AGENDA ITEM: I. Call to Order 12:15pm 
Called to order 12:15pm by Chair Sumpter

Single Meeting Proxy: Matthew Wright for Peter Bayer; Henry Selvaraj for Wolf Bein; Anne Stevens for Andrew Bell; John Farley for Kendall Hartley; Abbie Kirkendall for Cecilia Maldonado; Sue Mueller for Janis McKay; Fred Krauss for Kara Wada.

Absent: none

AGENDA ITEM: II. Approval of Minutes from February 19, 2013
Meeting minutes – no corrections to the minutes February 19, 2013 – motion to approve, seconded. 35-1-1 approved.

AGENDA ITEM: III. Reports
a. Presidential Evaluation – Dr. Bill Robinson
   • 3-year evaluation of the President
   • Bylaws 14.2 – assessment by faculty
   • Campus Affairs committee is the committee that is assigned to do this
   • Task force – Senate Chair, Chair Campus Affairs, Presidential Representative
   • CAC writes report
   • Issues with comments, Regent Action – if given to Regents makes them a public document, so a representative selection of comments from each question goes to the Regents
   • 575 responses from the 1,840 (31.5% response rate) – little lower than last time.
   • Primary result is that 65.2% overall positive (strongly agree and agree)

BR: What need to know – 1st regent committee April 29th, final regent committee meeting May 2nd and Regent action June 6-7. Would suggest that the Board of Regents have reappointment meetings at the campus where the president resides. People should not need to travel when they want to comment on the President’s reappointment.

Questions
Senator Filler: How similar is our process to the others?
BR: Not similar, in fact Shannon is asked to write up the process.
Senator Filler: How do they differ?
BR: Community Colleges do not even do faculty survey and the others do not have a lot of procedures that include the faculty.
Senator Filler: Where are we going with this?
Chair Sumpter: The things that are sent are what are talked about in the code, but what we did was try and provide anonymity. Consulting with legal department so no slanderous comments are included for example. We then select what is a good representative sample of comments, both positive and negative. When we discussed what we do with the regents, they asked us to write it up for the other chairs.
Senator Unger: The 3 most negative questions. How did these compare to the past surveys?
BR: The two lowest ones were always at the bottom. Administrative accountability and strength of the leadership team are always at the bottom, since 1996.
Senator Unger: Section B – 2.6 does not appear to be generally happy with a GPA of that.
BR: That is a new question and we feel that people are not necessarily answering because of Neal but more how they feel in general.
Senator Spangelo: Bill Robinson did a great job and think he should be appointed permanent to this process. What about the executive practices?
BR: Put in about executive hiring practices and how valued faculty input is – those were the target of those things going on campus now.
Senator Filler motion to approve the report, seconded Senator Bhatnager
Vote to approve report – 35, 1, 1. Report approved
Chair Sumpter: Special thanks to the people from Campus Affairs Committee, Dr. Reiber, and Elda Sidhu from the Office of Legal Counsel.

b. Chair’s report
- Code change re: presidential hires
- Tenured - 29 members of UNLV tenured
- NSHE: new building for NSHE – here in Las Vegas
  - Rochelle and Maryland Parkway
  - Within walking distance of campus
  - UNLV will be lender – Monthly installments/30 years
- Report from Richard N. Katz – regarding e-learning
  - Report was accepted – called Sixteen Candles of eLearning
- RPAC town halls - Dental School had the most attended
- Brought up the RPAC – so seems like the other chairs do not appear to have problems
- Legislative update
  - Shannon and Brad Summerville – public comment pleading for salary restoration – to joint committee
- Start on unit elections – need to start for next year senate positions
- Positions on the executive committee – Flyers for EC and at large will go out this week and voting on April 23rd – busy agenda

Questions
Senator Franklin Sewell: upcoming board meeting PEBP and they will be setting rates, but encourage you to look into them. Submit complaints by email and the board does read them if you cannot attend.
Chair Sumpter: Welcome to go to the meeting or submit the comment by emails
Senator Farley: is it possible to get middle tier this year?
Senator Franklin Sewell—there will be no middle tier this year or maybe the following plan year (2014/2015). The corporate exchange will basically allow people to shop a variety of providers. Intended to provide options to hopefully lower costs—just an idea but not gone far. The NSHE taskforce encouraging them to look at this option.

AGENDA ITEM: IV. Old Business

a. Action Item: ‘consultation’ amendment
   This has been bouncing around for a while. Originally a recommendation to refer to the bylaws—then the provost office offered some alternative language. Chair of bylaws has recommended that we withdraw the current motion to adopt the ‘consultation’ amendment to the UNLV bylaws and let the bylaws stand as currently written.
   Senator Filler: I was the original person to make the motion and would like to withdraw and let the bylaws stand as currently written. I think something will need to be done in the long run.
   Senator Spangelo (seconder): also withdrawn
   Chair Sumpter: the consultation amendment withdrawn

b. Bylaw recommendation: Confidentiality form
   This was submitted yesterday—a recommended change to the confidentiality form. The committee came back with an additional phrase and amendment to the UNLV bylaws. The EC with the president and provost—offered alternative language to 10.2.1. Therefore going to send back to bylaws and ask them to review and determination on these.

