

**MAIN SENATE AGENDA**  
**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**  
**April 19, 2007, 1:30 p.m.**  
**RSJ 304**

*All Times Are Approximate*

1:30	1.	Roll Call and Introductions	
1:35	2.	Chair's Report	Information/Enclosure
1:40	3.	Consent Agenda	Action/Enclosure
1:55	4.	Proposed Summer Reading Program	Information
2:10	5.	Year-End Committee Report: <i>James Curtis</i> , Chair Technology Committee	Action/Enclosure
2:40	6.	Year-End Committee Report: <i>Grant Stitt</i> , Chair Campus Affairs Committee	Action/Enclosure
3:10		Break	
3:20	7.	Year-End Committee Report: <i>Barbara Scott</i> , Chair Non-traditional Faculty Task Force	Action/Enclosure
3:50	8.	Year-End Committee Report: <i>Kent Ervin</i> , Chair Salary & Benefits Committee	Action/Enclosure
4:20	9.	Year-End Committee Report: <i>Duncan Aldrich</i> , Chair Bylaws & Code Committee	Action/Enclosure
4:50	10.	New Business	Discussion
5:00	11.	Adjourn	

***Future Senate Meetings***

[UNR Faculty Senate Website](#)

May 9, 2007 at 1:30pm  
RSJ 304

June 7, 2007 at 1:30pm  
RSJ 304

***Future Board of Regents Meetings***

[NSHE Website](#)

June 21 & 22, 2007, TMCC  
Reno

August 16 & 17, 2007, UNR  
Reno

***NSHE Board of Regent's  
Meeting Summary for Senate Chairs  
March 15 & 16, 2007 Meeting***

**3. Chancellor's Report**

- Has seen greater cooperation among 8 institutions..."we really have a system".
- Working to present a unified legislative front with K-12
- Is making an offer to legislators: fund us and we'll raise more through private funds...gave hints of issues with NSHE spending perceptions by the legislature in that NSHE has not responsibly spent its dollars
- More pressure on deans/chairs to bring in foundation dollars
- On the Wednesday before the June Regents meeting, the Regents will be meeting with the Foundation Chairs to discuss the connection of Foundations to NSHE

**4. Public Comment:**

- WNCC Instructor who is also deaf asking for BoR support for building pool of interpreters...legislative efforts awaiting approval..."state of emergency"

**5. Consent Agenda:**

- Pulled: 2, 3, 4, 7,
- Remaining agenda items approved
- Item 2: Tenure Recommendations: still concerned about approving tenure...concern of the embarrassment of pulling someone's name...etc. Rest of regents still think the BoR should have final approval...all requests were approved
- Item 3: removed
- Item 4: tenure on hire: request for shorter materials or electronic materials...item approved
- Item 7: ASUN Constitution: approved

**6. Governor Gibbons**

- Talked about the \$50m shortfall with no solutions
- Reinforced his support of higher education

**7. Hire Above Schedule, UNLV**

- approved

**8. Hire above schedule, NSC**

- Approved

**10. Foundation Policies**

- This will again be addressed on the Wednesday before the June Board meeting
- Provided detail covering existing state laws which govern foundations
- Concern voiced about the foundation owning property rather than the Board...Wixom: may be important reasons why property is held by foundation...understand before we change
- Concern about infrastructure in policy to support public/private partnerships

**11. Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell**

- AB 212, AB 121 and AB 131 – career and technical education
- Gave summary of other initiatives involving technical education
- All day kindergarten bill passed through committee to the floor
- Offered her assistance to NSHE on bills and issues important to NSHE

**12. Regents' Awards**

- All approved

**13. Sabbatical Leave and Retirement Accrual**

- Clarification of language
- approved

**14. NSHE Policy on Restricted Access Research -- Pulled**

**15. Discipline-Specific Faculty Salary Schedules Adjustment**

- Why is nursing not here? Because community college nursing faculty hire range is lower. University's have higher salary ranges, plus there is a nursing task force to review salaries
- Some concern about increasing all salary ranges...rejected...Glick noted that NSHE is one of the few systems to set salary ranges and enforce them
- Will bring back the discussion about eliminating salary schedules altogether
- Adjustments approved

**16. Name Changes for Community Colleges**

- TMCC Student in support of keeping Community in name
- Anthony against
- Lucey: prefers change to College as it is better for the graduating students in explaining to employers
- Geddes against
- Focus on 3-tier system
- Sisolak in favor
- Passed to change WNCC and CCSN with 3 No's

### **17. *New Scholarship Endowment***

- Background: open account for cash endowment of \$2.5m for business scholarships throughout the system
- Gift was made to the system which requires the Regents authorize the accounting
- Passed unanimously

### **18. *NSHE Planning for the Future***

- Demographic breakdown
- Discussion of the role of K-12 on success of higher education
- Compared Nevada nationally and internationally, pointed out that there is work generally to be done and specifically in Nevada to promote student success and graduation rates
- Rogers: encouraging faculty to get out of their offices and talk to others...Rotary, etc.
- Rosenberg: suggested the Chancellor's office take the lead to connect faculty with teachers
- Whipple: Board needs to hear strategy for keeping Merit Scholars (asked Jane to bring something to the board in the future)

### **19. *Report on Legislature***

- A concern about money...reinforced frequently. It's early in the session and not atypical.
- Enrollments, budget, hold harmless. Hold harmless: when enrollments fall short, budgets will not be impacted. Right now, the gap has gone from \$17m to \$40+m. Much of the hold harmless is covered in the Governor's recommendation for NSHE. The net effect is that the base budget will go down while hold harmless goes up. \$47m in budget based on enrollment growth that has not been earned and should be subtracted from budget...those are primarily from UNLV, UNR and CCSN. Violated Letter of Intent which dictated a percentage give-back to state general fund. Instead, student fees were increased higher than mathematically possible and allocated more real dollars to general fund at a lower percentage rate. Legislators are irritated that the percentage was not honored. Now requesting the NSHE can move to a higher tuition model. Tuition increases would still go to general fund but are requesting that institutions keep the revenue generated by tuition increases. Changes to Millennium Scholarships are having an impact on enrollments. Argument to the legislature is that we have tightened requirements which will increase student success and are now punished with the reduction in funds.
- Can you track dollar-for-dollar the net result of the dollars NSHE puts in and the dollars allocated back to NSHE? No.
- Legislators are upset about what they call a violation of the letter of intent. They have requested transcripts of the meetings where the Regents have discussed the item.
- Funding allocation: Students cover approx. 20% of total cost of education
- iNtegrate: concerns from joint money committees...most about \$15 from NSHE and \$10 from state. What will you do with \$25m, can it be done, how much will

you want in the future. If we fund it now, does that give you an implicit approval of future funding. Drawing back to NOMADS example. Dan was not comfortable with his answers in that we are in the middle of the project and do not have enough information to answer. No disputes about the necessity of the project but the answers here need to be hardened up. There appears to be support. Knecht: not only create the dire picture of legacy systems but also that value that iNtegrate will deliver (improved services, etc.). White paper in process.

- Millennium Scholarship: Early promise made on scholarship that state general funds would not be needed to fund it. Now, there appears to be a need to use general funds. There are multiple bills now to address funding of this scholarship. Somewhere around 2011-2014, the fund will be empty unless the legislature identifies funds. Only way to keep the scholarship is to reduce the number of awards made. Are revisiting issues such as where this should be a need-based or merit-based.
- Planning and Capital dollars: nothing on the table at this point.
- Health Sciences System: have been asked to review their original budget and prioritize based on limited funds available. Need Regent's approval to move forward with this set of priorities with flexibility to adjust as legislators show interest. Still have \$110m in Gov's budget for capital, debates have focused on operating. Regents are adamant about ensuring that all line items are funded as the full budget is necessary in order to implement the System.

