

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes May 10, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 14

1. Roll Call and Introductions

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

Guests: Gale Craviso (Medicine), Donnelly Curtis (Library), Robert Dickens (Gov't Relations), Gena Jones (HR), Normand LeBlanc (Medicine), Tim McFarling (HR), Elliott Parker (COBA), Hans-Peter Parker (COS), Grant Stitt (HCS), Jill Wallace (TLT).

2. Request to Approve the April 20, 2006 Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Gardella/Beekun. To approve the April 20, 2006 meeting minutes as published.

ACTION: Passed Unanimously

3. Year End Committee Report: Mary Wilson, Bylaws and Code Committee:

Chair Wilds congratulated Mary Wilson as it was the end of her term on the committee and thanked Wilson and the committee for all their hard work. Wilson thanked her committee and said that they accomplished all that the executive board charged them with. The bylaws were the most time consuming, as the last update was in 1999. The bylaws which were approved by the senate January 20, 2006 would be going to the Board of Regents in June for approval. The committee reviewed bylaws for the School of Social Work, Managerial Sciences, and College of Liberal Arts. The committee had 3 recommendations:

- The committee recommends that the bylaws model developed by the 2001-02 Bylaws and Code committee be updated and implemented to promote consistency, clarity, and equity among bylaws throughout the campus.
- After reviewing the School of Social Work's bylaws and the Department of Managerial Sciences bylaws, the committee discussed the difficulty of the task of reviewing the bylaws since many campus bylaws lacked consistency and clarity. Since it is a standing charge of this committee to review and make recommendations on new or revised unit and department bylaws, the committee believes there is a need for change in this process in order to be more consistent and accurate with the review it conducts. To avoid inconsistencies, contradictions, and inequities across campus, we recommend that all unit and department bylaws be rewritten to follow the new model suggested above, adding to the model to fit their situations as needed. This would provide more consistency, clarity, and equity among the many bylaws on campus and reduce one factor identified as contributing to low morale. It would increase confidence from the faculty and administration in the committee's ability to review bylaws with accuracy and efficiency. The new model would answer many questions for unit and department bylaw committees about what should and should not be included, streamlining, and reducing the

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

difficulty involved with the process. Such a method would make it easier to have an objective third party offer interpretations of bylaws either as a formal or informal opinion if disagreements arise.

- The committee recommends the development of a bylaws review procedure that tracks the progress of bylaws as they proceed through the approve process. The committee also suggests that the committee comments become part of the bylaws approval submission, that the respective unit and department committees respond to the comments, and that the committee receive feedback from the units and colleges so that they can evaluate the usefulness of the comments.

Debra Vigil asked if there was a requirement for each department and unit to have bylaws.

Wilson said that the only bylaws required were the university bylaws, but that President Crowley requested that units have bylaws and some unit bylaws require department bylaws.

What happens when deans don't follow unit bylaws? During President Crowley's time, he expected deans and VP's to follow them, but if they did not, then it could be grievable.

Bylaws should not be so specific that they cannot be followed, but policies and procedures of the departments and units should be specific and flesh out the bylaws.

MOTION: Phaneuf/Gardella. To accept report and recommendation

ACTON: Passed unanimously

4. Year End Committee Report: Jane Bessette, Campus Affairs:

Jane Bessette, chair reported that the committee researched code and bylaws regarding the hiring practices. The committee discovered that there was not 10 years of records for the committee to look at regarding the hiring, termination, and reassignment actions for deans and above. The committee discovered that the President had the right to waive searches for deans and above, but communication had not been very good regarding this practice. The committee looked into professional development leave and sabbatical leave. The following people were appointed as liaisons to these committees:

Donnelyn Curtis	Status of Women Committee
Ann Tyler	Work and Family Task Force
Jane Bessette	Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Advocacy Committee
Jamie Leanos	Multiethnic Coalition
Carley Ries	Intercultural Collaborative
Tom King	University Disabilities Resource Coalition

Committee Recommendations:

- Charge 1 - Create a communication process around the search and appointment process so that the university community is informed. Determine what form of governance this campus will run under, AAUP or Corporate. We believe the confusion in this area results from the merging of these two forms of governance.
- Charge 2 - Proposal scores be regrouped to show that the proposal is worth 46 points, past accomplishments 35 points and letters of support/years since last leave 19 points. The way the criteria form is set up, it appears that past accomplishments has the greatest weight in an application.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes May 10, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 14

Communication of those individuals approved for leave, time period and activity/project they will be working on.

Instead of all approved proposals being available for viewing, only select stellar proposals. Perhaps have stellar proposals available in the library as well as provosts office? Or even better, saved to the web?

There was discussion about the make up of the professional development leave committee, and what the procedures were for awarding leave, what kind of feedback would be given if the application was denied, could the stellar applications be posted on the webpage for other faculty to view, what types of leaves are available for non-traditional faculty.