AGENDA ITEM: V. New Business

Senator Filler: A motion to create a position of faculty representative to the coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics. This representative shall be appointed annually by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

John Filler and Senator Opfer. The EC should come back to the Senate with a recommendation. Maybe recommend a one-year appointment, but that a person can serve more than 1 year.
Senator Wisner: Are you saying they should recommend a member of the EC?
Senator Filler: No that the EC make recommendations and make the suggestion
Senator Wisner: Why do we need someone?
Senator Filler: The only group that has faculty to the NCAA and collegiate and I think it is important
Senator Robinson: Should we say academic faculty and not from the department of athletics?
Senator Filler: Yes— but should be 1 year so not binding on the next group coming in to the EC.
Changes to motion approved. Vote 42, 1, 2 Motion passes

AGENDA ITEM: VI. Guest Speakers

c. Dr. Tom Piechota, VP of Research & Dean of the Graduate College
   • Primarily to discuss the changes to the Harry Reid Center
   Created in early 90’s and reports to the VP of research. Grew out of the days of research money, of which grew out of earmarks and funding has gone up and down.
• About 5 years ago funding had declined and consultants recommended
  1. focus the mission
  2. integration with campus

• All the issues are not resolved, but need to be addressed. Discussion continues on how to integrate with campus. HRC has good administrative core that supports research. Must be mindful of these in the reorganization. The last part is the campus refocusing and CoRE to further campus engagement and interdisciplinary efforts. Need to make sure things at the HRC are integrated into campus and to align with the academic mission of the campus.
  1. activities where there are ways to align with academic departments
  2. interdisciplinary efforts – align with things like CoRE
  3. Can it be made more efficient and streamline the core research services that help advance the research mission
  4. physical building can be moved to a model more like our science and engineering available to the rest of the campus.

Been working through the process – both HRC staff and external partners and President and Provost to make sure it works on campus. Discussions with the various departments Timeline finished by June and a great deal are falling into place. So things are already falling into place and move pretty easily across other departments. It is also spurring new initiatives.

Questions
Senator Spangelo: We were interested in the level of consultation with faculty, etc. What steps have you taken? HRC is unusual since it is soft money – but what has your office done to include the faculty?
TP: In terms of consultation – part of this was driven by some HRC staff bringing concerns of the direction was going. The direction was also of concern across campus – in listening to departments. Consultation took place with those folks and others – prior to initiating the process. That led to a broader discussion with the entire HRC staff. Ensure what the HRC does to advance the university mission. Sat down individually with all of them to see where they are and how best served in the integration.
Senator Slinn: Was the consultation prior or after?
TP: Consultation prior to and consultation is continuing now to see what it would look like at the end. Spoke to the EC, will meet with the HRC faculty and how they may come together.
Senator Slinn: Was it down with the administrative or everyone – seems they were blind-sided.
We are hearing now across campus that they were blind-sided.
TP: The consultation occurred at various levels with research faculty, administrative faculty – they do not have academic faculty
Senator Franklin Sewell: What you are describing is you had individual consultation and then you announced the reorganization with the rest of the administration and research faculty.
TP: Would add to that. The listening to departments, not any one single conversations and the way it was operating on campus. The consultant’s report – external evaluation. External stakeholders that work with campus were also consulting – business partners. There was a great deal of consultation that took place prior to.
Senator Culbret: A great deal were scared and that they were blindsided – a lot worked with them – we are confused as to what is happening. People had joint proposals and in a lot of cases we don’t know.
TP: People how had grants at HRC would be to integrate those into the departments – where it didn’t make sense, looking for those to bring forward what makes sense. We are still having those conversations. In some it makes sense and will be helpful to the departments.
Senator Culbreth: Are we forming new institutes and entities?
TP: Asked them to bring clear missions and not interested in creating something like we had before
Senator Culbreth: Not aware of how widely this was distributed
Senator Bhatnagar: I have watched this grow. How many faculty affected and will this disappear right away or the next couple of years.
TP: The number of people – you have research faculty and administrative support – had to see since some are part-time but depending somewhere around 40-60. Whether it disappears. The name won’t be taken off the building – but how well it is integrated. We have to have the academic units to make these decisions and want to have them as academic homes
Senator Wright – any accuracy that have been claimed – is this an accurate portrayal and could it have been handled better
TP: I think we are handling it the best way we can in the case of this type of reorganization. I have gone out of my way to ensure that we will do the best we can in this type of situation.
Senator Opfer: There is a director at the HRC who reports to VP of research – were they not following the reports?
TP: Some have dual appointments and have tenure. All have some academic appointment – some just had an appointment at the HRC and lack of appointment of academic – which led to the isolation of activity. We want to bring it on to the campus – we are not necessarily considering physically moving them – but their appointments
Senator Opfer: What were they doing differently than any other centers.
TP: The other centers have a better connection to an academic unit – tied to a college and department
Senator Opfer: For example the supercomputing center – not tied to the college of engineering
TP: But it supports a core mission of the university – so core lab and that integration is occurring at that level.
Senator Opfer: I see them and their competition to others, but there always going to be competition – so there is always going to be. So that is going to happen
TP: But the activity makes sense to be aligned with an academic unit – it should be.
Senator Opfer: Do you eliminate all centers?
TP: No
Senator Sling – The center itself will be declared inactive of the center.
TP: We have to evaluate it and I cannot answer that at this point
Senator Opfer – What if you decide it doesn’t work? And you already disbanded it
TP: Haven’t disbanded it.
Senator Robinson – If we close a department, there is a long process to go through – but sounds like we haven’t considered that in this process. Why was there no formal process or planning process, why do we scare everyone? What did we not consider everything first and then make the decision.
TP: We have followed all the processes.
Senator Franklin Sewell: Let me summarize what I am hearing – I am hearing you have consulted with. But the people there feel they have not been consulted with. So there is a disconnect? So potentially you can rethink the consultation so they are not scared. I get the sense from you is that is not what you intend but that is how they feel.
TP: The best consultation you can do – many of these are individual consulting – so sit down individually and talk about what their positions are and that is what I did. We are continuing to do.