## **20. Cost of Textbooks**

- Reports presented by each institution
- Can system buying power be leveraged?
- Geddes Requested that the Board review the concept of buying out contracts for bookstores that are operated through 3<sup>rd</sup> parties (sometime after June) – Wixom concerned with doing much more...Whipple still thinks we should look into buying out the bookstores
- Crear needs to be educated..."teachers"...need oversight or approval on the books faculty use...checks and balances
- ACTION: Submit textbook policy to the regents and institutions work together to learn from each other

## **21. K-12 Superintendents' Meetings**

- Preliminary report, final expected in June
- Topics discussed thus far:
  - How do students dual-enrolled pay for textbooks? Concern that rates for everything but textbooks had been reduced and cost can be prohibitive
  - Supply and demand of teachers...not enough teachers. Combine school districts and NSHE to recruit
  - Content for training administrators
  - Elementary teachers tend not to have math competency...asked for help in requiring more math education for elementary teachers...requesting 2 years math for licensure

- No effective mechanism to identify where teachers are strong or weak...working to get response from principles to evaluate the effectiveness of the NSHE graduates

**24-30: Committee reports**

- Reports and Minutes Here:
  - [Audit](#)
  - [Budget and Finance](#)
  - [Cultural Diversity and Security](#)
  - [Student and Academic Affairs](#)
  - [Technology](#)
  - [Research and Economic Development](#)
  - [Investment](#)
  - [Health Sciences System](#)

**32: Elect or Appoint**

- Wixom: let's not take a stand now, let's have a conversation.
- Gallagher: Not sure about support of elected board because of the continued shift of population to the south. Rural counties could be heavily affected if the census requires a redistricting.
- Voted to support an elected board.

**UNR Faculty Senate  
BRIEFING PAPER**

***Agenda Item Title:***

Year-End Committee Report: Technology Committee

***Action Requested:***

Recommendation of the Faculty Senate Technology Committee that the Senate go on record as supporting adequate ongoing funding from the University to support the Campus Desktop Replacement Program.

***A Vote in Favor Means:***

The Senate supports funding for the Desktop Replacement Program.

***A Vote Against Means:***

It is not will of the Senate to go on record as supporting the funding of this program at this time.

**\*\*\* NOTE:** The full committee report will be e-mail under separate cover on Friday, April 13, 2007.

**UNR Faculty Senate  
BRIEFING PAPER**

***Agenda Item Title:***

Year-End Committee Report: Campus Affairs Committee

***Action Requested:***

- The committee recommends that both search processes and activities of the Professional Development Leave Committee be monitored to insure further concerns do not arise.
- Recommended that once the Ombudsman is hired the Senate take an active role in monitoring the annual evaluations of the person in this position and insuring that the position is operating to its maximum level of effectiveness.
- Annual Evaluations for Top Administrators - The committee concurs with the Morale Task Forces original recommendation regarding these evaluations and recommends that the Senate continue to push for this process to begin at the earliest practicable time.
- Management Training for Administrators – The Senate should continue to insist that this begin at the earliest feasible time.
- Communications - The committee recommends that those in all levels of administration from the President down to department chairs be encouraged to communicate freely and often to all who they supervise.
- Merit Pay - The committee reiterates the faculty senate task force recommendation that **no one be excluded from merit**, except because of promotion.
- Administrative Faculty Evaluations: The committee concurs with the Morale Task Forces original recommendation regarding these evaluations and recommends that the Senate continue to push for this process to begin at the earliest practicable time.
- The Campus Affairs Committee suggests that the Executive Committee decide what they wish to recommend to the Senate in terms of changing the bylaws to either increase the total number of senators or change the calculation figures utilized to determine apportionment.
- **Suggested Charges for 2007-08 Campus Affairs Committee**
  1. Continue to follow-up on implementation of policies, procedures and actions taken to achieve recommendations of the Morale Task Force.
  2. Conduct a survey of emeritus faculty to determine the understanding by this group of the availability of benefits and the extent to which the benefits are utilized.
  3. Perhaps as mentioned previously the Campus Affairs Committee could 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."

***A Vote in Favor Means:***

Accept the report and its recommendations as noted above.

***A Vote Against Means:***

Report not accepted and modifications or revisions requested.

*Faculty Senate*  
**Campus Affairs Committee**  
2006-07 Year-End Report  
Submitted by: B. Grant Stitt, Chair  
**April 5, 2007**

*Committee Membership*

B. Grant Stitt, Chair  
Bruno Bauer  
Jane Bessette  
Dhanesh Chandra  
Donnelyn Curtis  
Thomas King  
Ted Oleson  
Carley Ries  
Ann Tyler  
Jeffery Underwood  
Debbie Vigil, Liason

*Committee Annual and Standing Charges*

**Campus Affairs Committee**  
**Recommended Charges for 2006-2007**

1. Review the findings from the 2005-06 Campus Affairs Committee (attached). Complete any charges as appropriate.
2. Review the recommendations made through the Senate's Morale Task Force in 2005-06 (attached) and follow-up the recommendations to ensure implementation.
3. The Faculty Senate is currently apportioned based on headcount (Faculty Senate Bylaws are attached). The Senate is due for reapportionment this year. There have been questions about whether the apportionment should be based on headcount or FTE. Conduct an apportionment study showing the differences that would exist with apportionment based on headcount vs. FTE.

2005-06 Charges

1. Review, evaluate and report on the hiring, termination, and reassignment actions for deans and above from 1995-2005.
  - Under what conditions have hires been made without searches?
  - Is there a process for requesting an exception to search? If so, describe the process and those involved in its approval.
  - Have exceptions to searches been approved for positions at the Dean or above level? If so, identify the justifications for granting those exceptions.
  - Interim-to-permanent positions

2. Review the current Professional Development Leave guidelines and process, especially the criteria and method used to evaluate applications (sabbaticals and faculty development). Gather information about other institutions' guidelines. Ask faculty who have served on the committee over the past 10 or so years for their input about the guidelines, criteria, and process. Consider whether the committee guidelines and process should be modified. If yes, draft a proposal for recommendation to the senate. Progress report due in November. Final report and recommendations due in March.

### Standing Charges

Appoint one each liaison to the following committees: Status of Women; Work and Family Task Force; Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Advocacy Committee; Multiethnic Coalition; Intercultural Collaborative; University Disabilities Resource Coalition. Contact Michael Coray to let him know the names of the liaisons.

*Detailed Committee Activity*  
(For Each Annual and Standing Charge)

**Charge 1**

**Review findings from the 2005-06 Campus Affairs Committee**

- Research and findings

Reviewed the findings from the 2005-06 Campus Affairs Committee and as a result of discussions with Committee members carried over from the 2005-06 year concluded that their first charge was sufficiently investigated. Regarding the second charge dealing with the Professional Development guidelines and process we received a memo from Professor Ken Peak (copy on file in the Faculty Senate Office) responding to concerns voiced in last year's Committee charge. His response summary was the following:

"In summary, I believe I can speak for this year's entire PDL committee and report that the process as described above works. Many if not all of the concerns that are listed in the Campus Affairs charge were simply not in evidence either this year or last. I do believe it is a fair and objective process. As situations or challenges arise, however, the process we use may need to be adapted, but I can see no compelling reason to consider overhauling it at present."

