

University of Nevada, Reno
2006-07 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes February 15, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 8

1. Roll Call and Introductions:

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

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

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

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

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

ACTION: Passed unanimously

3. Visit with Regent Jason Geddes:

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

Geddes reminded the senators that if they were contacting their legislator as a private citizen to use their personal email address. If faculty or staff wanted to forward a system or university cause, they to should give Bob Dickens a heads up first. Senators asked what could be done to help legislators see

University of Nevada, Reno
2006-07 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes February 15, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 8

the importance of renovation of the current buildings on campus. Legislators don't see renovation of old buildings as a high priority. It was pointed out that many of the buildings on the UNR campus were historic buildings. It was also brought up that the university was losing federal dollars due to not having more research space. Geddes asked if this information could be brought forward to the regents. Discussion was held regarding the system's focus on health care issues, The Health Sciences Initiative includes physical education programs, health sciences, aging, and many other issues associated with the costs of health care within a community. There are 140 programs on the campuses that are part of this system. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) was brought up and Geddes felt that ERP would happen.

4. Chair's Report:

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

5. Resolution for Coordination of Spring Break:

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

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

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

UNR Faculty Senate
Resolution
UNR and Washoe County Spring Breaks

University of Nevada, Reno
2006-07 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes February 15, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 8

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

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

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

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

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

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

The friendly amendments were acceptable.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Center for Regional Studies

The Center for Regional Studies Ad Hoc Review Committee, which consisted of Greg Gardella, JoAnne Skelly, and Maureen Cronin, reported that they had some concerns with the original proposal such as what appeared to be earmarked funding, documentation of support, relational structure and

University of Nevada, Reno
2006-07 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes February 15, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 8

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

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

ACTION: Passed unanimously

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

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

This bylaw revision would align the university bylaws with the code that had been changed to allow faculty to grieve evaluations. Currently the university bylaws state that evaluations must be contested with the peer review process. Mary Dugan has vetted this with only small changes. It is the goal of the executive board and the Bylaws and Code Committee to have something in place in time for faculty to grieve their evaluations for 2006. The Bylaws and Code Committee would continue to work on the process. Hoelzer reminded the senate that the code was contractual, and the bylaws were not. There was much discussion regarding the senate changing the university bylaws to align with the code. Some senators felt that the bylaws revision should not be passed, but rather that the code should be changed. Hoelzer explained that the code was changed to allow institutions to use either peer review or grievance on their respective campuses, and this bylaw change was just reiterating the new changes to the code. The code change was brought before the senate and approved. At this time the biggest benefit to changing the bylaws would be for clarity for faculty, so they would know the process that they would have to follow. Hoelzer would like to see the bylaws become more than a reiteration of the code. This code change was considered just the beginning of what needed to be done. This code change and bylaw change would again allow faculty to grieve their annual evaluations. The code has two choices: peer review and grievance for evaluations. Since the UNR Bylaws currently describe a Peer Review process, faculty would have two potentially contradictory processes available for pursuing a change in their annual evaluations.

Hoelzer felt that President Glick and Jannet Vreeland would be open to further changes which might allow faculty to grieve some language in their evaluation, not just the rating. According to Hoelzer, both Glick and Vreeland were fully committed to support faculty who were trying to use the reconsideration process to make appropriate change to the text of their evaluations. If faculty have a concern about the language in their evaluation, they should contact the senate office. The senate office would then decide if there was a reasonable set of issues to bring forward. Some senators

University of Nevada, Reno
2006-07 Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes February 15, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 8

expressed concern over leaving so much trust in the hands of the administration, as it might work with this administration, but maybe not the next one. Some senators said that they were willing to take a leap of faith that they would not have made a couple of years ago, and believed that voting for the revision was appropriate. Some felt that if the campus was out of compliance with the code that the regents would have to take a look at the code.

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

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

The friendly amendment was accepted.

The question was called

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

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

8. New Business:

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

Meeting adjourned 5:05 pm