

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

Meeting Minutes March 8, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 9

**1. Roll Call and Introductions:**

Present: Ray Battalon for Michelle Gardner (Pres), Cynthia Birk (COBA), Donnelyn Curtis (Library), Bill Follette (CLA), Howard Goldbaum (JO), Terry Henner (SOM), Guy Hoelzer (COS), Cindy Kiel (Research), Tom Lean (A & F), Normand LeBlanc (SOM), Normand LeBlanc for Gale Craviso (SOM), Jerome Maese for Maureen Cronin (SS), Mano Misra (EN), Kim O'Reily for David Crowther (CLA), Ron Phaneuf (COS), Mark Pinsky (COS), Nelson Rojas (CLA), Marlene Rebori for JoAnne Skelly (COOP), Stefanie Scoppettone (DEV), Barbara Scott (SOM), Mary Stewart (CLA), Patricia Swager (SOM), Shannon Taylor for Steve Rock (COE), Debra Vigil (SOM), Gini Vogel (CLA), Leonard Weinberg (CLA), Leah Wilds (CLA).

Absent: Denise Baclawski (Provost), Greg Gardella (IT), Karen Kopera-Frye (HHS), Elliott Parker (COBA), Judith Sugar (HHS), Esmail Zanjani (CABNR).

**2. Request to Approve February 15, 2007 Meeting Minutes:**

MOTION: Birk/Follette. To approve the meeting minutes as published.

ACTION: Passed 1 abstention

**3. Chair's Report, Chair Guy Hoelzer:**

Chair Guy Hoelzer reported that on the ombudsman search, 4 candidates had been on campus for day long interviews. The candidates were all local. The search committee was scheduled to meet tomorrow, Friday March 9, 2007. If senators would like an update on the process, they could call the senate office next week.

The Dean of the College of Science (COS) David Westfall would be stepping down in June for retirement. It appeared that an interim dean would be appointed while a search was conducted to find a permanent dean. A group was formed on campus to develop a Request for Proposal for a new child-care facility. The group would be looking for a commercial vendor for child-care center, which would ideally support and compliment what was currently available on campus. The site that was currently being considered was the old Bishop Manogue site. The senate was asked to comment on partial winter campus closure. Most senators said that it didn't really affect them. They would like to see the library remain open during the closure. They also felt that it was unfair to force people to take annual leave during the closure. For some administrative faculty and classified staff the closure was seen as a morale booster. It was mention that during the closure; people come in with their space heaters to work, so that offsets some of the energy savings. The closure creates a hardship on some departments as they have reports that must be finalized during the closure period. Overall the senate had no strong opinions at this point on campus closure.

**4. Results of the UNR Bylaws Vote, Chair Guy Hoelzer:**

The latest UNR bylaws vote was approved by the faculty with 100 votes for and 1 opposed. Hoelzer chose to open the vote to electronic voting and felt that increased the number of votes. The use of electronic voting was an option that the board and the senate office were considering offering again in the future for those who were unconcerned about being anonymous. The senate office staff attended the ultimate survey training and this might be used as a tool for voting, as it would allow the staff to know who voted, but not how they voted. Faculty could still use the two envelope method if they desired. There was some discussion that no method can be truly anonymous, and that faculty had to be able to trust the staff in the senate office. Senators expressed confidence in the senate office staff.

**5. Planning Principles for Effort Reporting, Chair Guy Hoelzer**

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

Meeting Minutes March 8, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 9

At its last meeting, the task force articulated a set of principles that should guide whatever mechanisms were put into place. Hoelzer asked if the senate had any comments on the principles. These principles and other information could be found at the following website. <http://www.unr.edu/ospa/website4/content/effortreporting.htm> Some of the concerns discussed were if faculty would lose salary if they had done university work under their grant, and if the university would be able to supply administrative support to soft funded faculty. The task force was discussing how to remain compliant without disrupting university business. Many universities were struggling with these same issues. The concerns of the federal government were that institutions were billing grants for institutional work. Effort reports had gone out and training sessions had already started. There were 69 training sessions scheduled which were announced in the electronic memo sent out by John Frederick, Executive Vice President and Provost.