Professor Peak did conclude his memo with a few recommendations for consideration. He also sent a copy of this memo to the Provost who oversees the PDL Committee. These recommendations were the following:

1. The PDL committee can be, and has been, placed in the difficult position of having to assess whether or not having two or more applicants on concurrent leave from the same department or unit would pose a heavy burden on the unit and its ability to offer certain courses to its students. In some cases, courses are extremely difficult or impossible to fill with LOAs. While it is certainly the right of each faculty member to apply for leave if meeting minimum qualifications, deans and chairs should address this issue (i.e., the timing of leaves and the ensuing impact on students and course offerings) at their respective levels. This matter could hopefully be addressed when such faculty first indicate they wish to apply, and then in the dean's/chair's/director's unequivocal letters to PDL in terms of support or non-support (an example would be helpful here, but, again, I must refrain from doing so). PDL is not benefited by a letter from a dean/ chair/director stating something like, "Yes, leave should be granted to both Professors X and Y, but it would pose a real hardship on us..." PDL should only have to weigh the merits of each application presented to it and not deal with, agonize over, or vote on the ramifications of faculty leaves on students, college, or department/unit.
2. Also, deans and chairs would do well to have their faculty speak in lay terms in their applications concerning how they intend to spend their leave time; using highly esoteric, technical terms from their discipline to attempt to describe their planned activities only complicates matters.

3. Also, where an applicant is an administrative faculty member, deans/chairs/directors should address and call attention to the same in their letters of support. The planned activities, prior research record, and accomplishments since coming to UNR or their last leave will be very different for administrative than for one who is on a B+ contract (and the PDL may not have a paper copies of the application at hand when deliberating).

- Actions taken

Regarding Charge 1 from 2005-06 no action was taken. Regarding Charge 2 dealing with Professional Development Leave guidelines and process, the above additional information was acquired. The Committee trusts that the Provost will take the recommendations suggested by Professor Peak under consideration for future operations of the PDL Committee.

- Recommendations (if applicable)

The committee recommends that both search processes and activities of the Professional Development Leave Committee be monitored to insure further concerns do not arise.

## **Charge 2**

### **Review the recommendations made through the Senate's Morale Task Force in 2005-06 and follow-up the recommendations to ensure implementation**

- Research and findings

First of all it should be pointed out that the recommendations of the Morale Task Force can be divided into nine areas. These are the following:

1. Ombudsman
2. Annual Evaluations for Top Administrators
3. Strategic Planning
4. Management Training for Administrators
5. Communications
6. Merit Pay
7. Service and Rotating Chairs
8. Joint and Split Appointments
9. Administrative Faculty Evaluations

Virtually everything the committee did regarding this charge takes the form of research and findings. The current status of the committee's knowledge regarding the status of the recommendations follows.

1. Ombudsman – The University has conducted a search for someone to fill this position and three candidates were interviewed. The Search Committee has forwarded their non-ranked report on all of the candidates including, exhaustive

reference checks, to the President. The Search Committee and the campus await the President's decision regarding hiring.

2. Annual Evaluations for Top Administrators - As of Spring Semester 2007 no systematic annual evaluation process has been initiated for the evaluation of all top level administrators. The committee's inquiry into this area seems to indicate that nothing has changed significantly since the Morale Task Force's final report was submitted May 10, 2006. The topic was not discussed further at any Academic Leadership Council meetings this past year.

3. Strategic Planning - The following is Provost John Frederick's response taken from a memo to Committee Chair Grant Stitt, dated January 10, 2007.

*(1) The first question has to do with Recommendation # 3 regarding Strategic Planning. We realize the UPC has been abandoned and believe that the ALC is acting in its place. Is this correct? Next, what exactly is the status of the planning process on campus? It was recommended that strategic planning be coordinated with university self study for accreditation. Is that what has happened? I guess, the simplest way for you to answer this would be outline what you see as the planning processes that we will be engaged in the future, given President Glick's philosophy.*

The UPC has not met since spring 2005 and is effectively disbanded. In its place, the Academic Leadership Council has been deliberating regularly on issues of strategic importance and providing input on the prioritization of resources. The Faculty Senate has become the reviewing body for major new units, including new schools, centers, and institutes. New policies are reviewed by all relevant entities representing students, staff, faculty, and administration. Since there were no new resources available to the campus this past year, we were not able to implement any of the budgetary priorities.

Looking to the future, the Regents mandate that strategic planning should take place at each campus every six years. It has been our intent, and remains so, to engage in our next major round of campus-wide strategic planning following the external accreditation visit this coming fall. This new round of strategic planning will be informed by the self-study that we are producing this year. Some of this is outlined in the Introduction of a strategic planning implementation report that has recently been posted on the planning web site at <http://www.unr.edu/planning>. A campus announcement will be sent out in a couple of weeks, once faculty and students have returned, to alert all to the existence of this report.

The process that will be followed in the next major round of campus-wide strategic planning is yet to be determined. The deans will be holding a full-day retreat in February to begin considering appropriate models for that process. Their deliberations will then be shared with the Faculty Senate, President's Council, Staff Employees Council, and student governments for further refinement this spring. Our goal is to design a process that has the endorsement and participation of all groups.

4, Management Training for Administrators - The following is Provost John Frederick's response taken from a memo to Committee Chair Grant Stitt, dated January 10, 2007.

*(2) The Morale Task Force recommended management training for top administrators (deans and vice presidents) be started as soon as possible (Recommendation #4). The Task Force felt that this was critical so that training could then be top-down with middle managers then learning from their superiors. What is the status of this critically needed training?*

First of all, I would defend the administrative and managerial capabilities of our deans and vice-presidents, all of whom I have found to be responsible and thoughtful individuals whose primary interest is the welfare of the university. Without exception, all have held prior positions of leadership in which they managed other units/organizations successfully before they were brought into their current positions. I am hesitant to accept a blanket recommendation that these individuals require a great deal of "management training" given their experience and backgrounds.

At the same time, I recognize that this recommendation arose from an exercise in which the university was examining the causes of low morale in various offices and departments. I believe that sometimes, the cause of unhappiness is the result of an administrative decision that faculty or staff feel is unfair or unjustified. In other cases, low morale is the result of inadequate communication. There have been several occasions when I have been asked to intervene or to investigate whether decisions made by other administrators were appropriate. In most instances, I have found that those decisions have been justified or were a reasonable exercise of that individual's judgment. In each case, we have worked diligently to ensure that the outcome has been based on factual evidence and achieved a fair conclusion. Again, I do not detect a blanket need for management training for this group of administrators.

Now, does this mean that we should ignore the recommendation and not provide any management training or professional development for supervisors? No, not at all. However, I believe that the approach taken by Human Resources in designing a comprehensive set of workshops and training opportunities for all supervisors, in which deans and vice-presidents may participate, is the appropriate path to take. These workshops are designed to highlight different specific areas of good management practice, and we can *all* learn useful things from such programs. However, I would target department chairs, directors, office managers, and other supervisors, and not just deans and vice-presidents, as the primary audience for these development opportunities.

Unfortunately, with no new financial resources, we have been unable to implement fully the training program designed by Human Resources, which called for the use in some cases of outside consultants. Nevertheless, we continue to offer in-house workshops on promotion and tenure, sabbatical leave application, personnel management, affirmative action, search procedures, fiscal management, and other matters of administrative interest, most of which are attended by deans and other campus administrators. In addition, deans and vice-presidents all regularly attend

regional and national meetings at which there are professional development and training opportunities.

5. Communications - The ALC minutes are now posted for all to review at [http://www.unr.edu/provost/alc\\_notes/alcnotes.html](http://www.unr.edu/provost/alc_notes/alcnotes.html) . It was noted that there has, however, been some delay in getting them posted in a timely fashion. The arrival of President Glick seems to have greatly facilitated communications as he meets regularly with many campus groups and encourages input from all. Though communications have improved there needs to be continued concerted efforts to insure that all attempts are made to keep channels open and accessible at all levels.

