

AGENDA
University of Nevada, Reno
2005-06 Faculty Senate
March 8, 2007, 1:30 p.m.
RSJ 304

All Times are Approximate

- | | | | |
|------|-----|--|-----------------------|
| 1:30 | 1. | Roll Call and Introductions | |
| 1:35 | 2. | Request to Approve the February 15, 2007 Meeting Minutes | Action/Enclosure |
| 1:40 | 3. | Chair's Report | Information |
| 1:50 | 4. | Results of the UNR Bylaws Vote: <i>Guy Hoelzer</i> , Chair | Information/Enclosure |
| 2:10 | 5. | Planning Principles for Effort Reporting: <i>Guy Hoelzer</i> , Chair | Information/Enclosure |
| 2:45 | 6. | Executive Board Nominating Committee | Action/Enclosure |
| 3:00 | | Break | |
| 3:10 | 7. | Proposed Changes to Faculty Senate Bylaws, First Reading: <i>Guy Hoelzer</i> , Chair | Information/Enclosure |
| 3:45 | 8. | Preview of Board of Regent's March 15-16 Agenda: <i>Guy Hoelzer</i> , Chair | Information/Enclosure |
| 4:00 | 9. | New Business | Discussion |
| 5:00 | 10. | Adjourn | |

Future Senate Meetings

[UNR Faculty Senate Website](#)

April 19, 2007 at 1:30pm
RSJ 304

May 9, 2007 at 1:30pm
RSJ 304

Future Board of Regents Meetings

[NSHE Website](#)

March 15 & 16, 2007, WNCC
Carson City

June 21 & 22, 2007, TMCC
Reno

1. Roll Call and Introductions:

Present: Denise Baclawski (Provost's), Cynthia Birk (COBA), Kristen Burgarello for Stefanie Scopettone (Development), John Cannon for David Crowther (COE), Gale Craviso (SOM), Maureen Cronin (Student Services), Donnelly Curtis (Library), Steve Djukanovich for Thomas Lean (Administration and Finance), Kurt Esser for Michelle Gardner (President's), William Follette (CLA), Greg Gardella (IT), Howard Goldbaum (JO), Guy Hoelzer (COS), Derek Kauneckis for Leonard Weinberg (CLA), Cindy Kiel (Research), Normand LeBlanc (SOM), Mano Misra (EN), Melissa P'Brien for Patricia Swager (SOM), Elliott Parker (CLA), Ron Phaneuf (COS), Hans-Peter Plag (COS), Wendy Rauw for Esmail Zanjani (CABNR), Steve Rock (COE), Nelson Rojas (CLA), Nelson Rojas for Mary Stewart (CLA), Jo Anne Skelly (COOP), Judith Sugar (HHS), Debra Vigil (SOM), Debra Vigil for Barbara Scott (SOM), Leah Wilds.

Absent: Terry Henner (SOM), Mark Pinsky (COS).

Guests: Glen Atkinson (COBA), Meliza Chorozy (SS), Sam Mills (NSBDC),

2. Request to Approve the January 18, 2007 Meeting Minutes:

MOTION: Follette/ Baclawski. To approve meeting minutes as published.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

3. Visit with Regent Jason Geddes:

Chair Guy Hoelzer introduced and welcomed Regent Jason Geddes. Geddes was born and raised in Nevada, ASUN President at UNR, received a graduate degree in Environmental Sciences and Health from UNR and also was a faculty member at UNR. Geddes, currently employed at the Economic Development Authority was appointed to replace Doug Hill on the Board of Regents which puts him in office until October 2008. Some issues that he had been working on were renewable energy, energy conservation and green buildings. The system had established a green committee which would be giving a presentation at the June Regents' Meeting on the system using energy as well as possible. Geddes also spoke about the development of new programs and centers and that the regents were looking to become involved earlier in the development process. Part of the reason for that was to avoid duplication of programs and centers. He would like to see all campuses do their long term planning in a similar pattern and cycle to make the creation of a system-wide plan easier and allow the regents to get a more comprehensive picture. Geddes who served 2 years on the Nevada State Legislature said that the legislative website was one of the best for interactivity between the legislature and the general public. Budget and legislation are set on very tight time frames and legislators are not always well versed on every bill or topic, so it would be important to have your voice heard. There were no new planning dollars scheduled for new construction other than the math and science building, this puts the university 4 years out before they would be able to start new construction. There was a need to prioritize throughout the system. Geddes said that the Health Sciences System was a very positive initiative and

would focus state and federal attention on what all the campuses were doing in that regard and where we can help and provide assistance to advance the health cause of the state. In the Capital Improvements Planning (CIP) is the improvement of the medical school at UNR. Geddes feels that there would be 2 strong campuses in the Health Science Center. Geddes reminded the senators that if they were contacting their legislator as a private citizen to use their personal email address. If faculty or staff wanted to forward a system or university cause, they should give Bob Dickens a heads up first. Senators asked what could be done to help legislators see the importance of renovation of the current buildings on campus. Legislators don't see renovation of old buildings as a high priority. It was pointed out that many of the buildings on the UNR campus were historic buildings. It was also brought up that the university was losing federal dollars due to not having more research space. Geddes asked if this information could be brought forward to the regents. Discussion was held regarding the system's focus on health care issues, The Health Sciences Initiative includes physical education programs, health sciences, aging, and many other issues associated with the costs of health care within a community. There are 140 programs on the campuses that are part of this system. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) was brought up and Geddes felt that ERP would happen.

