

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Meeting Minutes January 18, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 7

**1. Roll Call and Introductions**

Present: Denise Baclawski (ES), Gale Craviso (SOM), Maureen Cronin (SS), David Crowther (COE), Donnelly Curtis ((Library), Bill Follette (CLA), Greg Gardella (IT), Hatice Gecol (EN), Terry Henner (SOM), Guy Hoelzer (COS), Cindy Kiel (Research), Tom Lean (A & F), Normand LeBlanc (SOM), Bourne Morris for Howard Goldbaum (JO), Elliott Parker (COBA), Elliott Parker for Cynthia Birk (COBA), Ron Phaneuf (COS), Mark Pinsky (COS), Hans-Peter Plag (COS), Steve Rock (COE), Nelson Rojas (CLA), Stefanie Scoppettone (Dev), Barbara Scott (SOM), JoAnne Skelly (COOP), Mary Stewart (CLA), Judith Sugar (HHS), Patricia Swager (SOM), Mark Teglas for Esmail Zanjani (CABNR), Debra Vigil (SOM), Virginia Vogel (CLA), Leonard Weinberg (CLA), Leah Wilds (CLA).  
Absent: Bob Chaires (HHS), Michelle Gardner (PRES).

Guests: John Mahaffey, Pat Ghezzi, Nick Coltrain, Tammy Freeman, Diann Laing, Sharon Brush, Kathy Shively, Jack Hayes, Mark Brenner

**2. Request to Approve December 13, 2006 Meeting Minutes:**

MOTION: Baclawski/Vigil: To approve the meeting minutes as drafted.

ACTION: Passed unanimously.

**3. Chair's Report**

Chair Hoelzer reported that at this point, he could not be reached by campus phone yet, but hoped that the problem would be solved soon. The regents changed the code, mandating that UNR allow linked grievance of evaluation and merit, this would mean a change in the UNR bylaws to become compliant with the code and to the liking of the faculty. This would need to be done as quickly as possible so that the bylaw could be voted on in February and the change in place for evaluations this year. The date of the March senate meeting is still uncertain and To Be Determined. The Ombudsman search has progressed to the short list stage, and it looks like we have 4 very strong candidates for interviews starting about January 29, 2007. Following the senate discussion at the December meeting, the executive board started discussions toward creating a textbook fund that could receive donations from both faculty and alumni, which would help defray the costs of textbooks for students. Hoelzer gave the senate a little background information on the disagreement between the chancellor and the regents. The chancellor appointed a lobbyist for the Health Sciences Center and there was concern that he circumvented the normal search procedure, involving the regents. The legislative session would begin February 5, 2007 and it was important to have this lobbyist in place prior to the beginning of the session. The discussion became heated and the Chancellor quit saying that the Regents don't know how business gets done. The next day, cooler heads prevailed and Chancellor Rogers and Regent Leavitt worked out their differences and the Chancellor withdrew his resignation in the 72 hour time period.

**4. Resolution on the development of a University of Nevada Honor Code:**

**Resolution on the development of a University of Nevada Honor Code**

The Academic Standards Committee has unanimously supported (at its meeting on December 7, 2006 and by email following that meeting) the following resolution:

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Meeting Minutes January 18, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 7

The Academic Standards Committee proposes to ask the UNR student government to develop an Honor Code statement that describes the state of personal and social integrity to which students should aspire, and asks Faculty Senate approval to do so.

In researching our charge to develop an honor code, it became clear to us that the Honor Code should complement the existing Student Code of Conduct as an overall statement of values, as contrasted with the specific rules, punishments, and procedures in the Student Code of Conduct. The purpose of a broad statement of that kind is to challenge students to aspire to high standards of personal integrity and of citizenship in the University community. The Academic Standards Committee feels that the Code will be more meaningful and have a greater chance of positive impact if the process of arriving at the Honor Code is isomorphic with its ultimate purpose. Thus, in our view, students themselves should be supported by faculty in examining this issue and arriving at a formal Honor Code.