6. Merit Pay - The faculty senate task force recommended that **no one be excluded from merit** because of rank or range. President Glick supports this position. Assistant Vice-President for Human Resources Gena Jones replied to questions on this issue from the Campus Affairs committee. According to Ms. Jones:

- All academic or administrative faculty are eligible for a merit award, except those who have received during the year, or will receive on July 1, an advance in rank or range.
- Salaries do not "top out" at the maximum of the range. However, the state ceases to fund the university for merit for salary amounts above the range, so the university has to pay for these amounts out of the operations budget. Ranges are adjusted each time COLA is allocated.
- There should not be a difference because of the source of funding, e.g., grant-funded faculty should be treated the same as state-funded faculty. *However, if there are not enough funds for the merit out of the soft funds, then in some cases the merit is not being provided or is being provided at a lower amount.*

The committee reiterated the faculty senate task force recommendation that **no one be excluded from merit**, except because of promotion.

7. Service and Rotating Chairs - The following is Provost John Frederick's response taken from a memo to Committee Chair Grant Stitt, dated January 10, 2007.

*(3) The Morale Task Force was extremely concerned with the undervaluing of service on campus, especially as it relates to campus leadership and shared governance (Recommendation #7). Will you share with us any discussions you and the deans and VPs have had regarding making sure that service is adequately rewarded? This is an issue that must be encouraged from the top-down and it must be a message that is transmitted campus-wide so that service is universally recognized and rewarded.*

*Next, spinning off of its discussion of the importance of service on campus, the Morale Task Force found significant problems created in some departments due to rotating chair positions. This sometimes resulted in associate professors being put into positions of potential conflict vis-a-vis full professors in their departments, as well as having to sacrifice their career pursuits due to administrative responsibilities. The Morale Task Force recommended that "a special ad hoc*

*committee be convened to examine the function of rotating academic chairs and discuss with current chairs and their deans ways to make this essential work more effective and more desirable." It was also recommended that a permanent group of seasoned chairs to advise and mentor new chairs be selected. I know that on at least two occasions I have volunteered to be a member of such a group. To the best of my knowledge no such group has been created.*

I appreciate the task force's concern with recognition of outstanding service contributions of faculty. These concerns clearly fall into at least two categories: (i) committee service by faculty and (ii) service through assigned administrative responsibilities. With regard to the latter, there has been a significant amount of discussion among the deans devoted over the past 1 ½ years to the issue of valuing the service provided by chairs and directors on campus. We have also discussed, though not as thoroughly, the need to recognize and reward outstanding service through the annual evaluation process. I can assure you that this has been a consistent emphasis by the administration that pre-dates any recommendations from the task force. These discussions have been chronicled in the ALC meeting notes that are posted on my web site.

In recent years, the following actions related to this recommendation have been taken:

- Every year the Faculty Senate submits a list of individuals who should be recognized for outstanding committee service. These individuals are rewarded through an increase in their merit award.
- Each year, at least one or two individuals are awarded the extraordinary level of merit primarily for service contributions to the university.
- I have, on a couple of occasions, taken into special account the service contributions of associate professor department chairs when they were up for promotion to full professor.

I should hasten to note, however, that service has not, and should not in my opinion, be a deciding factor in a tenure decision. For this reason, I usually counsel young faculty to limit their service activities. It is necessary to perform sufficient service to indicate willingness to contribute to the mission of the department, but I do not advise spending a lot of time on service-related activities.

Returning to the issue of department chairs, the deans have identified the following challenges:

- Some departments have rotating chairs with terms that are so short there is no continuity of leadership in the department. Chairs turn over just at the point when they are becoming effective in their leadership role.
- Several department chair positions are filled by associate professors who risk delaying promotion to full professor (or endangering that promotion altogether) by

serving as chair. As a converse issue, not enough full professors are willing to step up to take over departmental leadership.

- There is divided opinion about whether the chair's stipend obligates chairs to take care of department business during the summer, or whether chairs should be on A-contracts. Chairs are on A-contracts in some colleges, but not others.
- Science and engineering chairs often pay themselves from grants during the summer months, and therefore cannot perform department-related service as this would be in violation of federal effort-reporting policies.
- The best chairs are the ones who find ways to delegate the service responsibilities of their departments among the faculty. More chairs need to be counseled in how to delegate tasks. This builds a departmental culture in which responsibilities are shared and faculty are engaged in the needs of the department.
- Related to the last point, for those departments with rotating chairs, a system of "succession planning" is needed to prepare the next chair, as is the case in some of our more successful departments.

I brought these points to the Senate Executive Committee (last month) for consideration. One result of our discussion is that I will form a campus-wide task force on department chair issues this spring that will have faculty members, chairs, and deans in its composition. I will begin the process of appointing members to this task force once the semester begins, but I note that this step is being taken not in response to the task force recommendations, but in response to deliberations with the deans and the Faculty Senate that were made independent of that report.

Finally, on the suggestion to create mentoring groups for chairs, this has already happened informally to some extent. I am aware of a group of chairs that get together regularly to compare notes and experiences in an effort to support one another and I have occasionally referred new chairs to this group. In addition, I would contend that it is better for a dean to mentor a chair (or to suggest a mentor) than to do this via some outside process. Chairs ideally must balance the needs with the needs of their college. For this reason, it is important that deans have an active role in counseling and mentoring chairs so that they can be most effective within the context of the college.

The committee reviewed the Provost's response to the service question and felt that the presence of annual awards for service are desirable but all told there seems to be only lip service to the recognition of the importance of service on campus. At the same time the Provost's comment that service should not be the "deciding factor" regarding tenure or promotion considerations is well taken. The committee feels that the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee to do all in its power to change the value of service, especially for senior faculty, as it exists a part of the campus culture.

Next, regarding rotating chairs and the role of chairs, the Provost will be putting together a task force to investigate all aspects of this situation and to make

recommendations for solutions.

## 8. Joint and Split Appointments

The following is from Jane Bessette's report from HR on this issue. It includes questions and the answers provided by Gena Jones.

### SPLIT/JOINT Appointments

1) Has the Provost Office & HR begun to develop detailed yet flexible documents providing guidelines to establish, manage, and evaluate joint appointments?

Nothing formal has been established other than instructing Chairs/Directors to consult with one another regarding the performance of the faculty member in their department, prior to completing the evaluation. The Chair/Director with the greatest FTE is the supervisor to complete the evaluation..

2) Have Memorandums of Understanding been established for those individuals who are on joint/split appointments?

Not to my knowledge.

9. Administrative Faculty Evaluations - An Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force was created through the auspices of Human Resources to investigate and revise the administrative faculty evaluation process. They evaluated the entire process and incorporated best practices from sources into a new evaluation process. Two factors that were recognized as needing attention were (1) communication between administrative faculty members and their supervisors and (2) the creation of a new process that enabled such communication to occur. It was decided that goal statements in the form of individual performance objectives needed to be tied to PDQs and department/unit goals. A new process was created and presented to administrative faculty at eight open meetings. The new process received positive feedback along with some recommended changes. The process is now being refined to begin next Fall. Also, it was determined that management training for supervisors and this is being undertaken.

### **Additional Findings -**

The committee feels it is required that we include at this point comments the President Glick provide at the December 8, 2006 meeting of the Nevada Faculty Alliance in response to the recommendations made by the Faculty Senate Morale Task Force. The following is taken verbatim from the NFA report on that meeting.

(President Glick) went over the recommendations of the final report of the 2005-2006 UNR Faculty Senate Morale Task Force, one by one, offering support and/or suggestions for all of them. These included (enumerated as in the Faculty Senate final report):

1. Hire a University Ombudsman: President Glick said a Position Description Questionnaire had been developed and the position will be posted in the near future.
2. Annual evaluations for top administrators: President Glick agreed, and said that should include himself, too. He concurred with 360 degree evaluations, but thought that full faculty surveys were probably not warranted annually.
3. Revise the approach to strategic planning: The UPC no longer exists, and President Glick said he felt the best strategic plans were those that could be written on 3"x4" cards.
4. Management training for all those who supervise personnel: President Glick supported this.
5. Improve communications: The minutes of the Academic Leadership Council meetings are now being distributed to faculty.
6. Not excluding anyone from merit: President Glick agreed, commenting that this should include those at the top of salary ranges.
7. Value service more, encourage senior faculty to fully engage in shared governance, find ways to make the work of department chairs more effective and more desirable, and establish a permanent group of seasoned chairs to mentor new department chairs: President Glick agreed, but commented on the challenge of judging the quality of service – a person on one committee might contribute more than someone on many committees.
8. Develop guidelines for establishing, managing, and evaluating joint appointments: President Glick recommended a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for all joint appointments.
9. Improve the evaluation process for administrative faculty: Human Resources has formed the Administrative Faculty Evaluation Task Force to review the current process of administrative faculty evaluation and propose a revised process.