Kathy Lockner: Yes now there are conversations are being made. But not at the beginning. At that point is where it happened. It should be done first and that wasn’t done. Those who integrated into the departments are already their, but those that are not – then other than bringing lines we won’t be welcome. At first we came from there – we do need more focus – you in the departments need to accept us. Public Health and Chemistry were already integrated. What is the mission, what will it look like, and where will we go?

Chair Sumpter: Can you provide regular updates that would be great.

- Faculty awards are being reviewed now – have had good response 400,000 to distribute but over 900,000 in request, so we have hard work. Thirteen proposals on IT category.

d. Dr. Mark Fink, Director of Office of Online Education
   - New media consortium – only in one in the state.
   - Provost and I were on the e-learning steering committee. Went and looked at Austin TX but they are not the best representation. We suggested opt-in and opt-out.
   - Study group on disruptive and adaptive technologies – take that information on a continual basis.
   - 16 recommendations listed below
     Recommendation 1: Invest in Quality Matters and Other QA Tools and Techniques
     Recommendation 2: Invest in Learning Management System (LMS) Harmonization
     Recommendation 3: Invest in Distance Education and Related Policy Review
     Recommendation 4: Invest in Learning Analytics
     Recommendation 5: Invest in E-Textbooks
     Recommendation 6: Invest in a Shared Student Learning Portal and Student e-Portfolio
     Recommendation 7: Develop an NSHE-wide Shared Student Services Strategy
     Recommendation 8: Invest in a Database of Effective Practices in E-Learning and in an E-Learning R&D capability
     Recommendation 9: Invest in Student Readiness for E-Learning
     Recommendation 10: Invest in Adaptive Learning
     Recommendation 11: Invest in Shared Marketing
     Recommendation 12: Continue to invest in rural broadband networking R&D
     Recommendation 13: Invest in a repository of learning objects
     Recommendation 14: Develop e-Ncore
     Recommendation 15: Create Centers of e-Learning Excellence to Support e-Ncore
     Recommendation 16: Hire an E-learning Program Officer and Create an Influential Governance
AGENDA ITEM: VI. New Business

Bill Robinson: Like to propose the sense of the senate – that we support the existing policy and do not change the policy regarding to concealed weapons on campus. There is an NSHE policy, which allows for carrying a concealed weapon if they get approval by the president.

Senator Opfer: Point of information – Is that true if the person has a weapon in their vehicle?

Chair Sumpter: Yes that is the same

Senator Filler: That sense of the senate was about 5 years ago – I think we pull that out and reaffirm that. That would have been Stavros Anthony.

Senator Robinson: We reaffirm the prior sense of the senate.

Senator Unger: Second it.

Chair Sumpter read what Senator Robinson sent. Senator Robinson withdrew his original motion.

Senator Unger: withdrew his second.
Senator Robinson: Support the continuation of current policy opposes anything that allows weapons without our consent.

Senator Slinn: I can support that – but I think they are two separate issues. Try not to confuse them.

Senator Robinson: We should oppose change to the Nevada revised statues which would permit those who hold concealed weapons permits carry these guns in our laboratories and classrooms without the president’s office knowledge or consent.

Senator Robinson: Propose ... The UNLV Faculty Senate opposes the proposed assembly bill AB-143.

Senator Williams: Seconded. Motion passes 31-5-4.

**AGENDA ITEM: VII. Public Comment**

a. Bring to Faculty Senate attention – Food Pantry with intent to help UNLV community in need – maintaining it but need more money and more sustainable – the Foundation has supported us for payroll deduction. As of now less than 15 people are doing it – if you can please help that would be great. Need to try and get more money to maintain the level of distribution. Please spread the word.

b. Both meetings for the president’s evaluation are in Student Union Ballroom A

**AGENDA ITEM: VIII. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 2:10pm

Next meeting April 23, 2013