Other campuses that have taken this student-focused approach have found it to be very successful and they emphasize the importance of this process of development. Examples include the University of Colorado, which has the following student-generated statement in every classroom on a plaque:

*On my honor as a University of Colorado at Boulder student I have neither given nor received unauthorized assistance on this work*

and Valparaiso University, which requires that every student write out the follow Honor Code in full and sign it for all work submitted for academic credit:

*I have neither given or received, nor have I tolerated others' use of unauthorized aid.*

We recognize that student government would have the right to proceed independently on this matter and to make recommendations directly to the administration, but we feel that the students will recognize the importance of faculty endorsement as part of this process. It is our suggestion that Academic Standards offer to the students to have a faculty member from the committee serve as a liaison to help them in their work. By having a liaison work with the students we would hope to maximize the likelihood that the product would be one that we as a committee could fully support. We propose that any language developed by the students be considered by the Academic Standards Committee and our recommendations be forwarded along with the student proposal to the full Faculty Senate for consideration.

John Mahaffey a member of the Academic Standards Committee spoke about an honor code being a collaborative effort with the faculty senate and the ASUN. The committee's suggestion was to have a couple of members of the academic standards committee work with the ASUN on this, and the committee asked that the resolution be brought forward to the senate for endorsement. The honor code language would be more meaningful if generated by the students. There was discussion about educating students in the honor code, where would the enforcing authority lie, what about GSA being included. The senate made a friendly amendment to include GSA in the resolution.

MOTION: Weinberg/Parker: Move to accept the resolution as presented.

ACTION: Passed unanimously.

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Meeting Minutes January 18, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 7

**5. Items of Interest on the January Board of Regents Meeting Agenda**

Hoelzer said he had no real commentary on the links that the senate received, but asked senators if they had comments that they would like him to bring forward to the regents.

*Handbook Revisions:*

Greg Gardella expressed concern that with the policy change, that the board secretary could make changes that might not appear to have substantive changes, yet could be more far reaching than anticipated. Hoelzer explained the rationale behind the regents considering this as the regents desire not to deal with minutia; however it could open the door to a problem. Steve Rock spoke with Dan Klaich, who said that the regents are trying to decide, where that line is, what is substantive and what would be administrative minutia. Hoelzer said that there have been changes made to the manual yet not going through the regents in the past year that have been substantive and problems have been generated. Cindy Kiel mentioned that one of the changes made to the manual that was not well publicized was that a 12 month faculty must take annual leave for outside consulting. No one knows how it was changed. It was a substantive change of faculty rights, as faculty used to be able to take 1 day per month for consulting. Hoelzer said that these changes seem to be made too easily and in some cases without notification, let alone consultation. Regents such as Sisolak hate dealing with minutia. Senators discussed what level of involvement in decision making policy changes the senate chairs should have and can we research other models if this one is not effective, timely notification issue, and ease of access of changes on the regents' policy and procedures.

*Disciplinary Proceedings and Expunging of Disciplinary Records:*

This would allow for expunging of disciplinary student record after 6 years if someone requests this.

*Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum:*

Regents are hearing the concern and are listening to the parents regarding the change in the core curriculum for incoming students. Some regents have children caught in the middle of this as well, so this should not slip through the cracks.

**6. Strategic Planning**

John Frederick, Executive Vice President and Provost reported on Strategic Planning. When President Lilly came on board with a desire to conduct strategic planning, there was a well defined process which many on campus did not understand. There were four different phases of strategic planning conducted and the campus came to understand the process better. The plans done by departments and colleges have improved, however, the university's had not improved immensely, a major addendum was added to the original in 2002/03. The university needed to discuss what was achieved through the planning. The university had been conducting a self-study as part of the accreditation process with a site visit in October 2007. Standard One of the self-study required a response to what the campus had done regarding strategic planning. When the plan was done, there was a tendency by campus to put the strategic plan on a shelf and let it gather dust. This plan had a major impact on the campus; particularly with college reorganization. Frederick thanked Diann Laing for creating the presentation. There were five major objectives covered in the presentation: educate, explore (research), engage (our community), enable (infrastructure), enhance (to improve campus environment).

Strategies and major point of the objectives:

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Meeting Minutes January 18, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 7

Educate: expand undergraduate involvement and scholarly activities and other learning opportunities, encourage study abroad, develop new assessment instruments, strengthen core curriculum, enhanced graduate education.

Explore: recruit and retain high quality scholars in all systems, define promotion and tenure criteria in every program, target a select number of signature scholarly, research and creative activities.

Engage: make university more acceptable by identifying and engaging facilitators and communicating better with the external community, meeting state economic, environmental, social, and special development needs, increase faculty participation.

Enable: Information Technology sources of support, parking, space (Getchell long term tear down and turn into administration building, short term, and a student resource learning center) work to remove the financial obligation of the Fire Science Academy, ERP, streamlining administrative function, develop library. Frederick would like to return at a later meeting to discuss the plans for Getchell Library. There will possibly be 8-10 classrooms in Getchell and the auditorium in JTSU would become a lecture hall.