The purpose of including President Glick's comments here was to show that he, in fact, supports all of the goals that the Task Force recommendations are designed to achieve.

- Recommendations (if applicable)

The following are recommendations that the committee makes regarding each of the areas delineated in the Morale Task Force recommendations.

1. Ombudsman – Regarding the Ombudsman the committee recommends that once the Ombudsman is hired that the Senate take an active role in monitoring the annual evaluations of the person in this position and insuring that the position is operating to it maximum level of effectiveness.
2. Annual Evaluations for Top Administrators - The committee concurs with the Morale Task Forces original recommendation regarding these evaluations and recommends that the Senate continue to push for this process to begin at the earliest practicable time. Perhaps the senate could request the Provost or President to create a committee to oversee the implementation of annual evaluations for top

administrators and a representative or representatives of the Campus Affairs Committee could be members of this committee.

3. Strategic Planning – The committee concurs with President Glick that strategic planning should be minimized but no the less carried out on a regular basis as dictated by the Board of Regents. The committee believe that such planning is critical to the growth and improvement of the University, but it must be done in the context of understanding the realistic projections for future resources, only in this way can the process attain a level of credibility that allows it too be taken seriously. Further, strategic plans must result in timely feedback from appropriate levels of the higher administration.

4. Management Training for Administrators – In reviewing the Provost's response regarding management training for top level administrators, the committee notes that his position seemed to deflect the need for training of top administrators down to lower level managers. The committee still stands behind the recommendation of the Morale Task Force which was, " To help administrators develop the skills to resolve conflicts and deal effectively with complex personnel problems, we recommended management training programs for all those who supervise personnel in the university." We note that the President supports this as well. Therefore, the Senate should continue to insist that this begin at the earliest feasible time.

5. Communications - The committee recommends that those in all levels of administration from the President down to department chairs be encouraged to communicate freely and often to all who they supervise. Further, the President, Provost, Vice-Presidents and Deans are encouraged to schedule regular meetings with faculty groups to hear concerns and generate dialog on all matters. At the same time the Senate Executive Committee and all members of the Senate are encouraged to communicate regularly to their constituents.

6. Merit Pay - The committee reiterates the faculty senate task force recommendation that **no one be excluded from merit**, except because of promotion. This includes faculty whose salaries are not paid by state funds. Corporate, government, and other sponsors rely on UNR to set appropriate remuneration levels (Base Salaries) for its employees. All faculty, regardless of their source of funding, should be evaluated each year through the same process as others in their unit, and be "awarded" the appropriate (consistent) Merit Increase adjustment to their Base Salary. The University should make sure that non-state-funded faculty being treated like state-funded faculty, in this regard. The University should warn non-state-funded faculty that it is their responsibility to find the funds to cover salary increases, or their percent FTE will need to be decreased, since their Contract Amount equals their Base Salary multiplied by their percent FTE. To facilitate paying for increases in salaries, OSPA should check that multi-year grant budgets assume a COLA+merit increase of, e.g., 4% per year to faculty Base Salaries. This policy should be posted on the OSPA web site, to help Principal Investigators explain, e.g., in Budget Explanations to agencies, the basis for annual increases in Base Salaries in their budgets. Note that this would not require that more funds be requested for salaries each year (although that would be an option).

If the annual funding were constant, then the % of FTE would be reduced each year.

7. Service and Rotating Chairs - In its May 8, 2006 report to the Senate the Morale Task Force recommended the following: "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." To the best of our knowledge no Senate committee was entrusted with this charge. The committee believes, as did the Morale Task Force, and as the President has concurred, that the role and importance of service needs to be a topic of discussion and the the Senate must pursue this issue. Perhaps this should be a charge for next year's Campus Affairs Committee.

Next, regarding chairs, the committee concurs with the points brought up by the Provost and applauds the creation of the Chairs Task Force to explore these issues. The committee recommends that the Senate monitor the progress of this Task Force and be sure that the recommendations provided be reviewed by the Senate help to achieve the broadest possible review.

#### 8. Joint and Split Appointments

The committee concurs with the Morale Task Force and President Glick that guidelines must be established for managing and evaluating joint appointments and recommends a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for all joint appointments. To date this recommendation has not been achieved and the Senate must further monitor this situation and encourage action as soon as possible

#### 9. Administrative Faculty Evaluations

The committee recommends that the faculty senate monitor the implementation of the new administrative faculty evaluation process and attempt to determine if previous problems have be alleviated.

### Charge 3

#### **Conduct an apportionment study showing the differences that would exist with apportionment based on headcount vs. FTE.**

- Research and findings

The Campus Affairs Committee was charged with the investigating the question of whether Senate apportionment would be any different if it was done by FTE instead of headcount. The Senate Bylaws state, "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." With the assistance of Arthur Chenin in Institutional Analysis data were obtained comparing the results of calculations using both FTE and headcount. Utilizing current data the

the new calculations result in either 42 senators using the headcount or 40 using FTE. With headcount the School of Medicine and the College of Science would have two more senators than if the FTE figures were used. The whole issue may be moot since the Bylaws specify that the total number of senators cannot exceed 35.

- Recommendations (if applicable)

The Campus Affairs Committee suggests that the Executive Committee decide what they wish to recommend to the Senate in terms of changing the bylaws to either increase the total number of senators or change the calculation figures utilized to determine apportionment.

Standing Charge. Appointed the following committee members as liaisons -  
Donnelyn Curtis - Status of Women;  
Ann Tyler - Work and Family Task Force;  
Jane Bessette- Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Advocacy Committee;  
Ted Oleson - Multiethnic Coalition;  
Carley Ries - Intercultural Collaborative;  
Tom King - University Disabilities Resource Coalition.

### **Additional Item – (Emeritus Faculty)**

In discussions with Robin Gonzalez it was suggested that the committee might begin discussion on how to determine the distribution of benefits accorded emeritus faculty and the extent to which these benefits are available and utilized across the boards. Preliminary efforts were made to put information together on this future charge and they will be passed on to next year's committee.

### **Suggested Charges for 2007-08 Campus Affairs Committee**

1. Continue to follow-up on implementation of policies, procedures and actions taken to achieve recommendations of the Morale Task Force.
2. Conduct a survey of emeritus faculty to determine the understanding by this group of the availability of benefits and the extent to which the benefits are utilized.
3. Perhaps as mentioned previously the Campus Affairs Committee could 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."

**UNR Faculty Senate  
BRIEFING PAPER**

***Agenda Item Title: Non-Traditional Faculty Task Force Recommendations***

***Action Requested:***

1. Faculty Senate to ask administration to develop system of bridge funding for NTT faculty (for shortfalls/end of funding and for emergency situations such as illness) based on years of service, productivity, track record and other criteria to be developed.
2. Faculty Senate to ask administration to phase in a system to offer B contract faculty the option of having retirement benefits paid on overload salary.
3. Charges for committee for next year to include:
  - a. continue to identify issues of concern to non-tenure track faculty;
  - b. summarize and report findings from survey of academic faculty;
  - c. complete surveys of administrative and LOA faculty;
  - d. incorporate gender as a variable in examining NTT vs TT/T distribution;
  - e. expand membership of this committee to bring new perspectives; and
  - f. propose potential solutions to strengthen and support rights and safety net for NTT faculty.