4. Chair's Report:

The agenda had to be changed as Duncan Aldrich, Chair of the Bylaws and Code Committee was in another meeting until after the break. Chair Guy Hoelzer reported that the Senator Hatice Gecol had resigned from the senate to serve as an advisor to Governor Gibbons. Gecol was replaced by Manoranjan Misra who asked Hoelzer to come and speak to his constituents. Hoelzer would be willing to speak with any senators constituents if asked. The March meeting had been changed from March 15, 2007 to March 8, 2007 as the regents meeting was the same day. Senate representation and participation discussions at the highest levels of administration have improved. Steve Rock, Vice Chair has been regularly included in the Academic Leadership Council meeting. Hoelzer would be included in the weekly meeting of the President's Council. Hoelzer felt that there was a sense of trust flowing in both directions. Two of the four Ombudsman candidates had been interviewed and Hoelzer encouraged participation in the process. Hoelzer thanked senators for helping to start the ball rolling with rich discussion on Effort Reporting. A large working group had been formed to solve this problem, which included Steve Rock, Ron Phaneuf, Hans-Peter Plag, Bill Follette, Cindy Kiel, Guy Hoelzer from the senate, many senior administrators and some staff representatives and would be chaired by John Frederick. The issue of A contract faculty and consulting was still being examined. The code is ambiguous in this as all faculty have the right to consult one day per week, yet 12 month faculty must take annual leave which they accrue at the rate of only 2 day per month. This could become a bigger issue as they do not earn annual leave at that rate. Hoelzer would like to see more research done on this prior to getting an interpretation from legal counsel.

5. Resolution for Coordination of Spring Break:

The senate passed a resolution that requested the coordination of UNR, TMCC and Washoe County School District to align their spring breaks. The university would not be able to change their spring break for the next five years, but after that they would be willing to cooperate to align the spring break. Some of the reasons for this request were: faculty and staff at these institutions have children or spouses involved with Washoe County School District or visa versa. The College of Education (COE) at UNR has students in programs involved in the Washoe County School District and this interferes with the program.

MOTION: Follette/Rojas. To approved the resolution as written.

A friendly amendment was added to the resolution so it would read:

UNR Faculty Senate
Resolution
UNR and Washoe County Spring Breaks

WHEREAS, the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) and the Washoe County School District (WCSD) serve many of the same citizens;

WHEREAS, the faculty and administrators of the UNR College of Education must coordinate numerous internships and other programs with WCSD and coordinated spring breaks would greatly enhance such programs;

WHEREAS, many UNR and TMCC faculty, staff and students have children who attend WCSD schools and/or have partners employed at WCSD;

WHEREAS, many WCSD teachers have children who attend UNR and TMCC or themselves attend classes at UNR;

WHEREAS, citizens in the above groups are presented with difficulties accommodating spring breaks scheduled at different times;

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the UNR Faculty Senate encourages the UNR, TMCC and WCSD administrations to work together as much as is reasonably possible to coordinate spring break to the benefit of the faculty, staff, students, and families.

The friendly amendments were acceptable.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

Report on the Jan BOR Meeting, summary included in packet:

Hoelzer briefly touched on the items that he felt were most important:

NSHE had requested 110 million from the legislature for the Health Science Center and 10 million for ERP. The system was looking to hire a project manager and using the funds for back fill positions to get the Student Services package going. It appeared that the regents would follow the advice of the expert consultants in this matter. No substantive discussion was held regarding the balance of power between the regents and the chancellor.

Handbook Revisions: Passed with some discussion about the definition of “non-substantive changes” which are defined in limited terms in the policy as name changes, typos.

Naming of Community Colleges: The president of CCSN presented a proposal to the regents to change the name from Community College of Southern Nevada to College of Southern Nevada as they now have select 4-year degree programs.

An honorary doctorate degree was granted to Regent Thalia Dondero even though the regents had agreed in the past not to grant any more honorary degrees to sitting regents.

