UNLV 2011-2012 Faculty Senate Minutes
Tuesday, February 21, 2012

A regular Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chair Greg Brown at 12:15 p.m. in Student Union room 208 B-C on Tuesday, February 21, 2012.


Single Meeting Proxy: Sara Gordon for Peter Bayer; Eva Stowers for Jennifer Fabbi; John Filler for Scott Loe; Fred Krauss for Carolyn Hensley; Margot Mink Colbert for Peter Jakubowski; Gary Larson for Paul Traudt. Long term Proxy: David Hatchett for Eduardo Robleto; Jay Souza for Amy Bouchard. Absent: Stephen Bates, Andrew Bell. Excused: Mike Wilde.

Chair Brown recognized two visiting Faculty Senate chairs: Tracy Sherman from College of Southern Nevada, and Robin Herlands from Nevada State College. Senator Harry (seconded Senator Moerhring) moved to approve the minutes for December 6th and January 24th Senate meetings without corrections. Both minutes were approved by a vote of 33 yeas, 2 nays, 2 present.

Chair’s Report:
UNLV:

- The 2012 catalog is being finalized, and with particular recognition to the General Education, Curriculum and Academic Standards Committees for putting in extra time to help finalize it.
- Senate and committee elections will be coming up soon. There are 20 senate seats available and 95 committee seat vacancies. The new Senate will take office on June 1; a call for nominations will happen in March for the five seats on the Executive Committee with the election to take place at the last meeting of this Senate, April 17. Committee elections should be reported by May 4th. All Senators, Senior Senators, and committee chairs should be encouraging colleagues (especially those who have not served previously or recently) to participate in shared governance of UNLV.
- Senator Hartley stated that the Provost’s search committee had met January 27th with the search firm. From a list of 100 applicants, it has been narrowed to a field of 40 on the second level. Airport interviews begin in mid-March. Senators Hartley, Loe, Fine, Werth, and Montgomery are on the committee of 24 individuals.

System issues:

- Council of Chairs has proposed changes to last year’s proposed Code amendment concerning curricular review, to be discussed with System Counsel toward a proposed Code amendment in June. These identify 4 aspects of CR (curricular review) not all of which are currently identified in the Code: 1) budget review to establish a need for program elimination that could lead to termination of tenured faculty; 2) identification of programs for possible consolidation or elimination; reassignment; 3) reorganization or potential layoff of tenured faculty; and 4) a bona fide appeal for tenured faculty before being laid off.
Now that the Low Yield program review Code amendment is in the Handbook and was modified so that the process of reviewing programs will be campus-based, Chair Brown has charged the PNPR committee to develop an initial proposal for this process.

Presidential Vacancy Code amendment is not on March BOR agenda; likely not to be revived.

The proposed amendment adding a Letter of Instruction to the Code has been withdrawn from the March BOR agenda. Other Senate chairs intend to discuss the issue. Chair Brown has charged the P&T committee to develop questions for that discussion.

Upcoming Meetings:
- Funding Formula committee will meet at UNLV next Wednesday, Feb. 29 at 9am, in Greenspun Hall auditorium.
- Board of Regents will meet next Thursday and Friday (March 1 & 2) at CSN-West Charleston.
- PEBP Board will meet Thursday, March 15 at 9am with videoconference to the Grant Sawyer Building.

Committee Report

**Fiscal Affairs Committee** – A written chart and report summary of the recent Employee Compensation Priorities survey was presented by Chair Brown on behalf of committee Chair Mike Wilde. Senators discussed the data significance. A total of 2686 employees (faculty, admin faculty and classified) were sent the survey with a response of 48.5% or 1302. It was noted that classified and professional staff have taken a pay cut for longer than any other parts of the workforce, and several respondents suggested restoration of base pay for that group should be highest priority. Based on initial review of the comments, it is clear that “all of the above” is really the clear first choice and that concerns over health benefits actually rank much higher than the closed-response result suggest. Senator Spangelo asked if the retention bonuses work? And would like someone to go back 10 quarters to make that determination. Chair Brown state that the Fiscal Affairs committee is also researching other public university which have had budget cuts to identify ones where pay is being restored or has been restored, or even where raises are being proposed to gauge “best practices” for restoration of competitive compensation.