Enhance: foster a culture that embraces diversity, enhance recruitment/access for students, build more residential communities to provide a campus residential environment for more students, promote participation in more co-curricular learning opportunities, improve student communication and orientation, improve working conditions for faculty and staff, enhance campus safety, enhance undergraduate student educational experience by improving access to advising services.

The regents mandated strategic plan every eight years, but UNR would be using the accreditation study as the basis for the plan. A Deans' retreat was to be scheduled in three weeks to discuss how to describe the process so that everyone has the appropriate amount of input and involvement in the process. Frederick would then bring the proposal forward to the Faculty Senate, ASUN (Associated Students of the University of Nevada), GSA (Graduate Student Association), SEC (Staff Employees Council) for agreement from all groups about how to conduct the process next time. The expectation of ICR affecting stipends was that they would be steady, but no increases, although the formula might change.

### 7. Effort Reporting

Hoelzer said that he would turn the floor over to Cindy Kiel for a brief presentation on effort reporting and the go around the table and give each senator a chance to speak and ask questions. The will open up discussion to all. Kiel distributed handouts which included:

*Cost Accounting Standards* which is the agreement between the university and the federal government, and tells the government how we are currently following the regulations.

*Federal regulations*: those sections that pertained to effort reporting.

*Summary* of what is contained in those regulations

These are currently what the law requires from us, what we should have been doing for the last 20 years.

In August, effort reporting responsibility switched from the controller to Office of Sponsored Projects, the cost accounting standards have not been updated to reflect that change yet. It could take two years for federal government to accept the changes to the university's cost accounting standards.

Kiel introduced Tammy Freeman who began as an Effort Reporting Specialist in September.

Freeman previously worked at Desert Research Institute (DRI) in Effort Reporting and would be implementing the new electronic system at the university. Freeman showed faculty how to navigate through the system which would be in use next reporting cycle. Everyone who would be required to certify would receive an email with a link to the system. If you think that you should have received an

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Meeting Minutes January 18, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 7

email regarding effort reporting and have not, please call Kiel. The person who works the time should certify for themselves but the PI can set the system otherwise and certify on another's behalf. If changes are made to the screen, then a message goes to the reviewer for electronic review. Anyone, who charges time to a grant regardless whether they are "A" or "B" contract or when that money is received, must report. The federal regulations require that reporting be done by academic term, but no less than twice a year. Freeman had identified people in each department or unit that would serve as pre-reviewers.

Cost sharing directives were under the Office of Management and Budget in the federal government. These directives were not part of the regulations if mandatory cost sharing commitments, then must track, if volunteered that cost share in the budget of the proposal then it would become mandatory upon the award that the cost share was tracked, however if not in the budget, then no need to track it. Honesty was important. Cost share was a good thing, but remember that it would drive down the F & A, but again, remember honesty in reporting.

Senators offered the following questions of comments:

The challenge of this issue would be what we need to do as faculty and how we could pay for the development of new proposals.

How can you charge 100% if you aren't spending 100% and you must follow regulations but how could we create a situation where we didn't undermine research efforts on campus...especially when there were many 100% researchers.

We're in a mode to deal with it after the fact, but we would need to look at this in the future and work out the details before a grant was submitted. If a grant was submitted with 5% effort, where does the information go? The funding agency would see the salary side that would show up on the invoice or statement. If audited, then these are looked at. There was a 25% adjustment allowance for effort, as long as stay within that, and then it wouldn't need to go back to the agency.

Classified staff report monthly, student workers, keep time cards which are sufficient. Records needed to be kept for the time period of the project plus three years. Suitable means would only be necessary if certifying on behalf of someone else. Suitable means has not been well defined until this point. If work on two grants, with estimate of 20% of time on one grant and 50% of time on the other, but actually spend 15% and 40% and no cost share was submitted, where do I go from there, where would the salary differential come from? The assumption from the agency would be that when you apply for a grant that you would reasonably budget for that grant, including cost sharing. This would be something that should have been thought of at the proposal stage, not at the award stage. The feds were most concerned about one grant paying for the effort of another grant however, if you had a core that crossed several projects that would need to be articulated in the proposal which would allow you to have fluidity across grants. Feds require a "Reasonable means of allocation". The preference was that the cost share not be claimed unless it was required by the grant. How was the administration taking care of the 10% of the time, so that 100% was not put into the project? The regulations state that part of the F & A should go to pay the salary for the 10% of the proposal writing time. Frederick replied that this would require a lot of discussion, as both the use of F & A or state funds would probably require some cuts. Concern was expressed that faculty (both A & B) that were fully grant supported would not have any flexibility. Kiel said that the cost of accounting standards allowed a reasonable flexibility of 5%. The example given was that if a faculty member served on the senate and spent approximately 4 or 5 hours per month on senate service, then taking into consideration all of their time work during the month, they could be in the 5% flexibility range. When the time came to do the effort reporting and they decided that 3% was spent in senate service then they would report 97% on the grant. The changes would be less than 5%, so no need for a cost