***A Vote in Favor Means:***

1. Administration will be asked to take action to develop a system of bridge funding for non-tenure track faculty.
2. Administration will be asked to phase in a system to offer B contract faculty the option of having retirement benefits paid on overload salary.
3. Committee will continue its work next year.

***A Vote Against Means:***

1. No further actions will be taken with regards to non traditional faculty.

*Faculty Senate*  
**Non-Traditional Faculty Task Force<sup>1</sup>**  
 2006-07 Year-End Report  
 Submitted by: *Barbara Scott*  
**April 6, 2007**

**Committee Membership**  
 Tim McFarling, Hans Peter Plag, Alla Safronova,  
 Barbara Scott, Lee Weber, Gary Zunino

**Committee Annual and Standing Charges**  
 (not yet established)

**Research and findings** (Data from December, 2006):

**Type of Appointment, Tenure Status, and FTE:**

Type of Appointment:	Non-Tenure Track	Tenure Eligible	Tenured
Academic n=1035	N=387 (354 FTE) 15% of all UNR faculty (19% of all FTE) 37% of all academic faculty	N=174 (173 FTE) 7% of all UNR Faculty 17% of all academic faculty	N=474 (461 FTE) 19% of all UNR Faculty (25% of all FTE) 46% of all academic faculty
Administrative n=709	N=680 (664 FTE) 27% of all UNR faculty (36% of all FTE) 96% of all administrative faculty		N=29 <sup>2</sup> (28 FTE) 1% of all UNR Faculty (1.5% of all FTE) 4% of all administrative faculty
Letter of Appointment n=783	N=781 (186 FTE) 31% of all UNR Faculty (10% of all FTE)		
All n=2527 (1866 FTE)	N=1848 (1204 FTE) 73% of all UNR Faculty (65% of all FTE)	N=174 (173 FTE) 7% of all UNR Faculty	N=503 (489 FTE) 20% of all UNR faculty

**Years of Service** (mean, standard deviation and total collective years worked)

Type of Appointment:	Non-Tenure Track	Tenure Eligible	Tenured
Academic	8.4 ± 6.7 years Range = 1 to 38 Total=3257 50% hired in last 6	3.7 ± 3.1 Range = 1 to 28 Total = 642 57% hired in last 3	18.7 ± 9.4 Range = 1 to 46 Total=8846 50% hired in last 17

<sup>1</sup> Non-traditional faculty (also referred to as “contingent” faculty in some AAUP publications) defined as any non-tenure track - administrative, academic, LOA.

<sup>2</sup> These represent academic faculty who achieved tenure and who later took administrative positions

	years	years	years
Administrative	8.1 ± 6.5 Range = 1 to 35 Total=5486 50% hired in last 6 years		21.6 ± 12.4 Range = 2 to 40 Total=626 52% hired in last 22 years
Letter of Appointment	5.6±7.2 Range = 1 to 57 Total=4338 52% hired in last 3 years		
All faculty: 9.2 ± 8.8 years (Range=1 to 57 years) Total=23,270 51% hired in last 6 years			

***Location, Rank/Range and funding sources of Non-Tenure Track Faculty***

Type of Appointment:	Location	Rank/Range	Funding Sources
Academic	Three colleges account for 76% of these faculty: Medicine – 45.6%; Sciences – 16.4%; Liberal Arts – 13.9%	Rank: 26% instructor; 43% assistant professor; 19% associate professor; 12% are professor	State: 40% Self-Supporting: 19% Grants: 40% Other: 1%
Administrative	37.5% are in four colleges/divisions: IT – 10.7%; Athletics – 10.3%; Medicine – 10%; Human and Community Studies – 7.4%. The rest are widely distributed.	Range: 57.4% are range 2 or 3	State: 50% Self-Supporting: 24% Grants: 19% Other: 7%
Letter of Appointment	Four colleges/divisions account for 68% of these faculty: Extended Studies – 18.5% <sup>a</sup> ; Medicine – 17.5%; Liberal Arts – 16.6%; Education – 15.2% <sup>b</sup>		
<p>a. Includes faculty at Fire Sciences Academy and public seminar/certificate offerings b. Includes community lead teachers who supervise student teachers</p>			

4. Issues of Concern identified by committee and from responses so far (n=98/356) to survey of academic NTT faculty:

- a. Limited/variable voting rights.
- b. NTT faculty feel “second class”.
- c. Constraints of soft \$ funding: need to reconcile committed time with needs of the institution (teaching, student advisement, proposal writing, etc.) university service (committees, faculty senate, etc.) and scholarly activity. (Currently under examination by Effort Reporting committee.)

- d. Job "Security"/Safety Net
  - 1.) Preliminary results of the survey of academic faculty indicate that 26% feel very insecure in the NTT position and 21% feel somewhat insecure. Some feel fear for job based on lack of any legal rights and being under threat of loss of job at any time.
  - 2.) Some departments may not allow academic faculty to hold appointments less than 0.5FTE, yet there are no bridge funds for temporary reductions in funding.
  - 3.) With year to year contracts, NTT faculty express worry and lack of "peace of mind" if the unexpected were to happen. Example: If faculty or family member were to become seriously ill and contract was not renewed or they were given 30 days notice, they would lose health insurance and accrued sick days and be left with no source of income.
  - 4.) NTT have worked for many years, brought in many \$ in F&A, advised many students, done service for university and community have no security.
- e. The nature of NTT contracts may not be fully explained/understood at the time in interview and/or hiring. Faculty may be confused or uninformed about differences/inequities in contracts for time to renewal, reasons for notification of non-reappointment. etc.
- f. Evaluation and Promotion:
  - 1.) Many feel that the opportunity for promotion is not available to them.
  - 2.) Criteria are the same as for tenure track, but support is lacking for time to do independent research, publication, etc. and the criteria for excellence defined by funding sources are often different than traditional criteria for promotion.
  - 3.) Faculty not mentored or informed of process after the fact.
  - 4.) SOM faculty clinical service is priority for some based on department need, but is not considered important by UNR "mainstream" promotion committee.
  - 5.) Criteria felt to change constantly – be a "moving target"
  - 6.) Some faculty left with little or no direction, some not evaluated until several years after hiring.
- g. Lack of opportunity for professional development leave, less access to funding for travel and conferences.
- h. NTT faculty asked to make long-term commitment to UNR and department mission and activities, but this is not reciprocated.
- i. Board of Regents handbook primarily addresses state-funded and tenured/tenure track faculty and in many cases, does not address the changing nature of the faculty employment status.

### **Actions taken**

1. Review of data related to UNR faculty as included in this report.
2. Developed and implemented on-line survey of academic non-tenure track faculty (currently underway).
3. Will work with NFA on upcoming forum to identify issues of concern to administrative faculty.

### **Recommendations (if applicable)**

4. Faculty Senate to ask administration to develop system of bridge funding for NTT faculty (for shortfalls/end of funding and for emergency situations such as illness) based on years of service, productivity, track record and other criteria to be developed.
5. Faculty Senate to ask administration to phase in a system to offer B contract faculty the option of having retirement benefits paid on overload salary.
6. Charges for committee for next year to include:
  - a. continue to identify issues of concern to non-tenure track faculty;

- b. summarize and report findings from survey of academic faculty;
- c. complete surveys of administrative and LOA faculty;
- d. incorporate gender as a variable in examining NTT vs TT/T distribution;
- e. expand membership of this committee to bring new perspectives; and
- f. propose potential solutions to strengthen and support rights and safety net for NTT faculty.