MOTION: Beekun/Birk. To approve the report and recommendations.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

5. Year End Committee Report Bourne Morris, Faculty Morale Task Force

The Task Force felt that since administration was not trained in good management practices that they tended to ignore them, and whether because of heavy workload or such, deans or directors were not willing to get in and help or train. The search for the ombudsman was scheduled to begin in July 2006. The training suggested for management may start next year if money was allocated for it. Many units have annual evaluations in place for top administrators, but the 5 colleges or units that do not are: College of Business Administration, College of Science, Information Technology/Library, Graduate School, and Administration and Finance.

The UPC was dissolved, but the senate had not been included in the planning process yet. The ALC meets regularly, and the minutes were distributed, but they appeared to be highly filtered. Chair Bourne Morris reported that this semester the committee looked at service, joint and split appointments, administrative and faculty evaluations, and rotating faculty chairs. The committee had the following new recommendations:

1. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate be charged with 1) examining the role and importance of service in evaluating faculty and staff and 2) seeking ways to encourage senior faculty to fully engage in shared governance on this campus.

2. The establishment of a special ad hoc committee to examine the function of rotating academic chairs and discuss with the current chairs and their deans ways to make this essential work more effective and more desirable. Also establish a group of seasoned chair to mentor new department chairs.

3. The provost and Human Resources develop guidelines to establish, manage, and evaluate joint and split appointments. We further urge that a Memorandum of Understanding be in place before a joint or split appointment offer letter is dispatched and a contract is prepared.

4. The Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force recently created by Human Resources review and consider the findings and recommendations of this task force.

The discussion from senators covered the gamut of the vacuum that the absence of the UPC caused with budgeting, to whether or not the deans could look at the big picture and not just focus on their units when it came time to allocating funds, to the fact that the ALC minutes published are highly filtered by the time the campus sees them, the lack of funding for training, both joint and split positions compound the problems, and that rotating chairs are not sympathetic to incoming chairs.

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes May 10, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 14

Senators suggested that perhaps a charge for the next committee should be to make sure that implementation happens. Morris said that the recommendations were carefully crafted for other committees to take over. The people who need to follow through on these recommendations are the executive board and the senate. Barbara Scott requested that this be a standing item on the agenda. Grant Stitt said that due process needed to stay in the forefront of the senate.

MOTION: Birk/Stewart. .To approve the report (change Academic to Campus Affairs Committee) and recommendations.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

6. Year End Committee Report: Academic Standards

The final report was not included in the last senate packet, the senate wanted to read the report prior to approving the report and recommendations.

MOTION: Phaneuf/Gardella. To approve report and accept the recommendations.

ACTION: Passed, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

7. Chair's Report

Chair Leah Wilds asked Howard Goldbaum, chair of the technology committee to speak about the Computer Replacement Program. Goldbaum stated that thanks to Patricia Swager, he did find out that the program would not be funded this next year. The university determined that a 3 year funding cycle was appropriate; however, while it was funded last year, it was not funded the previous year. The program was actually replacing computers over a 5 year span. The program would not be funded for 2007. Many faculty would be forced to conduct creative work and research on outdated computers. Nevada ranked at the bottom of the scale for use of technology. Goldbaum received emails from faculty regarding this issue and some of the concerns voiced were: faculty have more outdated computers than their students and have difficulty accessing their student's work, some faculty cannot access new features of university software programs such as WebCT, the affect that outdated equipment had on research and recruiting. It was mentioned that recycling of computers was important, they could then be resold at the surplus sale. One department was able to purchase a computer for \$60.00 for a graduate student. Beekun asked the senate to make a resolution and send it to central administration recommending that the 3 year cycle and funding be made permanent.

MOTION: Beekun/Rojas. To draft a resolution stating:

The Faculty Senate is dismayed by the decision to withdraw funding for next fiscal year replacement of faculty computers, and that the senate wishes to see decision reversed, and furthermore wishes administration to approve permanent funding for computer replacement on a three year basis, and that the senate examine support for computer replacement for state funded as well as non-state funded positions.

ACTION: Passed, 1 Objection, 1 Abstention

Wilds thanked the senators for all their hard work and stated that this had been a very rewarding experience for her and a privilege to serve on the senate and as senate chair. Wilds listed some of the major senate accomplishments this past year:

- Participation of the faculty in the Institutional Advisory Committee, the committee was very influential in the presidential search process

University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes May 10, 2006

RSJ 304

Meeting 14

- The creation, approval, and implementation of the Video Policy which was being looked at and adopted by other institutions
- The Bylaws and Code Committees' major revision of the UNR Bylaws
- The work of the Morale Task Force which was very productive
- The institution of the Peer Review Process, which allowed faculty recourse to an unfavorable evaluation (The executive board was working with Klaich to get rid of the process and return to allowing faculty to grieve their evaluations)
- The monumental task with the ERP process and getting the regents to look at a decentralized system.
- The substantial recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee

Wilds thanked the outgoing senators and handed out their certificates for service on the senate.

The senate gave Leah a certificate to Healthy Tails and Ron Phaneuf gave her a special cap in honor of her service.

Meeting Adjourned 3:30 pm