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Meeting Minutes January 18, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 7

transfer to be done and no salary reduction and still be accurate in their effort report. (This would need to be 5% overall, not per grant). Consistency was important, reporting the same data in all places would be consistent in an audit as each agency could decide what paper trail they would like to follow. While Digital Measures data was not public if an agency requested to review the information it would be discoverable information.

The university would hire people on soft money and expect them to do other things. Do we need to alter expectations and then how they are evaluated? In the School of Medicine (SOM), it is an extensive practice to ask 100% soft funded faculty to teach. Frederick said the university would need to review that practice.

The effort report was printable, classified employees would be completing the report monthly and the department coordinator, the pre-reviewer, and/or the employee would be able to print the report.

The regulations had not changed, only the practice had changed, which was triggered by a glitch in the system that did not recognize the change in object codes for LOA activities. If a faculty member worked 8 days in January on their project, 3 days over spring break, and 5 days in May, at the end of May they would receive an effort reporting form, certify the time worked and that would be the end of it. Yes, May would be overload, so it would actually be reported in September.

It would be possible for faculty on a 12-month contract to request 2 cycles. The semester cycles were to help maintain consistency. To change the cost accounting from a semester based reporting cycle would require re-negotiation with the feds. The reporting was also semester-based because of cost-sharing and ability to report through effort reporting.

Definition of a work week was found on page 220 on the handout cost accounting standards: the time period for a calendar work week was from 12:01 am Sunday to 12:00 pm Saturday, no provisions for compensatory time or overtime for any faculty member. Etc. There was a question on regardless of the number of hours required, not the number of hours worked so is there any flexibility. Kiel was waiting for an answer from HR regarding the definition of a volunteer.

The new electronic system experienced some technical difficulties, so the next cycle would be in February 2007 for the fall semester. The cost accounting standards apply for all sponsors, not just federal. Concern was expressed that we are setting soft money faculty up for failure, as the only way to get an excellent on an evaluation was to do things outside of the grant. If a faculty member only works on the grant, then not only would they only get an acceptable evaluation, but they would not be able to do community or institutional service. regarding a number of conflicts and could only see getting an excellent if he does things outside of acceptable...if work is done only on grant, then he cannot get excellent. What if I develop proposals outside of contact days...does UNR send them? The regulations state that if you do independent work outside of the university and it's not a part of your university effort it would be considered part of the faculty member's 1.0 FTE. However, if there is an institutional policy in place that said was not part of the 1.0 FTE, then it would be excluded. LOAs hired on a grant report just like others. Concern was expressed about being so regulation bound. Faculty could still supplement income on non contract days, as long as they are not combing grant funding with university responsibilities.

## 8. New Business

**University of Nevada, Reno**  
**2006-07 Faculty Senate**

Kiel brought up the policy change regarding 1-day consulting allowance for 12-month faculty. 12 month faculty were once able to take that day as work time but somewhere a change was made to the Handbook that requires faculty take day of Annual for that consulting. The policy change was made in the procedures manual and then put into the University Administrative Manual. While the manual carries the weight of policy, it was not contractually binding as the Code. Hoelzer could mention in a conversation with the Chancellor or the Presidents that when items that affect faculty trickle down behind the scenes that the provost should forward the information to the senate. This would especially need to be done in cases where the changes could result in grievances. This would be an appropriate time to work collaboratively with the administration. There was more discussion on how to prevent this type of thing from happening again, on having a parallel discussion with president, provost and to see if other system chairs were aware of this change, discussion on the need for 12 month faculty to have to use annual leave, the Conflict of Interest Policy allows the ownership of companies, etc, now there is this exception of 12 month faculty, the need to perhaps define faculty types, and if the policy change affects teaching.

Meeting adjourned 5:10pm.