6. Center for Regional Studies

The Center for Regional Studies Ad Hoc Review Committee, which consisted of Greg Gardella, JoAnne Skelly, and Maureen Cronin, reported that they had some concerns with the original proposal such as what appeared to be earmarked funding, documentation of support, relational structure and reporting line and technology resources. All of these were responded to in the revised proposal and the committee recommended that the report be approved. The state funding was secured prior to the approval of the Center's proposal. The senate amended the final recommendation in the report to delete the sentence that did not pertain to the center, but to business practices of the administration of the university, and to address these practices under new business. The senate agreed to discuss this at length at the next meeting as this was not the first time that a proposal or center was pushed through by administration. There was also discussion about a department in the College of Business not being included in the process. Sam Ellis, Director for the Small Business Center said the Center for Regional Studies was looking to broaden the interest on campus, not just in the business school. The center would be built upon and provide functional support to the campus. The senate and the committee noted that the funding process that happened should not affect the approval of the report and the proposal, but it was felt that this was an important issue that should be brought forward, not only under new business, but with John Frederick.

MOTION: Sugar/Follette. To approve the report with the process language taken out of the recommendation. The recommendation would read: It is hard to deny the inherent need for this type of research and service in our rapidly growing communities and state. The review committee therefore recommends that the Senate approve the establishment of the Center for Regional Studies.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

7. Bylaws Changes, Duncan Aldrich, Chair Bylaws and Code Committee:

Hoelzer pointed out that a revision was sent out and this is what the senate should be voting on, the revision just put prior approved paragraphs back in the bylaws.

This bylaw revision would align the university bylaws with the code that had been changed to allow faculty to grieve evaluations. Currently the university bylaws state that evaluations must be contested with the peer review process. Mary Dugan has vetted this with only small changes. It is the goal of the executive board and the Bylaws and Code Committee to have something in place in time for faculty to grieve their evaluations for 2006. The Bylaws and Code Committee would continue to work on the process. Hoelzer reminded the senate that the code was contractual, and the bylaws were not.

There was much discussion regarding the senate changing the university bylaws to align with the code. Some senators felt that the bylaws revision should not be passed, but rather that the code should be changed. Hoelzer explained that the code was changed to allow institutions to use either peer review or grievance on their respective campuses, and this bylaw change was just reiterating the new changes to the code. The code change was brought before the senate and approved. At this time the biggest benefit to changing the bylaws would be for clarity for faculty, so they would know the process that they would have to follow. Hoelzer would like to see the bylaws become more than a reiteration of the code. This code change was considered just the beginning of what needed to be done. This code change and bylaw change would again allow faculty to grieve their annual evaluations. The code has two choices: peer review and grievance for evaluations. Since the UNR Bylaws currently describe a Peer Review process, faculty would have two potentially contradictory processes available for pursuing a change in their annual evaluations.

Hoelzer felt that President Glick and Jannet Vreeland would be open to further changes which might allow faculty to grieve some language in their evaluation, not just the rating. According to Hoelzer, both Glick and Vreeland were fully committed to support faculty who were trying to use the reconsideration process to make appropriate change to the text of their evaluations. If faculty have a concern about the language in their evaluation, they should contact the senate office. The senate office would then decide if there was a reasonable set of issues to bring forward. Some senators expressed concern over leaving so much trust in the hands of the administration, as it might work with this administration, but maybe not the next one. Some senators said that they were willing to take a leap of faith that they would not have made a couple of years ago, and believed that voting for the revision was appropriate. Some felt that if the campus was out of compliance with the code that the regents would have to take a look at the code.

MOTION: Kiel/Birk. To approve the bylaws revision as written.

Nelson Rojas asked to make a friendly amendment to change "Petitioners" to "A petitioner" to agree with "his or her" in 33. a. so it would read "A petitioner initiating a grievance regarding a disagreement with his or her..."

The friendly amendment was accepted.

The question was called

Call the question: Parker/Follette ACTION: Passed with 3 abstentions

MOTION: Kiel/Birk. To approve the above changes and pass the bylaws' revision as amended.

Action: Passed.

8. New Business:

No new business was discussed, but the topics that came up in this meeting would be scheduled as new business for the March 8, 2007 meeting.

Meeting adjourned 5:05 pm

Title 5 - NSHE Governing Documents
Chapter 7
University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws

Chapter II - GRIEVANCES

33. PROCEDURES FOR INITIATING A GRIEVANCE

a. Petitioners initiating a grievance regarding a disagreement with an annual evaluation rating or denial of salary increase may first request reconsideration as provided for in Subsections 5.12.3 and 5.16 of the Code as a part of the grievance procedure. In connection with review of merit pay, "denial of a salary increase" means review of the step or level of merit in accordance with Section 5.16 of the Code.