**UNR Faculty Senate  
BRIEFING PAPER**

***Agenda Item Title:*** Report of the Salary & Benefits Committee

***Action Requested:***

Faculty Senate endorsement of the recommendations of the committee:

- (a) The university administration should be encouraged to fund salary equity adjustments in future budget years as a regular policy and to eliminate the age factor in administrative faculty salary assessments as soon as feasible.
- (b) The NSHE Retirement Plan Advisory Committee should be encouraged (1) to add an investment plan sponsor that provides lower-cost mutual fund alternatives, including a broader selection of passively-managed index funds, than are available from the current three vendors and (2) to make comparative performance data on the investment plans sponsors available to all plan participants.
- (c) The university administration and BCN Benefits Office should be encouraged to provide Certified Financial Planner services as an employee benefit.
- (d) The university should develop a general policy on how academic units provide for parental leave for teaching faculty during academic terms, including both guidelines for teaching release for the individual employee and resource commitments for academic units to provide substitute instructors.
- (e) The 2007-2008 Salary & Benefits Committee should be charged with following these and other issues detailed in the full report presented to the Faculty Senate.

***A Vote in Favor Means:***

The policy recommendations will be presented to the administration with the full support of the Faculty Senate. The recommended committee charges for 2007-2008 will be submitted to the Executive Committee.

***A Vote Against Means:***

The recommendations will not have Faculty Senate endorsement.

*Faculty Senate*  
**Salary and Benefits Committee**  
 2006-07 Year-End Report  
 Submitted by: *Kent M. Ervin*  
 9 April 2006

*Committee Membership*

Bonmaldi-Moore, Lorraine	Nursing
Charles, Patty	Internal Medicine
Coronella, Charles	Chem & Met Eng.
Ervin, Kent (Chair)	Chemistry
Hayes, Michaun	PBA
Lange, Horst	Foreign Lang. & Lit.
Meyer, Russ	Residential Life
O'Callaghan, Angela	So. Area Ext.

*Committee Annual and Standing Charges*

**1.** Monitor the implementation of regular salary equity studies, in particular the elimination of age as a factor for Administrative Faculty salary equity surveys.

*Research and Findings:* The committee met with Gena Jones, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, to discuss these and other issues. Human Resources conducted a salary equity assessment study during the past year. For the first time, the local cost-of-living versus the peer institutions was included as a factor in the analysis. In the study, no issues of inequities on the basis of gender, ethnicity, or age were found. A relatively small number of faculty employees were found to meet criteria for salary adjustments relative to the salary predicted by the study, if funding becomes available. These cases have been referred to the President's Council by H.R.

On the issue of elimination of age as a factor for the Administrative Faculty salary equity assessment, the Human Resources department is currently studying how more appropriate information on years of relevant experience could be included in the study in the future. Because this information is not currently available in the personnel data system, it would require collection and verification of the data, which is a large task requiring resources, as well as clear policies on how to determine what kind of experience is considered relevant for each administrative position. The committee suggests that the initial data collection and verification process could be done efficiently as an addition to the annual review process, then in the future through the hiring process.

*Recommendation:* The university administration should be encouraged to fund salary equity adjustments in future budget years as a regular policy and to eliminate the age factor in administrative faculty salary assessments as soon as feasible.

*Recommendation:* The Salary & Benefits Committee for 2007-2008 should be charged with continuing to monitor salary equity assessment issues.

## 2. Track progress of retiree benefits legislation

*Research and Findings:* New regulations by the Governmental Accounting Standards Boards (GASB) require states to account for the future cost of retirement benefits. This represents a liability of unknown magnitude for retiree health benefits under the Public Employees Benefits Plan. It is our understanding that no final action has yet been taken by the legislature that would affect NSHE retiree benefits. We are confident that the NFA, UNR, and NSHE legislative liaisons are appropriately following these issues. Quoting from Jim Richardson's March 11 legislative report: "Concerns about the health program and the liability for retirees continues to be a major topic of conversation at the legislature. Several bills have been introduced, and we are still awaiting introduction of the Governor's bill that will set up the trust fund to start dealing with the so-called GASB problem, which means public entities will be forced to show all liabilities for future benefits promised to retirees. We are also awaiting introduction of the bill deriving from the four year study done by the legislature under ACR 10. This bill will recommend a number of changes in how PEBP operates as well as how members of that important board are chosen."

*Recommendation:* For 2007-2008, the Salary & Benefits Committee should be charged to review the impact of possible changes in health benefits for retirees.

## 3. 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.

*Research and Findings:* The NSHE Retirement Plan Advisory Committee (RPAC) is currently conducting its regular 5-year review of the three retirement plan sponsors (AIG VALIC, Fidelity, and TIAA-CREF) to be completed at its June 2007 meeting. At that time the RPAC will decide whether to renew these vendors or else to solicit a new Request for Proposals. For the first time as part of its 5-year review, the RPAC has requested that the overall investment returns and management expenses be reported by each of the three plan sponsors in a uniform report format developed by the RPAC. Comparative information on the performance of the plan sponsors will be useful. The committee is concerned that the three current plan sponsors do not offer mutual fund options that represent the lowest expenses or the broadest range of passively-managed index funds that are now available in the investment industry.

A Roth 403b alternative (post-tax contributions) to the voluntary traditional 403b plans (pre-tax contributions) was recommended for approval by the RPAC at its January 2007 meeting. The Roth option would be attractive to plan participants who expect to be in a higher tax bracket in retirement than when they make contributions. Implementation is subject to approval by the Chancellor and dedication of resources to draw up the legal plan documents.

*Recommendation:* The NSHE Retirement Plan Advisory Committee should be encouraged (1) to add an investment plan sponsor that provides lower-cost mutual fund alternatives, including a broader selection of passively-managed index funds, than are available from the current three vendors and (2) to make comparative performance data on the investment plans sponsors available to all plan participants.

*Recommendation:* The Salary & Benefits Committee should be charged to continue to monitor retirement plan investment options and plan performance in 2007-2008.

## 4. Review the possibility of establishing an educational program on retirement investment strategies for faculty.

*Research and Findings:* Anecdotal evidence suggests that many faculty members are poorly informed—and some are poorly motivated to learn—about investment strategies that are important to their future financial health and

ability to retire comfortably. The committee considered the possibility of a financial seminar program, but concluded that individual circumstances are sufficiently unique that the availability of individual financial counseling would be much more beneficial to faculty members. The services of a Certified Financial Planner (CFP) could be a benefit provided in a manner similar to the Employee Assistance Program or the ancillary insurance programs. The financial counseling should be independent of the retirement investment plan providers (i.e., AIG VALIC, Fidelity, TIAA-CREF for mandatory Retirement Plan Alternatives and voluntary 403b plans; ING and Hartford for the State of Nevada 457 plan). The CFP should be able to consider a faculty member's entire retirement and financial situation, with information provided voluntarily by the faculty member. UNR or NSHE cannot directly provide investment advice because of the fiduciary liabilities and federal regulations. Therefore, the committee recommends that the university contract with a qualified Certified Financial Planner for free or discounted individual fee-based financial planning sessions for faculty. The contracted CFP should *not* be promoting investment products or be paid by commission. Initially a pilot program might be started for faculty who have just earned tenure status, as that is a career point where consideration of long-term financial issues is particularly appropriate, or after 5 years of employment for non-tenure-track academic and administrative faculty.

*Recommendation:* The university administration and BCN Benefits Office should be encouraged to provide Certified Financial Planner services as an employee benefit.

*Recommendation:* The 2007-2008 Salary & Benefits Committee should be charged with promoting and monitoring the implementation of a financial planning benefit.

5. 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.

*Research and Findings:* A Request for Proposals for voluntary ancillary insurance programs has been issued by the NSHE benefits office with a due date of late Spring 2007. Michelle Kelly, recently appointed as BCN Benefits Manager, assures us that a primary consideration in selection of vendors will be that the previous participants could be transferred to new plans without interruption and without new evidence of insurability. Their target is for a new enrollment period in Fall 2007 with a start date of January 2008.