**6. Executive Board Nominating Committee Election:**

The nominating committee would nominate members of the senate to serve on the executive board for the 2007-08 Senate. The Executive Board consisted of the Chair, Vice Chair, Parliamentarian, and 2 At-large members. The nominating committee would consist of 5 senators and when nominating senators to the executive board senate experience would be a priority. Hoelzer asked for nominations from the floor. There were none. The following senators were elected to the nominating committee: Donnelyn Curtis, Greg Gardella, Elliott Parker, Stefanie Scoppettone, and JoAnne Skelly

**Break:**

**7. Proposed Changes to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, First Reading, Chair Guy Hoelzer:**

Hoelzer explained that the Executive Board was experimenting with the use of a briefing paper to explain the suggested changes to the senate bylaws. He would first like to go over the briefing paper and then get to the specific language in the bylaws. The suggested changes include: the old senate electing the new executive board, changing the title of the Vice Chair to Chair Elect, allowing senators to be elected as Chair Elect later in their term; change the maximum period of service from 4.5 years in 6 contiguous years to 4 years in 5 consecutive years; neither the chair nor chair elect would represent their unit, but the senate as a whole and those units would be allowed to elect another representative to serve for that period. A benefit of being a chair or chair elect could be a stipend; the faculty senate pays 50% of the Chairs salary, so negotiations can be made with department for reduction in teaching load. This 50% also applies to administrative faculty. After some discussion, the senate agreed to have the executive board rework the language and present it to the senate at the next meeting for approval.

**8. Preview Board of Regents' March 15-16 Meeting Agenda, Chair Guy Hoelzer::**

A revised agenda was sent out this morning which included a regents discussion on the merit of appointed versus elected regents; this is SRJ 4 which would have to be approved by 2 sessions of the legislature and then approved by a vote of the electorate. Hoelzer asked if the senate would like him to weigh in on this. The senate responded that if the council of chairs felt that a statement would somehow help, then it would be worthwhile, but otherwise the consensus was to leave it alone at this point in time. The senate did discuss the advantages and disadvantages of both elected and appointed regents. The next BOR agenda item that caused concern was Proprietary Research. This agenda item was sponsored by UNLV President Ashley and co-sponsored by UNR President Glick. At this time UNR does not have any classified research, but there was concern with the language of

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

Meeting Minutes March 8, 2007

RSJ 304

Meeting 9

the policy language. Hoelzer would like to have the item pulled prior to going to the meeting as the council of chairs had cause for concern with the policy. The council of chairs would like to see the policy reworked, vetted by the senates, and then brought back to the regents at a later date. The policy was difficult to understand, since classified research was combined with proprietary research and they are very different. The institutions would like the regents to allow each institution to develop their own policy regarding this.

**9. New Business:**

The executive board had also been looking at reapportionment of the faculty senate and in light of new head count information; the senate would have 40 senators if apportioned in the same manner. The bylaws currently state that there could be no more than 35 senate representatives. The board had been discussing different ways to reapportion the senate. Currently the ratio is 1 representative to every forty .50 FTE faculty member in a unit. They looked at raising the number to 1 to 100, which would decrease the size of the senate to 22 members and most units would have only 1 representative. A smaller senate might make discussions more functional and senators more responsible to and visible to their constituents. Another thought was to just use units so each unit had one senator. That would mean approximately 18 senators, 12 from Academic units, and 6 from Administrative Units.

A question was raised as to why visits by the president and provost had become so infrequent. The president has advised his staff that he needed to have more regular meetings with the senate. The president would be speaking at a special senate meeting April 5, 2007 from 1:30 to 3:30 in RSJ 304, so please mark your calendars. The provost only attended when the senate had issues that they wanted to discuss with him.

Cindy Kiel advised faculty that the effort reports that were just sent out were incorrect, so please toss them. Her office would be sending out the correct ones next week.

\* A memo was sent out to explain that the only incorrect effort reports were the classified staff effort reports were incorrect.

Meeting adjourned 4:35 pm.