The petitioner may file a request for reconsideration regarding a disagreement with his or her annual evaluation rating or denial of salary increase, in accordance with Subsections 5.12.3 and 5.16 of the Code within 15 calendar days of the date he or she received written reasons for the action or decision. The request for reconsideration shall be submitted in writing to the petitioner's department chair, supervisor, or dean together with the reasons, arguments, and documentation supporting the request for reconsideration. The petitioner's department chair, supervisor, or dean who rendered the negative decision shall promptly direct the request for reconsideration through regular administrative channels up through the President's Office with recommendations for or against reconsideration of the decision (except that the supervisor is not required to state reasons for an adverse annual evaluation under Section 5.2.3 if the reasons for the evaluation are stated in the evaluation). Final action shall be taken within a reasonable time by the president after receipt of the recommendations.

If the petitioner is dissatisfied with the President's decision after reconsideration, within 15 working days after the receipt of the President's decision, the petitioner may file a written Notice of Grievance as described in 33c.

b. Petitioners initiating a grievance for denial of appointment with tenure or promotion may first request reconsideration as provided for in Subsections 3.4.5, 5.2.3, and 5.2.4 of the Code as a part of the grievance procedure.

The petitioner may file a request for reconsideration of the denial of appointment with tenure or promotion, in accordance with Subsection 5.2.4 of the Code within 15 calendar days of the date he or she received written reasons for the action or decision. The request for reconsideration shall be submitted in writing to the petitioner's department chair, supervisor, or dean together with the reasons, arguments, and documentation supporting the request for reconsideration. The petitioner's department chair, supervisor, or dean who rendered the negative decision shall promptly direct the request for reconsideration through regular administrative channels up through the President's Office with recommendations for or against reconsideration of the decision. Final action shall be taken within a reasonable time by the president after receipt of the recommendations, except if the President, after reconsideration, decides to recommend appointment with tenure, the final decision regarding tenure must be made by the Board of Regents.

If the petitioner is dissatisfied with the President's decision after reconsideration, within 15 working days after the receipt of the President's decision, the petitioner may file a written Notice of Grievance as described in 33c. Cases of reconsideration of non-appointment or non-reappointment as provided in Subsections 5.4.2., 5.9.1, 5.9.2, 5.9.3, and 5.9.4 of the Nevada System of Higher Education Code are not eligible for grievance (Code 5.7.2).

c. A petitioner may institute a grievance by filing a written Notice of Grievance with the Chair of the Faculty Senate within 15 working days from the date the petitioner gains knowledge of the act or omission to act being challenged. The Notice of Grievance shall contain 1) a brief statement of the act or omission to act that is being challenged; 2) the reasons supporting the grievance; and 3) the remedy sought. The chair of Faculty Senate shall serve the Notice of Grievance on the respondent at the time it is filed.

Upon completion of a hearing by the University Grievance Committee, the recommendation of the Committee shall be forwarded to the President for final decision.

Final action shall be taken by the President. However, the approval of the Board of Regents shall be required for appointment to tenure. In cases requiring the Board of Regents' approval, the President may request an oral presentation to the Regents of the reasons for and against the personnel action before final decision. (B/R 1/99)

Chapter III - PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES EVALUATION AND PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

36. EVALUATION

Each faculty member shall be evaluated in writing at least once annually by department chairs, supervisors or heads of administrative units according to the above-specified professional responsibilities. The performance evaluations of executive and supervisory faculty shall include consultation with the professional and classified staff of the administrative unit. All performance evaluations shall include a rating of (i) "excellent," (ii) "commendable," (iii) "satisfactory," or (iv) "unsatisfactory." An overall evaluation of "excellent" or "commendable" shall be considered meritorious. Each person shall submit documentation, as specified in department, unit, and University bylaws, for evaluation. The evaluation of each person shall carry a signed statement indicating that he or she has read the evaluation or has waived the right to read it. If the faculty member disagrees with the annual evaluation rating, he or she may submit a written rejoinder (Code 5.16) and/or may initiate a reconsideration and/or grievance through regular administrative channels as specified in Bylaw 33a.

All evaluations shall be initiated by the department and shall be made on the basis of equitable and uniform criteria. Evaluations of instructional faculty shall include an assessment of teaching evaluations completed by their students. Quality of performance for each area of professional activity shall be assessed according to procedures and criteria specified in department, unit, and University bylaws. For academic faculty, evaluations shall include peer review. For tenure-track faculty members, external peer review shall be required for promotion or tenure, as specified in unit and/or department bylaws. All evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with principles of judicious review, here defined as careful and professional assessment of admissible evidence materials presented so as to insure a just and equitable recommendation. Faculty shall, upon request, have access to materials used by the supervisor in writing the evaluation, including the results of, but not the originals of, student evaluations and comments, and in the case of administrative faculty whose evaluations include surveys, the results of, but not the originals or copies of, such surveys. In responding to such a request, the supervisor must ensure the anonymity of the students and the survey respondents. With the exception of the results of such student evaluations and comments and such surveys, anonymous materials shall not be

considered by the supervisor. Faculty members receiving an overall rating of “unsatisfactory” on their evaluation shall be provided with constructive feedback in the written evaluation for improving their performance. This constructive feedback must include a written plan for improvement, which must be specific and must be provided at the time of the first “unsatisfactory” rating.

37. PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

All tenure, promotion, and annual evaluations shall be made on the basis of the person's professional performance in meeting the responsibilities specified in Section 35. All such evaluations shall be initiated at the department level and forwarded to the appropriate administrator. After review, the administrator shall inform each faculty member of the final recommendation, within 15 calendar days from the date of making the recommendation. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation regarding tenure, an annual evaluation rating, a salary increase, promotion or reappointment to employment, he or she may ask for reconsideration through regular administrative channels as specified in the Code, Subsection(s) 5.2.4, 5.12.3, and 5.16 within 15 calendar days of the receipt of the written reasons (except that the supervisor is not required to state reasons for an adverse annual evaluation under section 5.2.3 if the reasons for the evaluation are stated in the evaluation).

Any changes in title of an academic faculty member within Rank 0 status shall be subject to the same established personnel review procedures as used in changes in rank.

The Code (Subsections 5.11.1, 5.11.2) requires that procedures for annual evaluation shall be established in institutional bylaws. These evaluations provide a primary source for decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and salary increases. Therefore, each unit within the University is obligated to define further the procedures employed for the annual evaluation process as well as provisions for accountability.

The purpose of meritorious evaluations should be perceived by the faculty and administration alike not only as the rewarding of excellence, but as an opportunity for each faculty member to assess his or her performance within the academic community and to improve that performance with reference to specific and uniform written criteria applied by each department or appropriate unit in the evaluation process. Moreover, it is understood that a meritorious evaluation is a matter of academic record, a recognition of performance deserving of special note, regardless of the current availability of funds for direct merit award.

(B/R 1/99)

Planning Principles for Effort Reporting Certification

- Employee compensation will not be negatively impacted.
- Any solutions must satisfy sponsor and auditor requirements.
- Employees' effort certification and compensation sources should both reflect a reasonable estimate of their job duties.
- Employees should be encouraged to participate in non-grant-supported activities that benefit the university.
- Policies should aid in the recruitment and retention of faculty and the overall growth of research activity.
- Faculty role statements and effort certification reports should be consistent.
- The university must ultimately fashion a sustainable solution.
- Solutions should preserve the essence of the university's research mission.
- Solutions should take infrastructure into account, including personnel, training, software, etc.

2006-07 Faculty Senate Executive Board Nominating Committee
Ballot
Vote for Four

_____ Donnelyn Curtis

_____ Greg Gardella

_____ Tom Lean

_____ Elliott Parker

_____ Stefanie Scoppettone

_____ JoAnne Skelly

UNR Faculty Senate BRIEFING PAPER

Agenda Item Title: Proposed Amendments to University of Nevada, Reno Faculty Senate Bylaws

Action Requested:

- Approval of amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws which allow for greater flexibility in the nomination of senators for Executive Board positions.

A Vote in Favor Means:

- The outgoing senate will vote for the next year's Executive Board.
- The title of Vice Chair will change to Chair Elect.
- Senators may be elected to Chair Elect later in their senate term.
- A substitute Senator may be elected to temporarily complete the term of a senator elected to serve as Chair Elect and Chair.

A Vote Against Means:

- The incoming senate will continue to elect the new Executive Board.
- The title of Vice Chair will not change.
- Nominees to Vice Chair must be in the 1st year of their senate term.
- Units do not elect replacements to substitute for senators elected to serve as Chair or Vice Chair.

University of Nevada, Reno
Faculty Senate

Bylaws

Article 1 The name of this association of faculty shall be the UNR Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as the "senate."

Article 2 The authority, purpose and objectives of the senate are established within the traditional concept of faculty organization in American universities, and shall be as defined in section 1.4.7 of the ~~University and Community College System of Nevada~~ **Nevada System of Higher Education** Code and in the University of Nevada, Reno Bylaws. The senate is authorized to act on questions and issues properly brought before it by the faculty of the several colleges, schools, and components, hereinafter in these bylaws called "units," of the university. The senate is authorized to take appropriate actions not in conflict with these bylaws, the bylaws of the University of Nevada, Reno, the ~~University and Community College System of Nevada~~ **Nevada System of Higher Education** Code, and the laws and statutes of the State of Nevada and the United States.

Article 3 Membership Authority

3.1 Membership and membership rights to the senate shall be extended to all faculty members elected to membership in the senate in accordance with article 4 of these bylaws.

3.2 Faculty members elected to the senate are authorized and have responsibility to represent faculty on matters of primary concern to the faculty of the university.