*Recommendation:* The 2007-2008 Salary & Benefits Committee should be charged with providing input on and monitoring the impact of new ancillary insurance programs.

## *Other Issues*

1. Following up on a charge from 2005-2006, the committee asked the Faculty Human Resources Office (Tim McFarling and Kim Beers) to provide information on its progress in implementing procedures for “onboarding” new faculty hires. A comprehensive resource guide for new faculty and unit administrators is being developed. The preliminary guide is available at <http://www.unr.edu/workingatnevada/>. The committee greatly appreciates the efforts of the Faculty Human Resources Office in streamlining and improving faculty search and hiring procedures.

2. The committee discussed policies for parental leave for Type B teaching faculty during academic terms.

*Research and Findings:* Faculty members may take extended leave for new-child duties or other family and medical under provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act. Type A (12-month) faculty may use both family sick leave and annual leave for a paid portion leave under FMLA. Type B (10-month) faculty have less flexibility because they do not have annual leave and because scheduled teaching duties are difficult for departments to cover. Temporary instructor substitutes during the middle of a course are difficult for students, so flexibility in providing semester-long teaching releases is ideal. There is apparently no uniform university policy for how teaching responsibilities for faculty on extended family or medical leave are covered by academic units. Anecdotal evidence suggests that (1) faculty members are poorly informed about their parental leave rights, (2) some academic units have limited or no resources to hire substitutes, which especially impacts small departments, and (3) individual faculty employees have had difficulty in negotiating these issues with supervisors. A well-defined policy for parental leave is important for recruiting new faculty and for enhancing the productivity of current faculty.

*Recommendation:* The university should develop a general policy on how academic units provide for parental leave for teaching faculty during academic terms, including both guidelines for teaching release for the individual employee and resource commitments for academic units to provide substitute instructors.

*Recommendation:* The 2007-2008 Salary and Benefits Committee should be charged to provide input on and monitor the implementation of a policy on parental leave for teaching faculty. This should include an investigation of how various academic units and other institutions handle these issues.

3. Interest has been expressed in the option of Type B 10-month contracts for administrative faculty. This might be an attractive and efficient model for administrative positions that have primary duties during the academic year, in Student Services for example.

*Recommendation:* Refer this issue to the Administrative Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures Committee for 2007-2008.

**UNR Faculty Senate  
BRIEFING PAPER**

***Agenda Item Title:*** Report of the Bylaws & Code Committee (BCC)

***Action Requested:***

1. The BCC recommends that next year's charge include a critical review of the recently passed 'reconsideration and grievance' procedures in the UNR bylaws. The revisions were done very quickly this winter, and though we believe they are functional, we also believe that some additional work might better provide for faculty needs – for example, is there a role for the Ombudsman in the process?
2. The BCC recommends continued review of the bylaws templates, to include extracting a template for department bylaws.

***A Vote in Favor Means:***

Recommended amendments may be pursued by the 2007-08 Bylaws & Code Committee regarding the reconsideration and grievance processes.

***A Vote Against Means:***

The BCC will not pursue additional amendments.

*Faculty Senate*  
***Bylaws and Code Committee (BCC)***  
2006-07 Year-End Report  
Submitted by: ***Duncan Aldrich***  
***April 6, 2007***

*Committee Membership*

Duncan Aldrich, John Davis, Fred DeRafols, Susan Lentz, Carol Ort, Andrew Nolan, Jacquelyn Sundstrand, Robin Gonzalez

Annual Charges

1. The 2001-2002 Bylaws and Code committee created a set of bylaws templates for use by departments and units in creating and updating bylaws. Review those templates, make updates and recommend a scope and method for implementation. The 2005-06 Bylaws & Code Committee suggested that all units and departments re-write bylaws to fit the new model.
2. The Committee has received complaints that a bylaws review procedure that tracks the progress of bylaws as they proceed through the approval 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.

Standing Charges

1. Chair serves on the University Policy (administrative manual) Board. Report as necessary to give senators an opportunity to provide input on proposed changes.
2. In consultation with the executive board, review all proposed revisions to the NSHE Code and analyze the potential impact of such revisions on faculty. In the event that those revisions are implemented at the system level, make recommendations regarding whether affected sections of the UNR Bylaws should be reconciled with the Code revisions. In instances where the committee finds a discrepancy between the UNR Bylaws and the Code, and believes that the position taken in the UNR Bylaws is preferable to the position taken in the Code, make recommendations for modifying the Code.
3. In consultation with the executive board, review and make recommendations on new or revised unit and department bylaws.

*Detailed Committee Activity*  
(For Each Annual and Standing Charge)

- Actions taken

1. Departments placed in receivership – the question was raised regarding policy for operation of departments that for whatever reason are unable to operate themselves. The BCC considered a draft policy which the Executive Board subsequently discussed with President Glick.
2. In November the UNR faculty voted to approve bylaws changes that had been drafted over the past couple of years, including a new 'peer review' process for disputing annual evaluations. The peer review process replaced the past reconsideration and grievance procedure which was thought to be out of compliance with NSHE code/policy.
3. The BCC reviewed a question regarding the policies and procedures statement for the Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology and Physiology graduate program (CMPP) – the question being whether the policies and procedures should include a sunset provision. The BCC recommended that the CMPP procedures should refer to section 6,045 of the University Administrative Manual (UAM), "Curriculum – Elimination of Degrees, Majors, or Programs."
4. The BCC worked extensively on several proposed UAM revisions. A major focus was on UAM Section 48, "Unit Bylaws," to meet our specific annual charge to revise this section having to do with the steps through which unit bylaws go for review. We are reworking one final piece of that and expect it will be accepted by the UAM Committee in May. The BCC also re-drafted UAM Section 2,513, "Course Buyout Policy," clarifying provisions for reduction in instructional FTE (the UAM Committee has subsequently accepted). We are sending comments to the UAM committee on a recent proposal regarding UAM Section 2,640, "Resignation and Termination for Faculty Members."
5. In December the Board of Regents adopted NSHE Code language that would allow 'reconsideration and grievance' of annual evaluations at NSHE institutions that tie evaluations to merit (which UNR does). In January the Faculty Senate Executive Board requested that the BCC propose a revision to the UNR Bylaws that would incorporate this change in the NSHE Code. The BCC proposed revised language that dropped the 'peer review' provisions for evaluation, replacing them with a 'reconsideration and grievance' process. This was accepted by the Faculty Senate and then the full faculty. It has since been approved by the Regents.
6. The BCC reviewed the School of Medicine Bylaws – the process served somewhat as a test of the 'Unit Bylaws' procedures we revised. What was very successful was working closely with the UNSOM Bylaws committee – with whom we spent most of an afternoon discussing our recommendations regarding their draft bylaws.
7. Unit Bylaws template (committee charge). The BCC has begun review (and revision) of the 'academic unit' template and expects to conclude work on the review by the end of the semester. We will propose that the 'administrative faculty' template be reviewed this autumn and that a 'department' template based on the 'academic unit' template be done this fall also.
8. Two other unit bylaws – Library and Mathematics – have been received and will be reviewed as soon as possible. One thing that has become apparent in our work this year is that the review of unit bylaws is very time consuming. Some strategizing is in store to devise best approaches to working through the unit bylaws review process.

- Recommendations (if applicable)

1. The BCC recommends that next year's charge include a critical review of the recently passed 'reconsideration and grievance' procedures in the UNR bylaws. The revisions were done very quickly this winter, and though we believe they are functional, we also believe that some additional work might better provide for faculty needs – for example, is there a role for the Ombudsman in the process?

2. As noted in 7 above, the BCC recommends continued review of the bylaws templates, to include extracting a template for department bylaws.