Speakers

- **PEBP Task Force** summary notes from January 25th meeting was included in the packet. Senator Cochran who serves on this task force gave additional information regarding what was discussed: PEBP plans to do a survey prior to NSHE conducting its survey; development of a middle tier option; improve customer service; get information out more quickly to new employees; make provider contracted service prices more available to PEBP employees. PEBP meets March 14.

- Dan Bubb, Director of Assessment since January 1, spoke to the Senate regarding the aspirations of his office working with the faculty and services he intends to offer such as workshops and symposiums, especially helpful for general education accreditation review next year.

- Chancellor Dan Klaich was welcomed to the Senate to discuss the proposal he has developed and will present to the Committee on the Funding of Higher Education. The old funding formula has clearly been laid to rest. It is no longer a north/south issue. Education is at stake in Nevada and this is the time to develop a new matrix, allow the institution to put money where it will do the most good. Cuts stop and time to rebuild.

Old Business / Action Item:

Senator Fabbi, seconded by Senator Robinson, moved to approve the following mission statement. Senator Ditmyer moved to call the question, seconded by Senator Stowers. By a vote of 37 yeas, 3 nays, and 1 present, the statement was passed. The Senate now has a Mission Statement thanks to the Senior Senators.
The UNLV Faculty Senate is the voice of the academic and administrative faculty working transparently with university administration to advance the vision and direction of the institution. Relying on faculty participation in its committee structure, the Senate promotes shared governance. Informed by dialogue among constituent groups, the Senate encourages thoughtful deliberation on campus and within its elected representative membership.

The Faculty Senate assures quality in research, creative activity, teaching, and service while exercising responsibility for maintaining and improving rigorous standards throughout the curriculum. The Senate is a strong advocate for competitive compensation, adequate benefits, and an inclusive, equitable work environment conducive to academic achievement.

The UNLV Faculty Senate vigorously champions freedom of thought and expression as the basic tenet of the academic environment at UNLV.

New Business / Future Action:

Committee Charge Revisions – senators discussed the possibility of combining several existing committees and perhaps creating sub-committees of the larger committee. This might reduce work, allow more faculty to participate and invigorate the committees. One senator was concerned that it might reduce transparency rather than increase it.

It was suggested to discuss this further with committee chairs, allowing them to meet with their members and assess what their mission would be.

iClicker straw poll was taken just to find where the Senate’s inclinations are regarding Committee Revision:

1. Inclination to support “Faculty Development Committee?”
   - Strong Support - 28%
   - Moderate support – 31%
   - Moderate opposition – 11%
   - Strong opposition – 19%
   - Indifferent/Don’t know – 11%

2. Inclination to support “Student Affairs committee?”
   - Strong Support – 19%
   - Moderate support – 35%
   - Moderate opposition – 14%
   - Strong opposition – 24%
   - Indifferent/Don’t know – 8%

3. Inclination to support “Campus and Faculty Affairs Committee?”
   - Strong Support – 13%
   - Moderate support – 26%
   - Moderate opposition – 8%
   - Strong opposition – 31%
   - Indifferent/Don’t know - 23%

4. Inclination to support “Program Review and Academic Assessment Committee?”
   - Strong Support – 29%
   - Moderate support – 24%
   - Moderate opposition – 5%
   - Strong opposition – 32%
   - Indifferent/Don’t know – 11%

New Business from the Floor: none

Public Comment – none

At 2:00 p.m. a motion to adjourn was made by Senator Hartley, seconded by Senator Pedersen. The next meeting is scheduled for March 20, 2012, SU 208-BC @ 12:15 p.m.