Article 4 Senate Membership

4.1 Eligibility to vote in nominations and elections to the senate shall be accorded to all UNR faculty with at least a .50 FTE authorized continuing contract, except that emeritus faculty shall not be eligible to vote. If a faculty member has a split appointment totaling .50 FTE or more, that faculty member may vote with the unit in which s/he has the larger FTE.

4.2 The president, provost, vice presidents, associate and assistant vice presidents, and chief administrators of units, or their administrative equivalents, shall not be eligible to hold elective membership on the senate; however, these administrators may vote with their units in elections to the senate. Chief administrators of units are defined as assistant deans and above, or their equivalents. Individual units may further restrict eligibility to election to the senate. Questions regarding eligibility for senate election shall be referred to the senate office.

4.3 The president, provost, and the vice presidents shall be nonvoting consulting members of the senate.

4.4 The term of office in the senate shall be three (3) years. Insofar as possible, an equal number of terms shall expire each year.

4.5 Members of the senate may not serve two full consecutive terms. No person shall serve on the senate **represent a unit as a senator** for more than ~~four and one-half~~ **four** years in any six contiguous **five consecutive** years. **This limitation does not apply to service as Chair Elect or Chair, as they do not represent particular units to the senate.**

4.6 Election to membership in the senate shall be held in February of each year, or as prescribed in article 5 of these bylaws.

4.7 The election process shall be supervised by the senate chair or designee(s) who shall operate under the following minimum standards.

4.7.1 Nominations and elections shall be by written ballot.

4.7.2 There shall be two (2) ballots: a nominating ballot and an election ballot.

4.7.3 Eligibility for nomination to membership on the senate shall be extended to all UNR faculty with at least a .50 FTE authorized continuing contract, except that emeritus faculty, faculty members who will *plan to* be on leave for more than three months *during their potential senate term*, and administrators as defined in 4.2 of these bylaws shall not be eligible to serve. If a faculty member has a split appointment that totals .50 FTE or more, that faculty member will be eligible for nomination in the unit in which s/he has the larger FTE. Each faculty member may nominate as many candidates as there are vacancies to be filled in the ~~respective unit of~~ *to which* the faculty member *belongs*. Nominees must indicate their willingness to serve before their names are placed on the election ballot.

4.7.4 Two faculty members for each vacancy (and ties, if applicable), who receive the most nomination votes, shall be represented for election to eligible unit faculty.

4.7.5 The faculty member with the majority of election votes shall be declared elected to senate membership.

4.7.6 In the event of a tie vote in the election ballot, a new vote shall be taken until a majority is achieved.

Article 5 Vacancies

5.1 When a member of the senate is for any reason absent from called and regularly scheduled senate meetings over an extended time period, then the executive board shall notify the unit. The faculty of the unit may conduct a special election to fill such vacancy as is created by the absent senate member. If no such election is held, then the member shall remain on the senate.

5.2 "Extended time period" is defined as member absent for more than three consecutive regularly scheduled senate meetings where no provision for proxy representation is provided, or where the absence of the member exceeds one academic semester.

5.3 Special elections to fill vacancies shall adhere to the procedures of article 4 of these bylaws.

5.4 A member of the senate may be recalled by petition to the executive board if at least 25 percent of the faculty members in the unit of the senate member, and upon the approval of a majority of the faculty members from such unit. The chair of the senate is exempt from recall, but may be removed as chair as provided in article 5.5 of these bylaws.

5.5 The chair of the senate may be impeached and removed from office by at least a two-thirds vote of the senate membership. Vote shall be by a secret ballot.

5.6 If the chair is the one and only representative of a unit, the executive board shall notify the unit. The faculty of the unit may conduct a special election to fill the vacancy as is created by the chair's inability to vote or fully represent the unit. The vacancy will be filled on a temporary basis, for the length of the chair's term as chair. The temporary term may be filled by any faculty member who, in accordance with these bylaws, is otherwise eligible to serve. The election will be conducted in accordance with these bylaws.

5.7 A senate member may appoint a proxy to serve at any senate meeting. Only one proxy may be exercised by ~~the same person~~ **any individual** at any time.

5.8 A proxy is extended all the prerogatives of a regularly elected member of the senate, provided that:

5.8.1 The regular member shall provide the secretary of the senate a dated statement of proxy representation, either by e-mail or signed memorandum.

5.8.2 The proxy representation shall in all respects be qualified for membership in the senate.

5.8.3 The proxy representation shall be appointed from the same unit of representation as the senate member.

Article 6 Voting

6.1 All members present at any meeting of the senate where the business of the senate is being transacted shall be entitled to cast one vote on any questions properly brought before the senate, and shall be entitled to cast in addition one proxy vote so long as a quorum is present.

6.2 Voting shall at all times conform to procedures established in Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, except as specified above.

