley also explained that they reorganized and placed directors of development in the colleges for better prospect management. Arthur Chenin voiced his concern that there were no front line people on the Technology Task Force. He felt that users needed to be a part of the process. Lilley responded that the committee was well rounded.

11. UNR Bylaws Peer Review

Chambers reported on the peer review process presented at the December meeting. Senators had questions regarding whether the review committees or the deans/vice presidents would be making the final decision. The UCCSN policy required that both the original evaluation and the new evaluation be maintained in a faculty's personnel file. Based on the policy, there would be no need for anyone to make a decision about one or the other. Chambers said that while she did not think this was what the Bylaws and Code Committee would prefer, the institution had to comply with the regent's policy. Waldo said he was not comfortable voting on a procedure that did not seem to resolve the issue of disputes over annual evaluations. It was suggested that having both the evaluations on file would create problems for both administrators and faculty when making other personnel decisions, e.g., merit, promotion, and tenure. Chambers suggested that if the senate agreed, the peer review could be approved as a process for this year only, and that Wilds could visit the issue with the other senate chairs. If the other chairs agreed, they could request a change in the regents' policy. Rafik Beekun asked if this procedure was for merit and what was the difference between the evaluation procedure and merit or tenure. Chambers replied that this was not for merit or tenure issues, only annual evaluations.

MOTION: Follette/Phaneuf. To approve the peer review process as presented with the stipulation that it be used this year only.

ACTION: Passed (1 abstention).

Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 pm