Article 7 Executive Board

7.1 Each year, the senate shall elect from among its members a ~~chair, a vice chair~~ **chair elect**, a parliamentarian, and two representatives at large to the senate's executive board. The current chair will also serve on the executive board. ~~The chair, vice chair, parliamentarian, two at large representatives, past chair and senate program manager shall constitute the senate executive board. The immediate past chair and senate manager serves will serve as an ex officio members of the executive board, and the program manager serves as a non-voting consulting member.~~

7.1.1 The chair of the senate or her/his designee shall be the official representative of the senate at all functions. The chair shall preside at meetings of the senate and the executive board, and may serve in other capacities as prescribed by the ~~UCCSN~~ **NSHE** Code or the UNR Bylaws.

7.1.2 The ~~vice chair~~ **chair elect** of the senate shall assume the position of chair in the absence of the chair. **The chair elect shall advance to chair upon completion of the term of the chair.**

7.1.3 The parliamentarian shall make recommendations to the chair on matters of parliamentarian procedures.

7.1.4 The executive board may serve as an ombuds group at the request of any faculty member and use its influence to resolve issues in an amicable manner.

7.1.5 The executive board shall meet regularly to develop agendas for meetings of the full senate, to appoint senate committees, to respond to requests for information or advice, and to develop goals and policies which the senate chair will, with appropriate help from the board, seek to implement.

7.2 Election of Officers

7.2.1 ***Any elected member of the senate is eligible to become chair elect.*** Any elected member of the senate ***whose term extends through the coming senate year*** is eligible to become an officer of the senate. ~~The chair elect shall be designated as chair elect. At the annual election, and in accordance with this article 7.2, the senate reserves the right to endorse the chair elect as the new chair, or to elect another eligible member of the senate.~~

7.2.2 Election of officers shall be by secret ballot and supervised by the members of the senate.

7.2.3 The Nominating Committee will identify a slate of candidates who are willing to run for office. The slate of candidates will be presented to the senate prior to the ~~first~~ ***last*** meeting of the ~~newly elected~~ senate. The new officers will be elected at that ~~first~~ ***last*** meeting, at which time the chair may call for nominations from the floor. ~~Such meeting shall be at the call of the outgoing chair of the senate, who shall act as temporary chair until the new chair is elected.~~

7.2.4 Officers of the senate may be recalled by at least a two-thirds vote of the senate membership. Vote shall be by secret ballot.

7.2.5 If a vacancy occurs mid-term for any officer, except senate chair, the executive board will serve as the nominating committee, and will present a slate of candidates willing to run for the vacancy at the next senate meeting.

7.2.6 While serving as chair and chair elect, the chair and chair elect shall not represent a specific unit, but rather the faculty as a whole. If the chair's or chair elect's term creates a vacancy in the representation of a unit, that unit shall elect a substitute to serve during that period.

Article 8 Committees

8.1 The following shall be the standing committees of the senate.

8.1.1 Nominating Committee: The committee shall include 5 members elected by and from the senate membership. The committee shall identify a slate of candidates for senate officers.

8.1.2 Legal Advisement Committee - The committee shall consist of the executive board and two representatives at large, elected by and from the senate. The committee shall advise on the disposition of the Faculty Legal Advisement Fund and on the services of the senate's legal counsel.

8.1.3 Policy Committees - Policy committees shall be established when deemed necessary by the senate executive board. Policy committees shall be ready to report at each meeting of the senate and shall submit a written annual report to the senate. The senate chair will present committee memberships and charges to the senate.

8.1.4 Administrative Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee: The committee shall include seven members appointed by the executive board from the faculty at large. The committee shall be ready to report at each meeting of the senate and shall submit a written annual report to the senate. The senate chair will present committee memberships and charges to the senate.

8.2 Ad hoc committees may be established by the senate executive board as the occasion may demand or as requested by the senate. Ad hoc committees shall be ready to report at each meeting of the senate until discharged by the senate. The senate chair will present committee memberships and charges to the senate.

8.3 The executive board may appoint up to two students and two classified staff to serve as nonvoting consultants to each senate committee.

8.4 Joint committees of the senate and other administrative or campus governing bodies shall be formed upon agreement by the senate chair and the appointing authorities of the units of the other bodies. The senate shall elect faculty members to joint committees to study and to make recommendations on matters of concern to both groups. The senate may request interim reports of a joint committee's progress and the senate shall receive copies of all final reports and recommendations.

Article 9 Meetings

9.1 In addition to regularly scheduled meetings, special meetings may be ordered by the senate upon petition of at least 25 percent of the senate membership, or by the executive board, or upon petition of at least ten percent of the faculty at large to the executive board of the senate. Senate meetings will be convened within two weeks of receipt of the petition.

9.2 A simple majority of the voting members of the senate shall constitute a quorum for transaction of business at any meeting of the senate.

9.3 Agendas and minutes of senate meetings shall be distributed to all faculty members.

Article 10 Parliamentary Authority

10.1 The latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised shall govern the senate in all cases where these bylaws are silent.

Article 11 Amendment

11.1 A proposed amendment to these bylaws may be introduced by any member of the senate. Presentation of the amendment must be in writing.

11.2 The proposed amendment will be adopted upon approval by a two-thirds majority of the total voting membership of the senate. This vote will be conducted at the next regularly scheduled senate meeting following the meeting at which the amendment is introduced. There shall be at least two weeks between the introduction of an amendment and the vote.

11.3 A successful amendment shall become effective upon the approval of the president.

Article 12 Apportionment

12.1 The senate shall reapportion itself, if necessary, at three-year intervals.

12.2 The total body of the senate shall at no time exceed 35 members.

12.3 Apportionment shall be based on December 1 faculty head count in units. For purposes described in this section, only faculty with at least a .50 FTE authorized continuing contract will be counted. The total number of seats for a unit will be equal to the faculty head count in that unit divided by 40, with no less than 1 seat for each unit. At the time of reapportionment, a unit qualifies to receive an additional seat based on rounding up to .75 of the next increment.

12.4 Representation in the senate shall be afforded to each unit in the university. Units other than colleges and schools may be divided for purposes of representation as the senate deems appropriate, provided (1) such division is approved by two-thirds of the voting senate membership, (2) the unit created by such division is operating separately under its own approved bylaws which are exclusive of any college or school, and (3) that it be done only at the time of reapportionment.

Proposed revisions presented for first reading to the Faculty Senate on March 8, 2007.

Previous four revisions: approved by the Faculty Senate on 9.18.03, and approved by the president on 10.30.03; approved by the senate 8.24.00 and approved by the president 9.6.00; approved by senate 1.20.00 and by president 2.3.00; approved by senate 8.21.97 and by president 5.4.98.

UNR Faculty Senate Meeting
March 8, 2007
[Agenda Item #8](#)

***Board of Regents Agenda Topics
March 15-16, 2007***

Full Board Agenda:

http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-15-07--/Bor_0307web.pdf

Consent Agenda:

http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-15-07--/Consent_0307web.pdf

Topics of potential interest to faculty:

Information item: Discussion of Foundation Policies, Legal Status and Representation by Counsel:

Questions have arisen regarding the extent to which System policies apply to Foundations, and regarding representation and indemnification of System Foundations..

<http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Main-Board/Ref.-D.pdf>

Action Item (second hearing): Policy on Restricted Access Research: On August 4, 2006, in response to concerns raised about practices at UNLV, the Board of Regents requested that the Presidents of UNLV, UNR, and DRI develop a System policy on classified and proprietary research, particularly with regard to confidentiality of records. The Presidents offer a new policy to clarify when and under what circumstances research records and contracts related to research may be kept confidential.

<http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Main-Board/Ref.-L.pdf>

Action Item: Name Changes for Community Colleges: Approve the renaming of the Community College of Southern Nevada to the College of Southern Nevada and Western Nevada Community College to Western Nevada College to be effective July 1, 2007.

<http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Main-Board/Ref.-N.pdf>

Action Item: New Scholarship Endowment: A donor who wishes to remain anonymous has proposed a \$2.5 million donation to the Nevada System of Higher Education to be administered at System Administration to create a new business scholarship.

<http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Main-Board/Ref.-O.pdf>

Action Item: Cost of Textbooks: During the October 2006 meeting, Regents expressed concern over the growing cost of textbooks and its impact on students. They requested that institutions provide a summary of recent efforts on campus to reduce the cost and increase the availability of textbooks for students who cannot afford them.

<http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Main-Board/Ref.-P.pdf>

**Board of Regents Agenda Topics
March 15-16, 2007**

Committee Agendas:

Audit: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-15-07--/aud-0307.pdf>

Budget & Finance: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-15-07--/bf-0307.pdf>

Student Access Dollars: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Budget---F/BF-6.pdf>

Cultural Diversity and Security: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-15-07--/CDS-03.07-web.pdf>

Background Checks of Childcare Workers: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Budget---F/BF-6.pdf>

Student and Academic Affairs: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-15-07--/SAA-03.07-web.pdf>

Institutional Strategic and Academic Plans: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/March-2007/Student---/ref-SAA-10-03.07.pdf>

Ad hoc Technology: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-06-07--/TC-03.06.07-web.pdf>

Research and Economic Development: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-08-07--/RED-Agenda.pdf>

Investment: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-09-07--/INV-Agenda.pdf>

Ad hoc Health Sciences System: <http://system.nevada.edu/Board-of-R/Meetings/Agendas/03-22-07--/HSS-Agenda.pdf>